THE USE OF TASK MANIPULATED ALONG INTO THE MANIPULATION OF TASK COMPLEXITY IN SPOKEN LANGUAGE PRODUCTION BY HIGH AND LOW LEVELS OF INDONESIAN EFL LEARNERS

A THESIS

By:

Aulia Fitri Ramadhani

MASTER OF ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM
FACULTY OF TEACHER AND EDUCATION TRAINING
UNIVERSITY OF LAMPUNG

2025

ABSTRAK

THE USE OF TASK MANIPULATED ALONG INTO THE MANIPULATION OF TASK COMPLEXITY IN SPOKEN LANGUAGE PRODUCTION BY HIGH AND LOW LEVELS OF INDONESIAN EFL LEARNERS

Oleh
Aulia Fitri Ramadhani

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk (i) menyelidiki apakah terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan secara statistik dalam produksi bahasa lisan siswa dalam hal kompleksitas, akurasi, dan kefasihan (CAF) yang dihasilkan dari dua tugas yang berbeda oleh siswa berkemampuan rendah dan tinggi, (ii) apakah terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan secara statistik dalam CAF yang dihasilkan dari dua tugas yang berbeda oleh siswa berkemampuan rendah, dan (iii) apakah terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan secara statistik dalam CAF yang dihasilkan dari dua tugas yang berbeda oleh siswa berkemampuan tinggi. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain repeated measures, dengan fokus pada siswa kelas XI di SMA Negeri 9 Bandar Lampung. Penelitian ini melibatkan 31 siswa yang dikelompokkan secara purposif ke dalam kategori kemampuan tinggi dan rendah, serta dinilai menggunakan dua tugas berbicara yang memiliki tingkat kompleksitas berbeda. Performa lisan siswa diukur dengan menggunakan indikator Kompleksitas, Akurasi, dan Kefasihan (CAF).

Data dianalisis menggunakan Two-Way ANOVA dan Paired Samples T-Test. (i) Hasil Two-Way ANOVA menunjukkan adanya perbedaan yang signifikan secara statistik pada tingkat kemampuan dan kompleksitas tugas, serta adanya interaksi yang signifikan antara keduanya ($F = 5.784$, $p = 0.019$), yang menunjukkan bahwa kompleksitas tugas memengaruhi siswa secara berbeda berdasarkan tingkat kemampuan mereka. (ii) Hasil uji Paired Samples T-Test menunjukkan bahwa siswa berkemampuan rendah mengalami peningkatan signifikan dalam kompleksitas ($p = 0.019$), namun mengalami penurunan signifikan dalam akurasi ($p = 0.009$) dan kefasihan ($p < 0.001$). (iii) Bagi siswa berkemampuan tinggi, tidak ditemukan perbedaan yang signifikan dalam kompleksitas ($p = 0.797$) dan akurasi ($p = 0.417$), namun kefasihan mengalami penurunan yang signifikan ($p = 0.037$). Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa kompleksitas tugas memengaruhi performa berbicara dan berinteraksi secara berbeda tergantung pada tingkat kemampuan siswa.

Kata Kunci: CAF, Tingkat Kemampuan, Produksi Lisan, TBLT, Kompleksitas Tugas

ABSTRACT

THE USE OF TASK MANIPULATED ALONG INTO THE MANIPULATION OF TASK COMPLEXITY IN SPOKEN LANGUAGE PRODUCTION BY HIGH AND LOW LEVELS OF INDONESIAN EFL LEARNERS

By
Aulia Fitri Ramadhani

This research aimed to (i) investigate whether or not there were any statistically significant differences of students' spoken language production in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) generated from two different tasks by low and high level students, (ii) there were statistically significant differences of CAF generated from two different tasks by low level students, and (iii) there were statistically significant differences of CAF generated from two different tasks by high level students. This research employed a repeated measures design, focusing on eleventh grade students at SMA N 9 Bandar Lampung. The research involved 31 students, purposively grouped into high and low proficiency categories, and assessed using two speaking tasks differing in complexity. Students' spoken performance was measured using Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF) indicators.

The data were analyzed using Two-Way ANOVA and Paired Samples T-Test. (i) The Two-Way ANOVA revealed a statistically significant differences of proficiency level and task complexity, and also a significant interaction between the two ($F = 5.784$, $p = 0.019$), showing that task complexity impacted students differently based on proficiency. (ii) Paired samples t-tests showed that low proficiency students experienced a significant increase in complexity ($p = 0.019$), but significant decreases in accuracy ($p = 0.009$) and fluency ($p < 0.001$). (iii) For high proficiency students, no significant differences were found in complexity ($p = 0.797$) and accuracy ($p = 0.417$), while fluency significantly decreased ($p = 0.037$). These findings suggest that task complexity affects spoken performance and interacts with students' proficiency levels in different ways.

Keywords: *CAF, Proficiency Level, Spoken Production, TBLT, Task Complexity*

THE USE OF TASK MANIPULATED ALONG INTO THE MANIPULATION OF TASK COMPLEXITY IN SPOKEN LANGUAGE PRODUCTION BY HIGH AND LOW LEVELS OF INDONESIAN EFL LEARNERS

By

Aulia Fitri Ramadhani

A Thesis

Submitted in a Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for S-2 Degree

in

Language and Arts Education Department
Teacher Training and Education Faculty

MASTER OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING STUDY PROGRAM
LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF LAMPUNG
2025

Research Title	: **THE USE OF TASK MANIPULATED ALONG INTO THE MANIPULATION OF TASKCOMPLEXITY IN SPOKEN LANGUAGE PRODUCTION BY HIGH AND LOW LEVELS OF INDONESIAN EFL LEARNERS**
Student's Name	: Aulia Fitri Ramadhani
Student's Number	: 2323042026
Study Program	: Master in English Language Teaching
Department	: Language and Arts Education
Faculty	: Teacher Training and Education

APPROVED BY

Advisory Committee

Advisor	Co-Advisor
Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D.	**Dr. Muhammad Sukirlan., M.A**
NIP 19650706 199403 1 002	**NIP 19641212 199003 1 003**

The Chairperson of the Department of Language and Arts Education	The Chairperson of Master in English Language Teaching
Dr. Sumarti, S.Pd. M.Hum.	**Dr. Budi Kadaryanto, M.A.**
NIP 19700318 199403 2 002	**NIP 19810326 200501 1 002**

ADMITTED BY

1. **Examination Committee**

Chairperson **Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D** .....

Secretary **Prof. Dr. Drs. Muhammad Sukirlan, M.A.** .....

Examiner **1.Prof. Dr. Flora, M.Pd.** .....

2.Dr. Drs. Hery Yufrizal, M.A. .....

2. **Dean of Teacher Training and Education Faculty**

Dr. Albet Maydiantoro, M.Pd.
NIP 19870504 201404 1 001

3. **Director of Postgraduate Program**

Prof. Dr. Ir. Murhadi, M.Si.
NIP 19640326 198902 1 001

4. **Graduated on : June 19th, 2025**

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN

Dengan ini saya menyatakan dengan sebenarnya bahwa:

1. Tesis dengan judul "The Use of Task Manipulated Along Into The Manipulation of Task Complexity in Spoken Language Production by High and Low Level of Indonesian EFL Learners" adalah hasil karya sendiri dan tidak melakukan penjiplakan atau pengutipan karya penulis lain dengan tidak sesuai dengan tata etika ilmiah yang berlaku dalam masyarakat akademik atau yang disebut dengan plagiarism.
2. Hak intelektual atas karya ilmiah ini diserahkan sepenuhnya kepada Universitas Lampung.

Atas pernyataan ini, apabila dikemudian hari ternyata ditemukan adanya ketidakbenaran, saya bersedia menanggung akibat dan sanksi yang diberikan kepada saya, saya bersedia dan sanggup dituntut sesuai hukum yang berlaku.

Bandar Lampung, 19 Juni 2025
Yang membuat pernyataan,

Aulia Fitri Ramadhani
NPM.2323042026

CURRICULUM VITAE

Aulia Fitri Ramadhani was born in Bandar Lampung on January 7, 2000. She is the second child of Mr. Sugiyono Sapto Susilo, S.H., and Mrs. Sriwahyuni. She has three siblings: two brothers, Muhammad Abdul Aziz and Arief Bintang Ilyasa, and one sister, Alesha Sabrina Zulfaraya.

Her formal education began at SD Negeri 1 Jatimulyo, where she completed her elementary studies in 2011. She then continued to SMP Negeri 3 Jatiagung and graduated in 2014. Her senior high school years were spent at MA Al-Fatah Lampung, from which she graduated in 2017.

That same year, she was admitted to the English Education Study Program at the State Islamic University (UIN) Raden Intan Lampung through the SNMPTN selection pathway. She earned her undergraduate degree in 2023 and subsequently continued her academic pursuits in the Master's Program in English Education at the University of Lampung.

