Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences
www.pjlss.edu.pk

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Effect of Task-Based Language Teaching on the Development of Speaking Complexity, Accuracy and Fluency (CAF) among Iraqi Intermediate EFL Learners

Ali Abdulkadhim Jassem[1*], Mehdi sarkhosh[2]

[1]Department of English Language Development, Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), Urmia University, Urmia, Iran
[2]Department of English Language Development, Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), Urmia University, Urmia, Iran

ABSTRACT

In the last couple of decades, language educators have focused on the development of communicative language teaching approaches, which emphasize teaching language through communication. Among these approaches, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has gained popularity, and it is believed that TBLT can contribute to the development of speaking CAF (Complexity, Accuracy and Fluency) among learners. The purpose of this study is to find out how well TBLT helps Iraqi students at the intermediate level acquire speaking CAF.

This quasi-experimental study included 50 individuals from a public school in Iraq. Students in the experimental group were taught using TBLT, whereas those in the control group were taught conventionally. Two test instruments (pre- and post-test) were used to gather research data, evaluating the students' speaking abilities both before and after treatment, and a questionnaire was used to find out how they felt about the use of TBLT The study instruments' validity and reliability were validated. The study's findings were analyzed using ANCOVA and MANCOVA. The data revealed that TBLT considerably improves students' speaking CAF, and they have good sentiments concerning its use in their speaking lessons.

INTRODUCTION

Language teaching approaches have always been a topic of discussion among scholars and educationists. In the last couple of decades, language educators have focused on the development of communicative language teaching approaches, which emphasize teaching language through communication. Among these approaches, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has gained popularity, and it is believed that TBLT can contribute to the development of speaking CAF (Complexity, Accuracy and Fluency) among learners. The ability of a speaker to use sophisticated, acceptable language elements, such as varied vocabulary, sentence structures, and discourse markers, is reflected in complexity (Housen & Kuiken, 2009). Accuracy entails using the correct language, grammar, and pronunciation. Fluency refers to the fluid, efficient production and comprehension of words. CAF aspects are important for assessing and developing oral proficiency (Skehan, 2009).

Yet research suggests that EFL speakers frequently struggle to obtain native-like CAF levels, with variation depending on first language influences and educational experiences (Ortega, 1999). In Iraq, English training has focused on grammar translation and audio-lingual approaches that emphasize repetition and drills. This inhibits the growth of spontaneous conversational capacities (Al-Sharo, 2019). Iraqi EFL students have demonstrated deficits in speaking fluency and accurately employing complicated vocabulary. Improving oral CAF is thus an important instructional goal.

Task-based language teaching (TBLT) is a viable method for enhancing EFL students' speaking ability.The basic unit of curriculum design and lessons in TBLT is intentional, real-world projects. Tasks require learners to utilize the target language to communicate information, make decisions, or solve issues. According to meta-analyses, TBLT increases motivation and speaking fluency while promoting integrated learning of topic, function, and form (Willis & Willis, 2007). TBLT therapies have also been shown to improve oral CAF, according to research (Rahimpour & Hazar, 2007).

The effectiveness of TBLT, on the other hand, is likely to be dependent on individual task conditions and learner demographics. CAF outcomes may be influenced by differences in task difficulty, organization, and interactional demands (Robinson, 2011). The effect of TBLT on speaking abilities should also be investigated further among Iraqi EFL learners, a demographic that has received little attention. As a result, the following research issue will be investigated in this dissertation: In comparison to a control group, how does a 10-week task-based language instruction program affect speaking complexity, accuracy, and fluency among intermediate Iraqi EFL learners.