DEDICATION

All praise and gratitude are solely for Allah SWT, whose infinite mercy and countless blessings continue to guide and strengthen me. I proudly dedicate this thesis to the following:

- First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my beloved parents, Sugiyono Sapto Susilo, and Sriwahyuni, who have always provided me with endless love, support, and motivation. Their unwavering trust has continuously inspired me to reach this point.
- To my wonderful siblings, Muhammad Abdul Aziz, Arief Bintang Ilyasa, and Alesha Sabrina Zulfaraya, as well as my dear sister in law Elly Febriantika and my beloved niece Hafidzah Athaya Salsabilla thank you for their unconditional love and support. You have all been my constant source of strength and motivation to become a better person every single day.
- My sincere appreciation goes to my esteemed lecturers, whose invaluable guidance, wisdom, and dedication have greatly enriched my knowledge and skills. Their encouragement has been instrumental in my academic journey.
- Special thanks to my dearest friends, Dwi Rahmadianti, M.Pd., Nur Azizah Sambuaga, M.Pd., Ade Nurul Fadillah, M.Pd., Nada Nabila, M.Pd., Elany Agnescia, M.Pd. and the rest of my MPBI 23 friends. Their unwavering support, laughter, and friendship have made this journey truly memorable and enjoyable. I am grateful for every moment we have shared.
- To my extended family, and to a special person who never stopped believing in me. thank you for their continuous support and prayers. Their encouragement has been a significant source of strength throughout my academic journey.
- Finally, to my almamater, the University of Lampung, I express my sincere appreciation for being the place where I have grown both academically and professionally. This institution has provided me with invaluable opportunities and experiences.

MOTTO

Then when you have decided, put your trust in Allah. Indeed, Allah loves those who rely upon Him.

(QS. Ali 'Imran: 159)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer sincerely expresses her deepest gratitude to Allah SWT, the Most Gracious and Most Merciful, for His countless blessings that have consistently guided her throughout her life and enabled the successful completion of this thesis. Salutations and blessings are devotedly offered to the most revered figure, Prophet Muhammad SAW. This thesis, entitled "The Use of Task Manipulated Along Into The Manipulation of Task Complexity in Spoken Language Production by High and Low Level of Indonesian EFL Learners," is submitted to the Master's Program in English Language Teaching at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Lampung University, as part of the requirements for obtaining a Master's degree. The writer is fully aware that this academic achievement would not have been realized without the support, motivation, and assistance of many generous and kind-hearted individuals. Therefore, with deep appreciation and sincere respect, she would like to express her heartfelt thanks to:

1. Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D., the primary advisor, for his exceptional guidance, meaningful suggestions, and consistent support throughout every stage of this research.
2. Prof. Dr. Muhammad Sukirlan, M.A., the co-advisor, for his valuable insights, encouraging advice, and generous assistance that helped refine and strengthen this study.
3. Prof. Dr. Flora, M.Pd., as the first examiner, for her critical observations and enriching input, which contributed greatly to the improvement of this thesis.
4. Dr. Drs. Hery Yufrizal, M.A., as the second examiner, for his detailed critiques and thoughtful recommendations that helped improve the clarity and depth of the research.
5. Dr. Budi Kadaryanto, M.A., as the Head of the Master in English Language Teaching Study Program, for his guidance, motivation and helpful advice during the thesis examination process.

6. All the lecturers in the Master Program of English Language Teaching at Lampung University, for their valuable knowledge, professional insights, and continued encouragement throughout her academic experience.
7. The writer's beloved family, especially her parents, for their endless love, prayers, and unwavering support both emotionally and financially which have been a constant source of strength during this journey.
8. The students of SMAN 9 Bandar Lampung, especially those from classes XI 2, for their active involvement, cooperation, and enthusiasm that made this research possible.
9. Her closest friends Dwi, Asya, Nada, Ade, and Elany, for their sincere prayers, encouragement, and loyal companionship during the highs and lows of this academic path.
10. And lastly, to everyone who has contributed to this research in any form, even if not mentioned by name your kindness and support are deeply appreciated and will never be forgotten.

The writer acknowledges the limitations within this study and welcomes constructive input and suggestions for improvements that can guide future research.

Bandar Lampung, 19 Juni 2025
The writer

Aulia Fitri Ramadhani

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ii
CURRICULUM VITAE v
DEDICATION vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS viii
I. INTRODUCTION **1**
1.1.Background.....1
1.2. Research Questions.....4
1.3. Objectives.....4
1.4. Uses.....5
1.5. Scope.....6
1.6. Definition of Terms.....7
II. LITERATURE REVIEW **8**
2.1. Concept of Task Based Language Teaching.....8
2.2. Concept of Task in Language Teaching.....11
2.3. The Differences between Task and Exercise.....13
2.4. Types of Tasks.....15
2.5. Methodology of Task Based Language Teaching.....17
2.6 The Cognition Hypotheses.....19
2.6.1. Task Complexity.....22
2.6.2. Manipulating Task Complexity.....24
2.7. Measures of Language Production Generated from Tasks.....25
2.7.1. Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF).....26
2.8. Previous Studies.....29
2.9. Theoretical Assumption.....30
2.10. Hypotheses.....31
III. METHODS **34**
3.1. Research Design.....34
3.2. Data (Variables).....35
3.3. Data Source.....35
3.3.1 Population and Sample.....35
3.4. Research Collection Instrument.....36
3.4.1. Validity.....37
3.4.2. Reliability.....39
3.5. Data Collecting Procedures.....40
3.6. Data Analysis.....41

3.7. Data Treatment 42
3.7.1. Normality Test 42
3.7.2. Homogeneity Test 43
3.8. Hypotheses Testing 44
V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION **46**
5.1. Conclusion 46
5.2. Suggestion 48
5.2.1. For English Teachers 48
5.2.2. For Further Researchers 50
REFERENCES **52**

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Task-Based Language Learning Principles 11
Table 2.2. Characteristics between Task and Exercise in Language Learning 15
Table 2.3 Task Based Methodology Design 20
Table 2.4. Manipulation of Task Complexity 26
Table 2.5. CAF Measurement 30
Table 3.1 Grouping Students' Spoken Language Production 35
Table 3.2. Resource-Directing and Resource-Dispersing Elements..... 36
Table 3.3. Reliability Level Classification Based on Coefficient Values..... 39

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter concerns with introduction of the research dealing with background of the problems, the research questions, the objectives of the research, uses of the research, scope of the research, and definition of terms.

1.1. Background

Richards (2008) defines spoken performance as the ability to communicate effectively in the target language in a variety of situations. This includes using appropriate words and grammar, managing conversations, and responding appropriately to what others say. Richards emphasizes the importance of communicative competence, which involves mastering grammar rules, understanding social norms, organizing conversations logically, and using strategies to maintain interaction.

Ellis (2003) similarly describes spoken performance as the use of grammatically correct and contextually appropriate language. According to him, effective communication requires speakers to select the right words and structures to ensure clarity and relevance. He highlights the importance of balancing linguistic accuracy with appropriateness to context and applying language rules in real-life interactions.

Spoken performance, therefore, refers to the ability to communicate clearly and appropriately across various situations. It entails the correct use of grammar and vocabulary, effective conversation management, and the ability to respond

properly in interactive settings. Strong spoken performance requires a combination of grammatical accuracy, contextual understanding, and communicative skills.

Spoken performance plays an important role in language learning as it enables learners to apply their knowledge in meaningful communication. It allows students to articulate their ideas, express opinions, and engage in discussions across academic, social, and professional contexts. Regular practice in speaking can support the development of fluency and boost learners' confidence in using the language. Moreover, spoken tasks allow students to demonstrate their existing vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, and pronunciation in real-time situations. However, the extent to which spoken performance contributes to language development depends greatly on how speaking tasks are designed and whether they are supported by instructional input, feedback, and scaffolding. Without such support, spoken performance alone may not be sufficient to significantly improve core language competencies.

Nevertheless, students often struggle with spoken performance, particularly in spontaneous situations that require them to think and speak simultaneously. Brown (2004) notes that learners may face difficulties with grammar and vocabulary, making it challenging to speak accurately. Maintaining fluency can also be difficult, with common issues such as hesitations and repetitions. In addition, managing conversations demands the ability to listen, process information, and respond quickly all under time pressure. Anxiety and low confidence can further hinder performance. Therefore, successful spoken

performance not only requires language knowledge but also the ability to manage cognitive and emotional demands during real-time communication.

To address such challenges, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) offers a promising instructional approach. Ellis (2003) explains that TBLT focuses on learning through meaningful tasks that mirror real-life communication. This method emphasizes task completion over language form and encourages students to use language functionally. TBLT promotes engagement, reduces fear of mistakes, and provides learners with opportunities to apply language in context.

Recent studies have increasingly examined how manipulating task complexity in TBLT influences language performance. Studies indicate that the complexity of tasks can affect students' spoken performance, particularly in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF). Tasks that gradually increase in difficulty may help learners enhance their spoken abilities in a structured way. These findings highlight the role of task design in shaping language use and its potential to support learner development in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) contexts.