Success in education and the workplace in Iraq increasingly depends on having great English communication skills (Al-Khafaji, 2021; Al-Sharo, 2019). Nonetheless, studies show that many Iraqi EFL students struggle to become fluent in spoken English (Alkhayaat, 2016; Jasim, 2018). Students still show significant deficiencies in pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency, and accuracy after years of teaching in public schools. According to observations, there is a strong preference for written dialogue over creative thought (Al-Sharo, 2019). These difficulties with oral competency are a reflection of the old, grammar- and translation-heavy teaching strategies that predominate in Iraq. Even with contact hours, the emphasis on translation, repetition, and grammar rules does not sufficiently foster the ability to speak effectively and spontaneously in English (Hamad, 2021). There aren't enough possibilities for learners to interact meaningfully and use language creatively. Prevalent evaluations also priorities precision over fluency, which hinders the development of communication skills. It is essential for Iraqi students to improve their speaking complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) in order to communicate concepts clearly in English. Complexity reflects the use of complex syntax and vocabulary (Housen & Kuiken, 2009). Accuracy requires using the right grammar and pronunciation. Smooth, effective verbal production is referred to as fluency (Skehan, 2009). Barriers to scholastic and professional success are created by weaknesses in any CAF area. The purpose of this study is to find out how well TBLT helps Iraqi students at the intermediate level acquire speaking CAF. The purpose of the current study is to evaluate how an instructional program based on TBLT concepts and methodologies affected intermediate level Iraqi students' attitudes toward English as well as their ability to speak CAF.

 The aim of the study is to answer the research questions.

1- Does the implementation of Task- based language teaching have any significant effect on the overall speaking ability of intermediate Iraqi EFL learners?

2-Does the implementation of Task- based language teaching have any significant effect on the Complexity of intermediate Iraqi EFL learners?

3-Does the implementation of Task- based language teaching have any significant effect on the Accuracy of intermediate Iraqi EFL learners?

4-Does the implementation of Task- based language teaching have any significant effect on the Fluency of intermediate Iraqi EFL learners?

5-What attitude do Iraqi EFL learners holds towards the implantation of Task-based language teaching?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has long been recognized as one of the most effective methods for teaching and learning languages in classrooms all around the world (Ellis, 2003; Nunan, 2004; Samuda & Bygate, 2008; Van den Branden, 2006).

Al Nashash (2006) investigated how first-year female secondary school students in Amman's task-based approach to teaching English language productive abilities affected their speech and written proficiency. The findings demonstrated that, in comparison to the conventional method of instruction, task-based language teaching via the developed program based on TBLT procedures and principles enhanced the acquisition of communicative speaking and writing skills. Joen and Jung (2006) looked into how EFL teachers in a Korean secondary school perceived TBLT. The study's overall conclusions showed that, even though more Korean EFL teachers understood the concepts of Total Behavior and Language Training (TBLT), many of them were still hesitant to use it as a teaching strategy because they thought it would cause disciplinary issues in the classroom.

Sofyana (2015) shows that the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching through Cartoon Story Maker effectively improved the student' speaking ability. In his quasi-experimental study, Wahidin (2016) found that TBLT had a favorable effect on speaking proficiency. Anjum et al. (2019) conducted experimental research on ninth-grade students in the Islamabad District to evaluate the effect of task-based language learning on secondary level learners' speaking skills development. The study's findings revealed statistically significant differences in mean speaking skills scores among the experimental group subjects. Nguyen et al. (2022) conducted a study on sixty-two teachers to gain insights into Vietnamese teachers' perceptions of TBLT, including their comprehension of tasks and TBLT principles. The study found that the majority of Vietnamese teachers had a high level of understanding and a positive attitude toward TBLT.

Speaking is one of the most challenging abilities that language learners must master, yet it is a very important one because it is an Oral production, reception, and processing of information are all parts of an interactive process that creates meaning (Florez, 1999). Speaking abilities were regarded by Hatala and Friesen (2002) as communicatively fruitful. Creating, acquiring, and organizing information are all part of learning the target language.

Speaking abilities were regarded by Hatala and Friesen (2002) as communicatively fruitful. They consist of creating, acquiring and organizing knowledge to learn the target language.

Task-based language teaching, according to Ellis (2003), is an approach to teaching that places an emphasis on using language as a tool for communication as opposed to a subject for investigation or manipulation. Obviously, in order for learners to acquire the proficiency required to use a second language easily and successfully in the kinds of circumstances they encounter outside of the classroom, they need to experience language as a tool for communication inside it.