For example, Saeedi et al. (2012) examined the effects of task complexity on narrative performance and found that increasing cognitive demands in resource-directing dimensions improved both complexity and accuracy. Similarly, Azizi et al. (2012) reported that task complexity significantly influenced Iranian L2 learners' oral performance. Masrom et al. (2015) explored the link between task complexity and motivation, finding that higher task complexity was associated with increased lexical production. Michel et al. (2007) compared monologic and dialogic tasks and found that task complexity impacted accuracy and fluency,

while dialogic tasks promoted more fluent but structurally simpler output. Robinson (2001) also showed that learners' perceptions of task difficulty aligned with the manipulated task complexity.

This research emphasized that understanding how task complexity influences spoken performance can guide teachers in designing effective speaking activities. By adjusting task demands, teachers can create communicative experiences that help students develop fluency, accuracy, and complexity. This research seeks to investigate the effects of task complexity on spoken performance by comparing how students from low and high proficiency levels perform under different task conditions. The research focuses on three key dimensions complexity, accuracy, and fluency to provide insights that support effective task design in EFL contexts. Therefore, the researcher is interested in conducting this study entitled "The Use of Task Manipulated Along Into The Manipulation of Task Complexity in Spoken Language Production by High and Low Level of Indonesian EFL Learners."

1.2. Research Questions

Dealing with the issues presented in the background, this study is intended to answer these following research questions:

1. Is there any statistically significant differences of students' spoken language production in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) generated from two different tasks by low and high level students ?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference of CAF generated from two different tasks by low level students?
3. Is there a statistically significant differences of CAF generated from two different tasks by high level students ?

1.3. Objectives

Regarding with the research questions above, this research intends to find out the following purposes:

1. To determine if there is a statistically significant difference in spoken language performance generated from two different types of tasks between low and high proficiency students.
2. To investigate whether low proficiency students produce different spoken language performance when generated from two different types of tasks.
3. To explore whether high proficiency students produce different spoken language performance when generated from two different types of tasks.

1.4. Uses

This research provided both theoretical and practical uses. Theoretically, it contributed to the existing body of knowledge on Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) by providing empirical evidence on how task complexity affected spoken language performance across different proficiency levels. It advanced the understanding of how complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) were impacted by task complexity, offering insights into the cognitive processes involved in language learning. Additionally, the findings offered a framework for future research on the effects of task complexity in other language skills, such as writing and reading, and among different learner demographics, including varying ages and cultural backgrounds. Practically, the insights from this research were used by educators to design and implement more effective TBLT-based spoken activities tailored to the proficiency levels of their students, thereby enhancing their teaching strategies. Curriculum developers incorporated the findings into

language programs to create a more structured approach to gradually increasing task complexity, helping students build their spoken skills more systematically. Understanding the impact of task complexity on students' speaking performance also allowed educators to create a more student-centered learning environment that reduced anxiety and boosted confidence, particularly for low proficiency students. Furthermore, the research was utilized in teacher training and professional development programs to equip educators with the knowledge and skills for effectively integrating TBLT in their classrooms. Finally, the research provided a basis for developing assessment tools that accurately measured the spoken abilities of students across different proficiency levels, allowing for more targeted feedback and support.

1.5. Scope

This research investigated whether there was any significant difference in spoken language performance generated from two different types of tasks between low and high proficiency students. In addition, this research also explored whether low-ability students performed differently with different task types and whether high-ability students showed variations in their spoken performance depending on the task type. The target group for this research consisted of 11th grade students at SMA N 9 Bandar Lampung. The goal was to offer practical insights for teachers, students, and schools to improve speaking skills through effective task design and implementation. The findings were expected to contribute to theoretical frameworks in TBLT and practical pedagogical practices.

1.6. Definition of Terms

In order to specify the topic of the research, the researcher provided some definitions of terms related to the research. These were some terms which were related to the research:

1 .Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) was an approach to teaching languages where students learned by doing real-life tasks that involved communication. It focused on both using the language naturally and learning correct grammar.

1. Task Complexity referred to the demands placed on attention, memory, reasoning, and other information processing by the task structure.
2. Speaking Performance was the act of producing spoken language in real situations.
3. **Low Proficiency** referred to students whose English language ability was relatively limited, particularly in terms of vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and confidence in speaking. In this study, these students were placed in a class with a lower average English achievement.
4. **High Proficiency** referred to students with a stronger command of the English language, demonstrated through higher vocabulary range, better grammatical accuracy, and greater fluency. In this study, they were from a class with higher English achievement.

The background information, research questions, objectives, uses, limits, and specific terms' meanings formed the core structure of this study. They gave a solid starting point and guided the understanding of what the research was about. These elements were explained more thoroughly in the next chapter, offering a deeper.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents theories relevant to the research, including concepts related to task-based language teaching, the definition of a task, the differences between tasks and exercises, the methodology of task-based teaching, the cognition hypotheses, previous studies on task complexity, measures of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF), theoretical assumptions, and hypotheses.

2.1. Concept of Task Based Language Teaching

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is used worldwide as a different way to teach languages. Instead of traditional methods, TBLT helps students improve their communication skills by having them complete tasks that require using the language. Ellis and Shintani (2014) explain that TBLT focuses on meaningful communication. It allows students to not only practice the language but also think about how they are learning it (Nunan, 2004). While doing these tasks, students interact in the language they are learning to achieve specific goals. These tasks are designed to connect what students do in the classroom with how they will use the language in real life. In a communicative approach to teaching, task-based language teaching (TBLT) focuses on using tasks to improve speaking skills. It values fluency over accuracy, though accuracy is still important. Students develop their grammar skills by talking with their classmates in the target language.

Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT), also called Task-based Learning or Task-based Instruction, is a teaching method that uses specific tasks to help students learn a new language. According to Van den Branden (2006), these tasks

help students produce language, engage in conversation, understand meanings, and focus on grammar, all of which are important for learning a second language. In TBLT, lessons are built around activities that require students to use the language in real-life situations.

According to Bygate (2016), TBLT involves using communicative and collaborative tasks to plan and deliver lessons. This means that students work together on activities that help them communicate in the target language. Ellis (2009) adds that TBLT focuses primarily on the meaning of what is being communicated, rather than the specific language forms. Students have the freedom to use any language resources they have to complete the tasks, and the final goal is usually a practical, non-linguistic outcome, like solving a problem or creating a plan. Skehan (1998) explains that in Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), tasks are central to the teaching process. They require learners to use language meaningfully to accomplish specific goals, making tasks both tools for learning and objectives to be met. This approach emphasizes practical, real-world use of language.

Similarly, Ellis (2003) views tasks as the foundation for planning and instruction in TBLT. He highlights several key features of this method: a. Encourages the 'natural' use of language in real-life scenarios. b. Puts learners at the center of the learning process, rather than having teachers control everything. c. Focuses on language forms, but within the context of using the language naturally during tasks. d. Uses tasks as a way to promote natural, meaningful language use. e. Points out that traditional language teaching methods are often not effective. Experts are in agreement that Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT)

emphasizes authentic language use by providing students with meaningful tasks that match their real-world needs. This approach places tasks as a central component in teaching, requiring students to use language meaningfully to develop skills that can be applied in real-life situations. By focusing on tasks relevant to everyday life, TBLT ensures that language learning becomes relevant and effective.

The following principles can be used as a guide to attain goals in task-based methodology because the main goal is to generate possibilities for language acquisition and skill development through collaborative knowledge.

Table 2.1. Task-Based Language Learning Principles

Willis (1996)	**Skehan (1998)**
1. Learners should be exposed to rich, meaningful, and authentic language.	Select a range of target structures to ensure systematic language development, without strictly following a structural syllabus.
2. Learners should have opportunities to use the language actively.	Choose tasks that fulfill the *utility criterion*, meaning they naturally elicit the use of targeted structures.
3. Tasks should motivate learners to participate in meaningful communication.	Sequence tasks to support a balanced development of fluency, accuracy, and complexity at different stages.
4. There should be a focus on language at specific stages of the task cycle.	Promote focus on form by manipulating learners' attention during task performance.

Willis (1996)	Skehan (1998)
5. The prominence of language focus can vary at different stages of learning.	Use *cycles of accountability* to encourage metacognitive awareness and reflection on language learning progress.

The principles listed above are meant to serve as a guideline for teaching task-based lessons rather than a set of rules. Teachers must make their own methodological judgments based on what they believe would work best with their students.

2.2. Concept of Task in Language Teaching

A task is an essential tool used by learners to gain knowledge and develop language proficiency. Learning through tasks is not a random event; it is a deliberate and recurring process integral to a sequence of learning activities designed to help students understand and use the material effectively. Tasks involve selecting, modifying, designing, composing, arranging, observing, and evaluating activities, often outlined in textbooks, student worksheets, modules, or other educational materials. Occasionally, there may be discrepancies between tasks in different resources and teacher referrals, but this does not invalidate the tasks. Teachers must be prepared to address any questions students might have about assignments from various sources.

Various perspectives on tasks highlight their multifaceted nature. Nunan (1989) describes a task as “a piece of classroom work which involves learners in

comprehending, manipulating, producing, or interacting in the target language while attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form. The task should also have a sense of completeness, being able to stand alone as a communicative act in its own right." Candlin (1985), as referenced by Long, views a task as one of several diverse, orderable problem-posing activities. It involves teachers and students in a joint selection from various cognitive and communicative procedures applied to new and existing knowledge in a collective exploration and pursuit of goals within a social milieu. Ellis (2003) defines a task as a work plan that requires learners to process language pragmatically to achieve an outcome evaluated in terms of content rather than language.

In essence, a task is an activity designed by the teacher to be completed by a learner in a language classroom. The focus is on the context and meaning of language use, not just on the form. Tasks aim to help learners achieve their communicative purposes, allowing them to convey messages effectively in specific communicative settings. Tasks should resemble real-life language use, emphasizing meaningful communication. They involve various language and thinking skills, rather than concentrating on a single grammar point or vocabulary set. These activities help students achieve specific learning outcomes. Teachers play a crucial role in selecting topics and tasks that motivate and engage students, match their language proficiency levels, and effectively promote language development. Through tasks, students not only achieve their learning objectives but also assess their abilities and understanding of the material. Ultimately, this approach ensures that students actively use the language in meaningful ways, enhancing their overall language skills.

2.3. The Differences between Task and Exercise

Tasks and exercises are both important components in language learning, but they serve different purposes. A task is an activity designed to use the target language in real-life situations, focusing on meaningful communication. According to Long (2016), tasks simulate real-life language use and engage students in various language and cognitive skills simultaneously. For instance, tasks often involve interaction and collaboration, making them engaging and motivating as they require students to solve problems or make decisions using the language. On the other hand, an exercise is a controlled activity aimed at practicing specific language points such as grammar, vocabulary, or pronunciation. Nunan (1989) describes exercises as activities that focus on accuracy and repetitive practice of isolated linguistic elements. These exercises are typically decontextualized and do not involve broader communicative contexts. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), exercises help reinforce learning by providing focused practice on particular language forms.

Ellis (2003) and Willis (1996) highlight that tasks emphasize meaning and authentic language use, while exercises are more about form and accuracy. Harmer (2007) notes that exercises, though less interactive, are crucial for practicing specific language points. Both tasks and exercises play vital roles in language education, offering a balanced approach to developing both communicative competence and linguistic accuracy. Here is the difference of task and exercise according to Skehan in Ellis (2000):

Table 2.2. Characteristics between Task and Exercise in Language Learning

Aspect	**Task**	**Exercise**
Orientation	Develops linguistic skills through communicative activity	Views linguistic skills as prerequisite to communication
Focus	Propositional content and pragmatic meaning (*focus on meaning*)	Linguistic form and semantic meaning (*focus on form*)
Goal	Achieving a communicative goal	Demonstrating code (language) knowledge
Outcome Evaluation	Based on achievement of communicative goal	Based on conformity to linguistic rules
Real-World Link	Directly relates to real-life communication	Prepares skills for future application

Tasks in language teaching have specific characteristics that distinguish them from exercises. According to Long (2016), tasks simulate real-life language use and emphasize meaningful communication. Skehan (1998) adds that tasks have clear goals and require learners to use a range of cognitive and linguistic skills. Similarly, Robinson (2001) highlights that tasks allow students to activate their existing knowledge while engaging in activities with varying levels of complexity.

In contrast, exercises, as defined by Richards and Schmidt (2010), are controlled activities that focus on practicing specific language forms, such as grammar or vocabulary. Exercises are typically repetitive, accuracy-oriented, and involve minimal communicative interaction.

For instance, a language exercise might ask students to fill in the blanks with the correct past tense form of verbs (e.g., “Yesterday, Nancy to school.”), focusing on grammatical accuracy. Meanwhile, a task could involve planning a birthday party, where students must decide what items to bring, where to hold the event, and write

invitation letters—thus encouraging negotiation, collaboration, and real-life language use.

Overall, tasks are better aligned with the principles of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) as they emphasize authentic interaction, problem-solving, and integration of multiple skills. Understanding these distinctions helps educators create more effective learning experiences by balancing language accuracy with communicative competence.

2.4. Types of Tasks

A task is a unit of work necessary to achieve a goal and typically includes details such as the author, due date, priority, and stage of completion. For larger or more complex projects, additional parameters like start dates, dependencies on other tasks, and milestones may be needed. However, increasing the level of detail in task structure can also complicate the process of adding new tasks.

According to Nunan (2004), there are several types of tasks designed to engage learners in different ways. Information-Gap Tasks require learners to communicate to complete missing information, such as sharing different parts of a map. Reasoning-Gap Tasks involve using logical reasoning to deduce new information, like solving puzzles. Opinion-Gap Tasks asked learners to express personal preferences or attitudes with reasons, for example, discussing ways to reduce waste. Jigsaw Tasks involved each learner having a piece of information to share, assembling a complete picture, such as piecing together parts of a story. Other task types included Problem-Solving Tasks, where learners found solutions to problems like resource allocation in emergencies; Decision-Making Tasks that required choosing between options by considering various factors, such as selecting the best

location for a school event; and Opinion-Exchange Tasks, which focused on sharing and debating opinions to reach consensus, like discussing school policies. Listing Tasks engaged learners in brainstorming related items, for instance, listing healthy habits, while Ranking and Ordering Tasks required prioritizing items based on criteria, such as ranking holiday destinations. Descriptive Tasks called for detailed descriptions of objects, people, or places, like describing a favorite place, and Narrative Tasks involved storytelling or recounting events, such as retelling a story highlighting main characters and events.

In this research, the impact of task complexity on language learning was investigated. The researcher used descriptive tasks within the Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) framework to compare simple-simple tasks with complex-simple tasks. Descriptive tasks required students to provide detailed descriptions of objects, people, places, or events, thus making them a suitable tool for assessing complexity, accuracy, and fluency in spoken performance. The aim was to understand how different levels of task complexity affected students' descriptive abilities and gain insight into how TBLT could be effectively used to improve language learning outcomes. Descriptive tasks were well suited for this research as they required the use of clear and detailed language, thus allowing the analysis of variations in students' spoken performance under different levels of task difficulty.

In particular, the researcher used a type of descriptive task, which was suitable for eliciting detailed spoken responses and analyzing students' spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF). This type of task required students to focus on physical appearance, clothing, setting, and changes over time, as well as to provide their personal opinions on which photo appeared the best and

why. This task combined descriptive and opinion-gap elements and was designed to elicit extended spoken responses, making it an appropriate instrument for measuring the complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) of students' spoken language output under varying task conditions.

2.5. Methodology of Task Based Language Teaching

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is a teaching method that uses practical tasks as the core of language instruction. According to Willis (1996), TBLT involves creating lessons based on tasks that reflect real-life language use. This approach encourages students to use the language in practical, interactive ways, moving away from traditional rote learning to more engaging and relevant activities.

Ellis (2003) describes TBLT as having three main stages: pre-task, during-task, and post-task. In the pre-task stage, teachers introduce the topic, give clear instructions, and provide the necessary vocabulary and structures. This stage helps students understand the purpose of the task, prepares them linguistically, and reduces anxiety by making the expectations clear. In the during-task stage, students perform the task, often working in pairs or groups. This phase focuses on authentic communication and allows students to use language naturally, drawing from their current language knowledge. The teacher may monitor students but does not intervene. In the post-task stage, students review their performance, reflect on what they have learned, and practice new language forms that emerged during the task. Nunan (2004) emphasizes that this stage is vital for reinforcing learning and addressing any language issues that arise.

A structure such as the one below offers a clear framework for task-based lessons, allowing for flexibility and variation at each stage.

Table 2.3 Task Based Methodology Design

Stage	**Features**
Pre-Task	Framing the activity, regulating planning time, doing a similar task
During-Task	Time pressure, regulating topic
Post-Task	Learner reports, repeat task, reflection

Source: A framework for designing task-based lessons, Ellis (2003)

In this research, the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) focused specifically on the during-task stage, without explicitly involving the pre-task and post-task stages. The primary focus of this research was to assess students' spoken performance through speaking tasks that varied in complexity. Therefore, elements commonly included in pre-task and post-task stages, such as language input, strategic planning, and feedback, were not implemented in the learning design. Students performed the tasks by relying on their existing language knowledge.

This approach was selected to support the main objective of the research, which was to evaluate how task complexity influenced students' speaking performance, particularly in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF). By limiting the implementation to the during-task stage, the researcher was able to focus more

clearly on the direct impact of task characteristics on students' language output without interference from instructional interventions.

Although TBLT was theoretically designed to be implemented in three full stages, many previous studies also applied partial approaches to align with specific research objectives and scope. In this context, focusing solely on the during-task stage did not contradict the fundamental principles of TBLT, as the core of this approach using communicative tasks that required active student engagement in meaningful language production was preserved.

With this methodological design, the research aimed to contribute to the development of task-based instructional practice, particularly in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. The findings were expected to offer insights into how task characteristics affected students' spoken performance across different proficiency levels and to serve as a valuable reference for researchers and educators in designing communicative tasks that align with students' needs and learning goals.

2.6 The Cognition Hypotheses

The Cognition Hypotheses in Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), developed by Peter Robinson, suggests that learners acquire language more effectively when they engage in tasks that progressively increase in cognitive complexity. This hypothesis proposes that as tasks become more challenging, learners are prompted to use more advanced language structures, thereby enhancing their language learning.