The most Activity-based language learning (ABLL) is another name for task-based language learning. The terms "task-based instruction" (TBI) and "task-based learning" (TBL) refer to instructional approaches that make tasks a fundamental part of the learning process. Task-based language learning (TBLL) is a learner-centered approach to language teaching that aims to increase learners' communicative competence by having them participate in meaning-focused communication while carrying out tasks (Ellis & Shintani, 2014, p. 135).

According to Frost (2007), TBLL places more emphasis on students completing meaningful tasks in the target language than it does on task accuracy. According to Corbett and Kearns (2003), the emphasis in the educational system is rapidly shifting away from teaching and toward learning. Task is a fundamental and important element in the TBLL technique. There are hundreds of jobs that humans typically complete each day such as making a call, performing a specific task, purchasing a T-shirt, booking a travel, and so forth.

Bygate (1999) made an effort to use several task types and looked at how effectively they affected both grammar and discourse competence as well as overall speaking ability. The study looked at how EFL Hungarian secondary school students responded in response to two different kinds of unscripted tasks: argument tasks and narrative tasks. Students engaged in an opinion gap activity in the first assignment, where they had to voice their viewpoints and come to a final consensus. The narrative job, on the other hand, was a one-way activity in which students spoke to their partners about a story they had just read. A speaking exam and a grammar test that concentrated on the grammatical structures and patterns employed by students were used to gauge the students' improvement.

TECHNIQUES OF ORAL COMMUNICATION IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

According to Brown (2001), an examination of the current difficulties in oral communication instruction could help put some perspective on ethical and practical issues like the following:

Conversional Exchange

"Do you speak English?" is usually meant to imply, according to Brown, "Are you able to carry on a reasonably fluent conversation?" Almost universally, the ability to accomplish pragmatic goals through interactive discourse with other speakers serves as a barometer for successful language acquisition. Teaching dialogues differ according to the learner, teacher, and classroom circumstances. New pedagogical research on teaching dialogue has yielded some recommendations for goals and strategies.

Mastering Accents

The importance of pronunciation practice in a communicative, interactive course of study has been discussed. The great majority of adult learners will never be able to speak a foreign language with no accent, so language programs should place more emphasis on meaningful situations, automaticity of production, and entire language than on these minute phonological details.

Complexity, accuracy and fluency

In communicative language instruction, accuracy, fluency, and complexity are all important objectives. In many communicative language classes, accuracy is achieved to some degree by letting students concentrate on phonetics, syntax, and discourse in their oral output, even though fluency may be the main objective.

Impact elements

When learning to speak, one of the hardest things for kids to overcome is the fear of saying anything wrong or unintelligible. Due to the linguistic ego, which perpetuates the idea that "you are what you speak," learners find it difficult to take criticism from others.

METHODOLOGY

The participants will be 50 intermediate level Iraqi students from a public school in Iraq. These students will be randomly assigned into two groups: the experimental group (25 students) and the control group (25 students) .Select a representative sample of intermediate schools in Iraq. Randomly assign schools to experimental (TBLT) and control (traditional teaching) groups. Randomly select students from each group to participate in the study.

Data Collection

The subjects completed an attitude questionnaire and a pretest before to the start of the study. And so the intervening process began. While the control group received the same instruction via traditional methods, the experimental group received instruction in English speaking through the TBLT program. At the conclusion of the study, a post-test and an attitude questionnaire were also administered.

Study Design

There was one experimental group and one control group in this quasi-experimental investigation. These cohorts were chosen at random from an Iraqi public school. They were arbitrary and judgmental. The control group was taught by university EFL instructors in the conventional way, whereas the experimental group received instruction through the researcher's task-based program (TBP). Pre- and post-tests were used to assess the speaking skills and attitudes of the experimental and control groups in relation to English.

Two male and one female trained EFL teachers taught the test group's two sections, while two teachers—one male and one female—taught the control group's two sections as well. Every EFL teacher has a teaching license and a BA in English literature and linguistics. Each teacher had been in the classroom for a minimum of ten years.

Quantitative Approach: Conduct a quasi-experimental study to measure the impact of TBLT on speaking skills by comparing the performance of students who receive TBLT instruction with a control group.

Qualitative Approach: Use qualitative methods, such as interviews or focus groups, to explore students' attitudes, perceptions, and experiences with TBLT in developing speaking skills.