Robinson (2001) argues that tasks should be sequenced from simpler to more complex, considering factors such as the number of elements involved, reasoning demands, and requirements for memory and attention. This progression helps learners expand their language abilities and develop stronger linguistic skills. Additionally, complex tasks foster meaningful interaction and negotiation of meaning among learners, which are crucial for language acquisition, Skehan (1998). For instance, learners might begin with simple tasks like describing their daily routines, then advance to more complex tasks such as planning a weekend trip, and finally engage in highly complex activities like debating controversial topics. Through these tasks, learners are encouraged to use increasingly sophisticated language, which supports their overall language development.

The Cognition Hypotheses, as proposed by Robinson (2001), suggests that the complexity of tasks influences learners' interaction and negotiation for meaning. Supported by Long (1996), the hypotheses states that when tasks become more complex, learners tend to focus more on problematic language forms both in input (what they hear or read) and output (what they say or write). This attention to language forms is heightened during complex tasks, which can lead to a responsive focus on form, such as through recasting techniques.

Robinson's Triadic Componential Framework further elaborates on the factors that influence L2 performance, categorized into task complexity (cognitive factors), task conditions (interactive factors), and task difficulty (learner factors). Here's a breakdown of the components:

Table 2.1. Robinson's Triaduc Componential Framework

Aspect	Subcategory	Factors/Variables
Task Complexity *(Cognitive factors)*	a. Resource-directing	± few elements ± here and now ± reasoning demands
	b. Resource-dispersing	± planning ± single task ± prior knowledge
Task Conditions *(Interactive factors)*	a. Participation variables	one-way / two-wayconvergent / divergentopen / closed
	b. Participant variables	Gender familiarity power / solidarity
Task Difficulty *(Learner factors)*	a. Affective variables	Motivation Anxiety confidence
	b. Ability variables	A ptitude Proficiency intelligence

1. Task Complexity (Cognitive factors): This refers to the cognitive demands of the task, such as the number of elements to manage, reasoning demands, and the complexity of language use required. Example: Using different tenses or deictic expressions (this, that, here, there).
2. Task Conditions (Interactive factors): These are factors related to the interaction during the task, such as the level of participation and the openness of the task to divergent thinking. Example: One-way communication versus two-way interaction.
3. Task Difficulty (Learner factors): This includes learner-specific factors such as motivation, anxiety, confidence, and proficiency levels. Example: Learner's aptitude, familiarity with the task, and intelligence.

Robinson (2001) argues that pedagogic tasks should be designed and sequenced based on task complexity, particularly by manipulating cognitive factors. He differentiates between task complexity, which involves cognitive factors, and task difficulty, which involves learner factors terms that were previously used interchangeably. Additionally, he distinguishes task complexity from task conditions, which involve interactive factors.

In this current research, task complexity will be designed according to two dimensions: resource-directing and resource-dispersing. This approach aims to fully facilitate learners' spoken language production between two types of tasks simple and complex in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF).

2.6.1. Task Complexity

Robinson (2001) defines task complexity as the cognitive demands placed on language learners, such as attention, memory, and reasoning required by the task

structure. He categorizes task complexity into two dimensions: resource-directing and resource-dispersing. The resource-directing dimension involves cognitive and conceptual demands like reasoning, spatial reasoning, and reference to different timeframes. On the other hand, the resource-dispersing dimension includes procedural demands such as planning time, task structure, and prior knowledge.

According to Robinson (2005), increasing task complexity in the resource-directing dimension enhances the accuracy and complexity of second language (L2) performance but reduces fluency. Conversely, increasing complexity in the resource-dispersing dimension improves fluency but negatively affects accuracy and complexity.

Robinson's Triadic Componential Framework (2003, 2005) suggests that task complexity influences task performance and learning differently depending on whether the demands are conceptual (resource-directing) or procedural (resource-dispersing). Resource-directing variables, like referencing past or present events and reasoning, guide learners to focus on language forms, improving accuracy and complexity. Resource-dispersing variables, such as planning time and task structure, promote quicker, more automatic language use but do not direct attention to language forms, enhancing fluency.

The framework also distinguishes between resource-depleting variables (performative and procedural demands) and resource-directing variables (cognitive and conceptual demands). Resource-depleting variables make significant demands on learners' resources, while resource-directing variables guide attention toward vocabulary and syntax.

For this research, tasks will be designed to manipulate task complexity through both resource-directing and resource-dispersing dimensions. This approach aims to address cognitive and conceptual demands, directing attention to linguistic forms and promoting quicker and more automatic language use.

2.6.2. Manipulating Task Complexity

As previously mentioned, this research manipulated and combined two dimensions of task complexity to compare students' spoken language production using two types of tasks: simple-simple and complex-simple, considering both resource-directing and resource-dispersing aspects simultaneously. This comparison was made between two groups of students with different proficiency levels: high and low.

To manipulate task complexity, six variables were considered: number of elements, here-now/there-then, reasoning demand, planning time, single task, and prior knowledge. These variables were combined and sequenced to create simple and complex tasks. In other words, the researcher varied the task complexity by increasing and decreasing these variables within both the resource-directing and resource-dispersing dimensions at the same time. An example of how tasks were manipulated is as follows:

Table 2.4. Manipulation of Task Complexity

Task	**Resource-directing**	**Resource-dispersing**
Task 1	+few elements	+planning time
	+here and now	+single task

	+no reasoning demand	+prior knowledge
Task 2	-many elements	+ planning time
	-there and then	+single task
	-No reasoning demand	+prior knowledge
Aspect	**Simple Task (+)**	**Complex Task (–)**
Number of Elements	Few Elements	Many Elements
Time Reference	Here & Now (Present Tense)	There & Then (Past Tense)
Reasoning Demand	No Reasoning Demand	Requires Reasoning
Planning	Has Planning Time	No Planning Time
Task Type	Single Task	Dual Task
Background Knowledge	Prior Knowledge Available	No Prior Knowledge

2.7. Measures of Language Production Generated from Tasks

Over the past three decades, interest in language production has led to the development of several psycholinguistic models that aim to explain how language transitions from the mind to spoken words. The message captures the features of the speaker's intended meaning, which are then used to encode the phonological structure of the utterance into the output systems. To outline the steps involved in generating a simple utterance, we can look at the steps involved in producing an

error. Skehan (1998) suggests that tasks should be sequenced by selecting tasks that promote fluency, accuracy, and complexity at an appropriate level of task difficulty. This is determined by three factors: (1) the complexity of the code, described in traditional methods such as structural approaches or developmental sequences (p.99); (2) cognitive complexity, which results from familiarity with the task, topic, or type, and processing requirements; the type, clarity, organization, and amount of information needed; and (3) communicative stress, which includes characteristics such as time pressure, the number of participants, and opportunities to control interaction.

Students' language production can be measured using Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF), which has been used to study Second Language Acquisition and Applied Linguistics for many years. The increasing emphasis on complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language acquisition research is having a significant impact. CAF are commonly used as performance descriptors for oral and written assessments of language skills and have been used to measure progress in language learning for the past few decades as an alternative to standardized proficiency tests (Housen and Kuiken, 2009).

2.7.1. Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF)

In the realm of language teaching and assessment, evaluating speaking ability through measures of Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF) is crucial for understanding learners' proficiency. Experts in the field have defined and outlined these dimensions to provide a comprehensive assessment of spoken language skills. Measuring Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF) in speaking ability involves assessing different aspects of learners' language use.

1. Complexity refers to how intricate and varied a learner's language is, including the use of complex sentence structures, a diverse vocabulary, and coherent organization of ideas. Peter Robinson (2001) discusses task complexity and its impact on language performance in his Triadic Componential Framework, emphasizing the range of vocabulary and grammar structures used, diversity of sentence structures, and the development of ideas.
2. Accuracy focuses on the correct use of grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. Rod Ellis (2003) highlights the importance of accuracy in language learning, with assessments focusing on identifying and correcting errors in grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. Evaluators also consider how clear and understandable the pronunciation is.

3. Fluency pertains to how smoothly and naturally a learner can speak without hesitations and pauses. Michael Long (1985) discusses the role of fluency in language acquisition and production, emphasizing the speed of speech, the flow of language, and the ability to maintain a steady conversation without interruptions. Assessments of fluency measure the ability to speak at an appropriate pace and maintain coherence in spoken discourse.

An example of assessing CAF in speaking could involve a task where students describe their daily routines. Assessors would evaluate the complexity based on sentence structure variety, vocabulary richness, and coherence of ideas. They would also assess accuracy by checking for grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation errors. Additionally, they would evaluate fluency by observing the smoothness of speech, the rate of speech, and the ability to speak without pauses

or hesitations. These assessments provide insights into students' overall speaking proficiency and inform targeted feedback to enhance their language skills effectively.

The specifications of the CAF chosen are listed below:

Table 2.5. CAF Measurement

CAF Measurement		
Complexity	Accuracy	Fluency
Syntatic: AS-Units	% of Error-Free Clauses	Speech Rate B

Measuring Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF) in speaking ability provides a comprehensive assessment of learners' language proficiency. By examining the complexity of language use, the accuracy of grammar and vocabulary, and the fluency of speech, educators can gain valuable insights into students' overall language skills. These assessments not only help in understanding students' strengths and areas needing improvement but also guide the development of targeted interventions to enhance language learning outcomes. As scholars like Peter Robinson, Rod Ellis, and Michael Long have outlined, focusing on CAF allows for a nuanced evaluation of language development, ensuring learners are equipped with the necessary skills for effective communication in real-world contexts.

2.8. Previous Studies

There are several previous studies on Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) that are relevant to this research.

The first study was conducted by Septiyana, and Abdurrahman, (2019). The findings showed that: (1) the steps in designing English speaking materials using TBLT included identifying potency and problems, data collection, product design, design validation, design revision, product testing, and product revision. Product testing was used to determine students' responses toward the developed materials. (2) The analysis of students' responses, involving 24 Islamic Economics students, showed very positive feedback toward the speaking materials designed with TBLT.

The second study was conducted by Rahmawati, and Wahyuni, (2020). The study revealed that: (1) the use of TBLT in speaking classes improved students' speaking skills. This was evidenced by the mean post-test score of the experimental group (79.69), which was higher than the group taught using the discussion technique (73.85). (2) Students showed very high interest in learning English through TBLT, with an average interest score of 92.0%.

The third study was carried out by Lume, and Hisbullah, (2022). The results indicated that TBLT was effective in improving students' speaking performance. The experimental group taught using TBLT achieved higher mean scores compared to the control group taught using the direct method. The t-test results supported the significant impact of TBLT on students' speaking ability.

These previous studies collectively highlight the effectiveness of TBLT in enhancing students' speaking skills and fostering strong engagement. They

emphasize the role of meaningful, communicative, and task-based learning in language development. This present study builds on those findings by examining how different levels of task complexity affect students' spoken production in terms of Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF).

2.9. Theoretical Assumption

This research was based on the assumption that task complexity (simple vs. complex tasks) had a significant influence on students' spoken language performance. This influence was expected to differ depending on students' levels of language proficiency.

High-proficiency students were assumed to perform better when given complex tasks. These tasks involved more elements, past time references, reasoning demands, and required higher cognitive engagement. Because these students possessed stronger language skills and greater cognitive resources, they were expected to produce more complex, accurate, and fluent spoken output (CAF) under such task conditions.

On the other hand, low-proficiency students were expected to perform better when completing simple tasks. Simpler tasks allowed them to focus on basic language production without being overwhelmed by excessive cognitive or linguistic demands. This helped them produce more accurate and fluent speech, even if the level of complexity remained low.

This assumption was grounded in Robinson's Cognition Hypothesis, which suggested that increasing task complexity could promote language development, particularly for students with higher proficiency levels. However, for lower-

proficiency learners, too much complexity might hinder performance rather than support it.

Therefore, this research assumed that task design needed to match students' proficiency levels in order to optimize spoken language performance. It investigated whether the different types of tasks (simple vs. complex) significantly influenced the complexity, accuracy, and fluency of students' spoken production, depending on whether the students were high or low in language proficiency.

2.10. Hypotheses

Hypotheses for this research are formulated to answer the following research questions using statistical analyses. The hypotheses formula as follows:

a. For the first research question:

Is there any statistically significant difference in students' spoken language production in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) generated from two different tasks by low and high proficiency students?

H_0: There was no statistically significant difference in students' spoken language production in terms of CAF between low and high proficiency students across two different tasks.

H_1: There was a statistically significant difference in students' spoken language production in terms of CAF between low and high proficiency students across two different tasks.

b. For the second research question:

Is there a statistically significant difference in CAF generated from two different tasks by low proficiency students?

H_0: There was no statistically significant difference in CAF generated from two different tasks by low proficiency students.

H_1: There was a statistically significant difference in CAF generated from two different tasks by low proficiency students.

c. For the third research question:

Is there a statistically significant difference in CAF generated from two different tasks by high proficiency students?

H_0: There was a statistically significant difference in CAF generated from two different tasks by high proficiency students.

H_1: There was a statistically significant difference in CAF generated from two different tasks by high proficiency students.

This chapter explores various theories and concepts from leading books and journal articles relating to Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and its impact on Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF) in language learning. The discussion focuses on how TBLT can be used to improve spoken language performance by comparing two types of tasks simple and complex. Differences in how low and high ability students respond to these tasks are examined. This chapter covers the theoretical background, including the principles of TBLT, how task complexity affects CAF, and the benefits and challenges of implementing TBLT strategies for students with different proficiency levels. Previous studies and the theoretical assumptions underlying this research are also reviewed. The

next chapter will provide a detailed description of the methods used to investigate these aspects.

III. METHODS

This section covers various aspects of the research process, including research design, variables, population and sample, research instruments, methods for data collection, procedures for data collection, data analysis, and hypotheses testing.

3.1. Research Design

This research used a repeated measures design to investigate how task complexity affected spoken performance in students with different levels of proficiency, focusing on complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) in spoken performance. To answer the first research question whether there was a statistically significant difference in spoken language performance between low and high proficiency students for two different types of tasks (simple vs. complex) a two-way ANOVA was used. According to Field (2018), this test examined how the CAF measures varied across two independent variables: task complexity (simple vs. complex) and student proficiency level (low vs. high), assessing both the main effects and interaction effects. For the second and third research questions whether spoken language performance differed between low proficiency students and high proficiency students when generated from two different task types paired samples t-tests were conducted. These tests compared the mean CAF scores for each group across the two task types to determine if there was a significant difference in spoken production within each proficiency level.

3.2. Data (Variables)

In this research, the researcher investigated how task complexity impacts on spoken production among eleventh grade students at SMA 9 Bandar Lampung. According to Hatch and Farhady (1982), the independent variables in this research are the type of task complexity (simple and complex) and students' proficiency level (low and high). The dependent variable is complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) in students' spoken language performance.

The independent variables (X) are task type (simple vs complex) and students' proficiency level (low vs high). These are the factors that we manipulate to see how they affect the results. The dependent variables (Y) are measures of complexity, accuracy, and fluency in students' spoken language performance.

3.3. Data Source

The source of data in research is the subject from which data is obtained. As for Research subjects are people or objects that can provide information to answer the formulation of the problem.

3.3.1 Population and Sample

The population for this research consisted of eleventh grade students at SMA N 9 Bandar Lampung in the academic year 2024/2025. From this population, two specific groups high proficiency and low proficiency students were purposively selected as the sample. Purposive sampling was employed to intentionally choose participants based on criteria such as proficiency levels, which was essential for creating distinct groups of high and low proficiency students (Steve et al., 2020). This method ensured that the selected class aligned with the study's requirements, allowing for a focused examination of proficiency effects. The sample was

divided into two distinct groups high proficiency and low proficiency to analyze the impact of task complexity on speaking performance across different proficiency levels.

Table 3.1 Grouping Students' Spoken Language Production

Groups	Task 1	Task 2
High Proficiency	Simple + simple	Complex + Simple
Low Proficiency	Simple + simple	Complex + Simple

3.4. Research Collection Instrument

To assess the use of task complexity in students' spoken performance, this research used specific speaking tasks. These tasks were designed with different levels of difficulty to analyze how students performed across varying levels of complexity.

The primary instrument for this research involved speaking tasks that were designed to evaluate students' spoken language production across different levels of task complexity and proficiency. Students' speaking performance was assessed through the completion of two types of tasks, each varied in complexity by incorporating resource-directing and resource-dispersing elements. The task models are described below:

Table 3.2. Resource-Directing and Resource-Dispersing Elements

Task	Resource-directing	Resource-dispersing
Task 1	few elements	planning time
	here and now	single task
	no reasoning demand	prior knowledge
Task 2	many elements	planning time
	there and then	single task
	reasoning demand	prior knowledge

This task design made it possible to compare task complexity (complex + simple vs. simple + simple) in relation to students' speaking performance, as outlined in the focus of this research.

3.4.1. Validity

Validity is an important aspect of the research instruments to ensure the accuracy and trustworthiness of the data. Validity refers to how well an instrument measured what it was supposed to measure, so that the results were appropriate, meaningful, and useful for the purpose of the assessment (Gronlund in Brown & Abeywickrama, 2004). Several types of validity were considered in evaluating the assessment results, especially in terms of Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF). The following section detailed the validity and reliability considerations for these instruments.

a. Content Validity

Content validity ensured that a test adequately represented and comprehensively covered the subject it was intended to measure. According to Setiyadi (2006), the materials provided had to align with the curriculum. In this research, the test aimed to evaluate the spoken performance of eleventh-grade high school students in terms of Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF), reflecting their learning based on the curriculum. To ensure content validity, the speaking tasks were selected from topics outlined in the Merdeka curriculum relevant to this research.

b. Construct Validity

Construct validity, according to Strauss and Smith (2009), ensured that the measures used in the research accurately reflected the intended interpretations and actions based on those interpretations. In this research, construct validity was ensured through the careful design of the tasks. These tasks were designed to assess how ESL learners performed in spoken language, focusing on Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF). Task complexity was adjusted by manipulating elements that directed and dispersed learners' cognitive resources, making the tasks more or less challenging.