Study Factors

The study comprises two dependent variables: the subjects' mean speaking skill test scores and the mean scores of their responses to the attitudinal questionnaire items, with the instructional program serving as the independent variable.

Analyze statistical data

To address the research questions, a pre-test and post-test of the speaking skills test and attitude questionnaire were used. The variation in adjusted average scores between the two groups was tested using covariance (ANCOVA, MANCOVA) to determine whether it was statistically significant. The corrected post-scores were also calculated.

FINDINGS

Findings related to the first to forth research questions

a. Student results on the general speaking abilities exam based on the study's variables that are independent.

According to the teaching technique, the researcher determined the means, adjusted standard deviations, and average error of the students' pre and post-test results. Table 4.1 shows the results.

Table 4.1: The means, standard deviations, modified means, and standard errors of the students' scores on the pre and posttests based on the teaching technique.

Group	N	Pretest for the Covariate Overall Speaking Test	Posttest of Overall Speaking Test

		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Adjusted Mean	SE
Control	25	4.646	1.50	5.080	1.45	5.861	0.18
Experimental	25	6.078	1.51	7.286	1.32	6.812	0.12

SD: standard deviation, SE: standard error

Table 4.1 indicates that differences exist between the two groups' adjusted means according to the method of instruction. The significance of these differences was assessed using the ANCOVA. The results are displayed in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: ANCOVA results on the overall result of the test for speaking due to teaching technique.

Source	Sum of Squares	Degree Freedom	Mean Square	F	Significance	Partial μ^2
Overall Speaking Test (Covariate)	119.355	1	119.355	337.465	0.000	79.0%
Group	35.431	1	35.431	101.623	0.000	53.5%
Error	29.156	85	0.295	2.378		
Total	198.653	91				

Table 4.2 demonstrates that the teaching method has a statistically significant difference ($\alpha = 0.05$) in favor of the experimental group's members between the two adjusted means of the students' post-test scores.

Components of the Speaking Exams

The examiner used the teaching approach to analyze the means, standard deviations, modified means, and standard error of the students' scores on the two before and post assessment elements. The results are displayed in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Means, Standard Deviations, Adjusted Means and Standard Error of the Students' Scores on the Dimensions of the Pre- and Post- Tests According to the Teaching Procedure.

Dimension	Group	N	Pretest of Overall Speaking Test (Covariate)		Posttest of Overall Speaking Test			
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Adjusted Mean	SE
Complexity	Control	25	2.465	0.85	2.368	0.91	3.186	0.07
	Experimental	25	3.032	0.82	3.657	0.87	3.532	0.06
Accuracy	Control	25	2.576	0.86	2.876	0.84	3.324	0.13
	Experimental	25	3.054	0.80	3.854	0.82	3.643	0.10

Fluency	Control	25	2.287	0.71	2.432	0.74	2.576	0.09
	Experimental	25	3.000	0.83	3.632	0.67	3.276	0.08

SD: standard deviation, SE: standard error

Table 4.3 shows that there are observed differences between the adjusted means of the students' scores on three dimensions of the test.

The speaking test dimensions were analyzed using MANCOVA in accordance with the study's independent factors. Table 4.4 presents the findings.

Table 4.4: Findings from MANCOVA on the Speaking Test's Dimensions in Line with the Instructional Approach

Effect	MANCOVA Test	Value	F	Hypothesis degree freedom	Error degree freedom	Significance	Partial μ^2
Complexity (Covariate)	Wilks' Lambda	0.691	21.568	2	85	0.000	0.345
Accuracy (Covariate)	Wilks' Lambda	0.673	20.643	2	85	0.000	0.318
Fluency (Covariate)	Wilks' Lambda	0.593	29.127	2	85	0.000	0.421
Group	Hotelling's Trace	1.478	63.223	2	85	0.000	0.611

Table 4.4 indicates a significant effect of the teaching approach and its interaction ($\alpha = 0.05$) on the parameters of the speaking exam. ANCOVA was performed to determine the effects of the factors on each axis independently. The findings are shown in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: ANCOVA Results on Each Dimension of Speaking Separately Based on the Teaching method.