To evaluate students' speaking performance, this research adapted the measures from Michel et al. (2007). Complexity was assessed by analyzing syntactic (sentence structure) and lexical (vocabulary) aspects using T-units (independent and dependent clauses). Accuracy was determined by calculating the percentage of error-free clauses, and fluency was measured by counting the total number of T-units produced. These methods ensured that the tasks effectively measured the targeted aspects of spoken performance as intended in the research.

3.4.2. Reliability

Reliability in this study referred to the consistency of scores derived from assessing students' speaking performance, ensuring stable and dependable results across different times and assessors. To ensure reliability, the study focused on evaluating accuracy, complexity, and fluency in students' spoken language. Two inter-raters, an English teacher and the researcher, assessed the students' spoken performances, aiming to establish reliable data. This approach sought to consistently evaluate the impact of task complexity on ESL students' speaking performance.

The reliability of the assessments was analyzed using SPSS to determine the significance of task effects numerically. Inter-rater reliability was evaluated using the *Spearman Rank Correlation* in accordance with the standards outlined by Setiyadi (2018).

Table 3.3. Reliability Level Classification Based on Coefficient Values

0.00 – 0.20	Very low Reliability
0.20 – 0.40	Low Reliability
0.40 – 0.60	Medium Reliability
0.60 – 0.80	High Reliability
0.80 – 1.00	Very high Reliability

Table 3.4. Inter- Rater Realibility Statistics of Two Types of Tasks 1

Table 3

Correlations

			Rater1	Rater2
Spearman's rho	Rater1	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.888**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	<,001
		N	31	31
	Rater2	Correlation Coefficient	.888**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	<,001	.
		N	31	31

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

			Rater1	Rater2
Spearman's rho	Rater1	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.963**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	<,001
		N	31	31
	Rater2	Correlation Coefficient	.963**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	<,001	.
		N	31	31

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The results showed that the Spearman Rank Correlation coefficient between Rater1 and Rater2 was 0.888 in the first dataset and 0.963 in the second dataset, both significant at the 0.01 level ($p < 0.001$). This indicates a very high level of inter-rater reliability.

3.5. Data Collecting Procedures

In conducting this research, it is essential to complete all preparatory procedures before proceeding with data analysis. The following steps outline the data collection process to obtain task-related information:

a. **Data Collection Setup:** Data is gathered through audio recordings of students performing speaking tasks with varying levels of complexity. Each student is individually recorded in a controlled classroom environment while completing the assigned tasks.

b. **Task Standardization**: The tasks are standardized to ensure consistency across participants. This includes maintaining the same instructions, conditions, and expectations for all students.

c. **Recording and Analysis:** The audio recordings captured students' spoken responses, which were then transcribed to convert the oral data into written form. These transcripts were analyzed in terms of accuracy, complexity, and fluency (CAF) to assess their spoken performance.

3.6. Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed to investigate how task complexity affects students' speaking ability in terms of CAF (Complexity, Accuracy, Fluency), considering both low and high proficiency groups. The steps for data analysis were as follows:

a. Transcribing the recorded speeches into written texts.
b. Scoring each transcription based on CAF using the following formulas:

Complexity:

Total Clauses/AS-Unit =

Accuracy:

Number of Error-Free AS-units

$$\frac{\text{Number of Syllables/ Total number of seconds/ seconds}}{\text{Number of AS-Units}} \times 100 =$$

Fluency speech rate B:

$$\frac{\text{Number of Syllables/}}{\text{Total number of seconds/ seconds}} \times 60 =$$

3.7. Data Treatment

There were some assumptions that needed to be fulfilled before analyzed the data, which were the normality test and the homogeneity test.

3.7.1. Normality Test

The normality distribution test is a test to measure whether our data has a normal distribution or not. The data gained in this research was statistically analyzed by using SPSS. The result for normality test for CAF measurement of two types of tasks is as follows. The hypotheses for the normality test were formulated accordingly.

H_1 : The distribution of the data is normal.

H_0 : The distribution of the data is not normal.

The criteria for acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses as follows:

H_1 is accepted if Sig.$> \alpha = 0.05$.

H_0 is accepted if Sig.$< \alpha = 0.05$.

Table 3.6. Normality Test for CAF Measurement of Two Types of Tasks

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Task1	.080	31	.200*	.973	31	.617
Task2	.156	31	.051	.965	31	.392

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Based on the results of the normality test using the Shapiro-Wilk method, the data from both Task 1 and Task 2 were normally distributed. The significance value for Task 1 was 0.617, and for Task 2 it was 0.392, both of which are greater than the 0.05 threshold. Since the p-values for both tasks exceeded 0.05, it can be concluded that the data were normally distributed. Therefore, the assumption of normality was met, and parametric statistical analysis could be used for further testing.

3.7.2. Homogeneity Test

The homogeneity test was used to determine whether the data from the sample had homogeneous variances. While homogeneity was not an absolute requirement, the researcher employed SPSS 26.0 for the analysis. The hypotheses for the homogeneity test were formulated accordingly.

H_1 : The variance of the data is homogeneous.

H_0 : The variance of the data is not homogeneous.

The criteria for acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses as follows:

H_1 is accepted if Sig.> $\alpha = 0.05$.

H_0 is accepted if Sig.< $\alpha = 0.05$.

Table 3.7. Homogeneity Test of CAF

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Dependent Variable: Speaking_Score

F	df1	df2	Sig.
1.749	3	58	.167

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Proficiency + Task_Type + Proficiency * Task_Type

The data is assumed homogeneous if the Sig. value is greater than 0.05. From the table above, the Sig. value was 0.167. Since the Sig. value is > 0.05, it means that the data was homogeneous.

3.8. Hypotheses Testing

Setiyadi (2018) defines a hypothesis in research as a statement that proposes the relationship or distribution of variables to be studied. This research involves two hypotheses: the null hypotheses (H_o) and the alternative hypotheses (H_1). These hypotheses provide temporary answers to the research questions posed. The following is the formula of the first research question:

H_0: There is no statistically significant difference of spoken language production (CAF) between low and high ability students when engaged in tasks of varying difficulty (simple vs. complex).

H_1: There is a statistically significant difference of spoken language production (CAF) between low and high ability students when engaged in tasks of varying complexity (simple vs. complex).

For the second research question:

H_0: There is no statistically significant difference of spoken language production (CAF) for low ability students when generated from simple and complex tasks.

H_1: There is a statistically significant difference of spoken language production (CAF) for low ability students when generated from simple and complex tasks.

For the third research question:

H_0: There is no statistically significant difference of spoken language production (CAF) for high-ability students when generated from simple and complex tasks.

H_1: There is a statistically significant difference of spoken language production (CAF) for high ability students when generated from simple and complex tasks.

This analysis revealed whether task complexity impacted the spoken performance of high-ability students differently, focusing on complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

This chapter provided explanations on research design, population and sampling, research instruments, validity and reliability, data collection procedures, data analysis, and hypotheses testing

V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This final chapter presents the conclusion of the research findings and offers suggestions for English teachers and future researchers who wish to implement task-based language teaching approaches. The conclusions summarize the significant effects of task type and proficiency level on students' spoken language performance, measured in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF).

4.1. Conclusion

This research found that both students' proficiency levels and the types of tasks significantly affected their spoken language performance, particularly in terms of Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF). High proficiency students consistently outperformed low proficiency students, especially when completing the more complex task. They were able to produce more complex and accurate language without a significant decrease in fluency. This indicated that they managed the cognitive demands of complex tasks more effectively. These findings supported Robinson's (2001) Cognition Hypothesis and Triadic Componential Framework, which emphasized the role of learners' cognitive ability in handling complex language tasks.

For low proficiency students, the findings showed a more detailed interaction between task complexity and task content. Although these students performed better on the complex task, which involved describing a person, this was likely because the topic was familiar and personally meaningful to them. In contrast, they had more difficulty with the simpler task of describing a place, such as a canteen, which required vocabulary and knowledge that were less familiar. This suggested that familiarity with the topic played an important role in helping low proficiency students produce language more effectively, in addition to the complexity of the task itself. These findings aligned with the principles of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), as stated by Ellis and Shintani (2014) and Van den Branden (2006), which highlight the importance of meaningful and relevant tasks in language learning.

The research also showed that high proficiency learners demonstrated greater cognitive flexibility. They were able to adjust their language production based on the demands of different tasks. The absence of a significant correlation between their performance on the two tasks suggested that they could adapt their speaking strategies depending on the situation. This supported Ellis's (2003) idea that advanced learners could modify their language use to fit various task conditions and communicative goals.

In conclusion, the results emphasized the need to design speaking tasks that balance cognitive challenge and contextual relevance. Tasks that are appropriate for students' proficiency levels and connected to their real-life experiences could lead to better learning outcomes, increased motivation, and more effective development of speaking skills. This study highlighted the importance of avoiding

a one-size-fits-all approach and encouraged teachers to apply differentiated instruction that meets the diverse needs of their learners.

However, these findings should be interpreted with caution due to some limitations of the study. Since only the during-task stage of TBLT was implemented, students received no pre-task support or post-task feedback. As a result, the research only captured students' immediate speaking performance, not their language development over time. In addition, the findings may not fully apply to typical classroom settings where full TBLT cycles and teacher guidance are usually present. Lastly, individual learner differences—such as familiarity with the topic or personal speaking strategies—may have influenced the results, particularly across proficiency levels.

5.2. Suggestion

There are some suggestions that the researcher of this study provide. The suggestions are aimed for teachers and future researchers.

5.2.1. For English Teachers

Based on the findings of this research, English teachers are encouraged to align the complexity of speaking tasks with students' proficiency levels. High proficiency learners benefited more from complex tasks that demanded higher-order thinking skills, enabling them to produce more accurate and complex language while maintaining fluency. In contrast, low proficiency learners performed better on simpler or moderately complex tasks, particularly when these tasks were familiar and personally meaningful. Such tasks reduced cognitive overload and improved learner confidence in using the language.

The research findings showed that low proficiency learners produced better spoken output when discussing familiar topics, such as describing someone they knew, compared to less familiar topics like describing a canteen. Their limited vocabulary often impeded their ability to express ideas clearly in unfamiliar contexts. Thus, selecting speaking tasks connected to students' everyday lives and personal experiences may enhance motivation and lead to improved spoken performance.

Teachers are also advised to design tasks that support a balance of Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF). By offering a variety of task types, teachers can address different areas of spoken production and respond to diverse learner needs. Furthermore, since this research did not include pre-task and post-task phases, future classroom applications should incorporate scaffolding strategies such as pre-task vocabulary support, teacher modeling, and guided practice to support students, especially those with lower proficiency.

Collaborative activities, such as pair or group discussions, are also recommended. These align with Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) principles and provide opportunities for learners to negotiate meaning and use language authentically.

Lastly, given that learners' performance varied by both task complexity and proficiency level, teachers should regularly observe and reflect on students' development. Adjusting task complexity based on ongoing assessment can optimize learning outcomes and promote steady progress in spoken English.

5.2.2. For Further Researchers

Considering the limitations of this research, future researchers are encouraged to adopt broader and more comprehensive approaches when exploring the relationship between task complexity and spoken language performance.

First, future studies should include the full sequence of TBLT stages, especially the pre-task and post-task phases. These stages offer learners essential support, such as language input, planning time, and feedback, which were not part of the current research. Including these elements could offer more nuanced insights into how instructional support influences performance.

Second, this research focused solely on students' immediate performance, without assessing long-term improvements. It is recommended that future research employ longitudinal designs to examine whether repeated engagement with specific task types results in sustained gains in speaking performance.

Third, future studies should aim to conduct research in authentic classroom environments, where natural teacher student interactions and instructional support are present. This would enhance the ecological validity and applicability of the findings to real-world educational settings.

Moreover, it would be valuable for future research to include a more diverse sample of learners, particularly from intermediate proficiency levels. This would help to generalize findings and clarify how task complexity affects learners across a broader proficiency spectrum.

In addition, exploring a wider range of task types such as problem-solving, decision-making, or narrative tasks would provide a more detailed understanding of how different task demands impact Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF).

A mixed-methods approach is also encouraged. By combining quantitative analysis with qualitative techniques such as interviews, observations, and think-aloud protocols, researchers can explore learners' internal processes, task engagement, and strategy use factors not addressed in this research.

Furthermore, future studies should consider individual learner variables, such as motivation, anxiety, background knowledge, and working memory capacity, as these may significantly affect learners' responses to varying task complexities.

Finally, applying research findings to classroom-based interventions and evaluating their practical impact would help bridge the gap between theoretical research and teaching practice. Such interventions could provide valuable insights into how TBLT can be effectively implemented to support language development across proficiency levels.

REFERENCES

Barry, K. (1998). A study of students' perception in English classes. *Journal Name, 3*(2).

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Teaching the spoken language*. Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. Pearson Education.

Bygate, M. (2016). Sources, developments and directions of task-based language teaching. *The Language Learning Journal*, *44*(4), 381–400.

Chaney, A. L. (1998). *Teaching oral communication in grades K-8*. Allyn and Bacon.

Chaney, A. L., & Burk, T. L. (1998). *Teaching oral communication in grades K-8*. Allyn & Bacon.

Choy, C. S., & Phaik, K. C. (2009). Teacher perceptions of critical thinking among students and its influence on higher education. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning*, *20*(2), 179–207.

Dalem, M. (2017). Difficulties of speaking encountered by English language students at Al Margeb University. *Premise Journal*, *6*(2), 20–29.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009, April). The methodology of task-based teaching. Paper presented at *The Asian EFL Journal Cebu Conference*, Cebu, Philippines.

Ellis, R. (2017). *Understanding second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. Routledge.

Gass, S. M., & Madden, C. G. (Eds.). (1985). *Input in second language acquisition*. Newbury House.

Hamka. (2002). *Psikologi pendidikan*. Rineka Cipta.

Hamzanwadi NW Gelogor. (2020). *Students' difficulties in speaking English* (Unpublished undergraduate thesis). UIN Mataram

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English*. Pearson Education.

Harmer, J. (2015). *The practice of English language teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Longman.

Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Routledge.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). Penguin.

Jacobs, G. M., & Hayirsever, F. (2016). Learning should be active: Classroom teaching should focus more on student engagement. *Educational Review*, *68*(1), 20–34.

Kim, Y., & Seo, S. (2022). The role of motivation in second language speaking: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Language Learning and Teaching*, *48*(2), 123–139.

La' Biran, R. (2017). Improving speaking ability through small group discussion for the eighth-year students of SMPN 2 Saluputti in Tana Toraja. *ELITE: English and Literature Journal*, *4*(1), 51–62. Retrieved from https://journal.uin-alauddin.ac.id/index.php/elite/article/view/4203

Leavit, C. (2002). Classroom research: Students' perception. *AILA Review* (5th ed.). Retrieved April 6.

Leong, L. M., & Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). An analysis of factors influencing learners' English speaking skill. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, *2*(1), 34–41.

Lindsay, P., & Norman, D. A. (1997). *Human information processing: An introduction to psychology*. Academic Press.

Long, M. H. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377–393). Newbury House.

Long, M. H. (2016). *Task-based language teaching*. John Wiley & Sons.

Long, M. H. (2016). In defense of tasks and TBLT: Nonissues and real issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *36*(1), 5–33.

Luoma, S. (2004). *Assessing speaking*. Cambridge University Press.

Mahpul. (2014). *Task complexity in dialogic oral production by EFL Indonesian learners* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Queensland.

Makmun, A. S. (2012). *Psikologi kependidikan*. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Michel, M., Kuiken, F., & Vedder, I. (2007). The influence of complexity in monologic versus dialogic tasks in Dutch L2. *Applied Linguistics*, *28*(1), 66–89.

Nirmawati, L. A. (2015). Improving students' speaking skills through speaking board games of grade VIII of SMP 13 Yogyakarta in the academic year 2013/2014 (Unpublished thesis). Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Rao, P. S. (2019). The importance of speaking skills in English classroom. *Alford Council of International English & Literature Journal*, *2*(2), 6–18.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

Robbins, S. P. (2003). *Organizational behaviour* (10th ed.). Prentice Hall.

Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistics*, *22*(1), 27–57.

Royani, E., Sulistyarini, W. D., & Tukimun. (2023). *Teaching speaking strategies*. Amerta Media.

Salihun, S. (2019). Students' problems in speaking skills at the second grade of MTs. (Unpublished thesis). [Institution name needed].

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Setiyadi, B. (2018). *Metode penelitian untuk pengajaran bahasa asing: Pendekatan kuantitatif dan kualitatif* (2nd ed.). Graha Ilmu.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.

Skehan, P. (2009). Modelling second language performance: Integrating complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexis. *Applied Linguistics, 30*(4), 510–532.

Strauss, E. M., & Smith, T. G. (2009). Construct validity: Advances in theory and methodology. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 5*, 1–25.

Segalowitz, N. (2010). *Cognitive bases of second language fluency*. Routledge.

Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode penelitian pendidikan.* Alfabeta.

Sun, Y. (2019). An analysis of the factors affecting second language acquisition and its implication for teaching and learning. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 10*(5), 1018–1022.

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills*. University of Michigan Press.

Thao, L. T. (2015). The importance of speaking skills for EFL learners. *Asian Journal of Educational Research, 3*(2), 34–39.

Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. Pearson Education.

Tika, H., & Abadi, A. (2021). Students' difficulties in speaking English in the second grade of MTsN 1 Bungo. *Jurnal Ilmiah Bina Bahasa, 14*(2), 141–150.

Van den Branden, K. (2006). *Task-based language education: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Walgito, B. (1990). *Pengantar psikologi umum*. Andi Offset.

Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman.

Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*(1), 54–66.

Zyoud, M. (2016). Theoretical perspective on how to develop speaking skill among university students. *Pioneer Journal of Educational Research, 3*, 59–65.