Dependent Variable	Source	Sum of Squares	Degree Freedom	Mean Square	F	Significance	Partial μ^2
Complexity	Complexity (Covariate)	6.432	1	6.432	35.365	0.000	34.0%
	Accuracy (Covariate)	0.967	1	0.967	6.356	0.012	7.4%
	Fluency (Covariate)	0.876	1	0.876	6.232	0.013	6.7%
	Group	11.437	1	11.437	50.065	0.000	39.5%
	Error	16.457	85	0.275			
	Total	62.763	90				
Accuracy	Complexity (Covariate)	0.952	1	0.952	6.234	0.011	7.6%

	Accuracy (Covariate)	6.642	1	6.642	36.394	0.000	30%
	Fluency (Covariate)	1.121	1	1.121	6.142	0.015	6.7%
	Group	9.138	1	9.138	49.958	0.000	37%
	Error	15.521	85	0.182			
	Total	61.372	90				
Fluency	Complexity (Covariate)	0.984	1	0.984	6.985	0.011	7.3%
	Accuracy (Covariate)	0.873	1	0.873	6.719	0.012	6.9%
	Fluency (Covariate)	7.085	1	7.085	54.983	0.000	39.5%
	Group	10.427	1	10.427	81.968		49%
	Error	10.912	85	0.131			
	Total	59.824	90				

Table 9 demonstrates that the teaching method favoring the experimental group resulted in a statistically significant difference ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the two adjusted averages of the students' scores on the two aspects (complexity, correctness, and fluency).

Findings related to the fifth research questions,

What attitude do Iraqi EFL learners holds towards the implantation of Task-based language teaching?

The researcher separated the results into two sections as follows to make it easier to convey the findings in relation to the question:
a. The overall grade for students' attitudes about English based on the study's independent variables: To determine the students' attitudes about English, the researcher calculated the means and standard deviations of the responses to the attitudinal questionnaire items both before and after implementing the TBLT program.

Additionally, the standard errors and post-adjusted means were computed. Table 4.6 displays the analysis's findings.

Table 4.6: shows, based on the study's independent variables, the averages, standard deviations, corrected means, and standard errors of the pre- and post-subjects' responses to the attitude questionnaire's items.

Group	N	Pretest for the Covariate Overall Attitudes Test		Posttest of Overall Attitudes Test			
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Adjusted Mean	SE
Control	25	2.325	0.20	2.551	0.28	2.927	0.09

Experimental	25	2.492	0.21	4.121	0.48	3.988	0.07
Total	50	2.408	0.22	3.336	0.85	3.124	0.06

SD: standard deviation, SE: standard error

Table 4.6 shows that there is a variation in the post-adjusted means of the students' responses based on the teaching technique.

To determine the significance of the observed difference, the researcher employed ANCOVA. Table 4.7 presents the findings.

Table 4.7: Outcomes of the ANCOVA on the Overall Attitude Questionnaire Score Affected by the Instructional Method

Source	Sum of Squares	Degree Freedom	Mean Square	F	Significance	Partial μ^2
Overall Attitudes (Covariate)	2.222	1	2.222	2.675	0.000	20.2%
Group	39.841	1	39.841	387.423	0.000	80.8%
Error	8.867	86	0.275			
Total	71.763	90				

Table 4.7 demonstrates that there is a statistically significant difference in favor of the students in the experimental group between the adjusted means of the post-test replies at (α = 0.05). The magnitude effect (80.8) shows that the educational program had a good overall impact on the students' views toward English.
b. The researcher calculated the means, the standard deviation of the adjusted means, and the standard error of the students' pre- and post-responses to the questionnaire dimensions using the study's independent variables. Table 4.8 displays the results. Adjusted Means, Standards Deviations, Standard Errors, and Means of the Pre and Post Subjects' Responses to the Dimensions Questionnaire Based on the Independent Variables of the Study are shown in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8

Dimension	Group	N	Pretest of Overall Speaking Test (Covariate)		Posttest of Overall Speaking Test			
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Adjusted Mean	SE
Developmental Orientation	Control	25	2.2635	0.38	2.468	0.37	2.463	0.11
	Experimental	25	2.924	0.37	4.211	0.52	4.182	0.09
	Total	50	2.593	0.37	3.339	0.98	3.322	0.07
Integrative Orientation	Control	25	2.342	0.19	2.521	0.31	2.584	0.12
	Experimental	25	2.468	0.31	3.702	0.54	3.692	0.09

	Total		2.405	0.28	3.111	0.73	3.138	0.08
Instrumental Orientation	Control	25	2.302	0.21	2.581	0.43	2.672	0.10
	Experimental	25	2.621	0.29	4.265	0.53	4.186	0.08
	Total		2.461	0.30	3.423	0.97	3.429	0.05
Travel Orientation	Control	25	2.341	0.37	2.651	0.68	2.711	0.13
	Experimental	25	2.581	0.60	4.099	0.65	3.976	0.10
	Total		2.461	0.52	3.375	0.97	3.343	0.08

SD: standard deviation, SE: standard error

Table 4.8 present that according to the teaching method, there have been detected variances in the adjusted means of the post-student responses, as Table 4.8 demonstrates. To determine which model is better suited, ANCOVA or MANCOVA, the researcher looked at intra-class linear correlation between the questionnaire's dimensions. Using Bartlett's test, the researcher also ascertained the significance of the link between each dimension of the attitudinal questionnaire. Table 4.9 displays the results.

Table 4.9: The dimensions of the attitude questionnaire and the Bartlett's test findings showed an intraclass linear connection that was attributed to the instruction process.

The Pearson Correlation	Orientation toward Development	Integrative Orientation	The role of instrumental orientation	Travel Orientation
Orientation toward Development	1			
Integrative Orientation	0.84	1		
Instrumental Orientation	0.90	0.88	1	
Travel Orientation	0.86	0.84	0.94	1
Bartlett's Sphericity Test	Likelihood Ratio	Approximate Chi 2	Degree freedom	Significance
	0.000	104.231	10	0.000

Table 4.9 shows that there is a substantial proportion (α = 0.05) between the identity matrix elements and the residual matrix components on the dimensions generated by the teaching technique. This situation compelled the researcher to use the MANCOVA; the results are shown in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10: The MANCOVA Results on the Attitudinal Questionnaire Variables in Relation to the Teaching Technique

Effect	MANCOVA Test	Value	F	Hypothesis degree freedom	Error degree freedom	Significance	Partial μ^2

Covariate Developmental Orientation	Wilks' Lambda	0.821	4.492	4	81	0.002	18.2%
Integrative Orientation (Covariate)	Wilks' Lambda	0.899	2.521	4	81	0.049	11.1%
Covariate Empirical Orientation	Wilks' Lambda	0.708	8.510	4	81	0.000	29.7%
Travel Orientation (Covariate)	Wilks' Lambda	0.936	1.561	4		0.190	7.0%
Group	Hotelling's Trace	6.121	121.384	4	81	0.000	0.611%

The results show that there is a statistically significant effect ($\alpha = 0.05$) attributed to the task-based program. ANCOVA was performed to determine the impact of the study's factors on each dimension independently. Table 4.11 presents the findings.

Table 4.11: Findings from the ANCOVA on the Attitude Questionnaire's Variables in Relation to the Instructional Approach

Dependent Variable	Source	Sum of Squares	Degree Freedom	Mean Square	F	Significance	Partial μ^2
Developmental Orientation	Developmental (Covariate)	2.654	1	2.654	16.251	0.000	16.3%
	Integrative Orientation (Covariate)	0.112	1	0.112	0.671	0.410	0.8%
	Instrumental Orientation (Covariate)	0.211	1	0.211	1.268	0.268	1.6%
	Travel Orientation (Covariate)	0.151	1	0.151	0.874	0.351	1.1%
	Group	65.021	1	65.021	394.121	0.000	83%
	Error	13.651	85	0.175			
	Total	108.214	91				
Integrative Orientation	Developmental (Covariate)	0.015	1	0.015	0.085	0.788	0.11%
	Integrative Orientation (Covariate)	1.755	1	1.755	9.824	0.003	10.8%
	Instrumental Orientation (Covariate)	0.004	1	0.004	0.018	0.921	0.0%

	Travel Orientation (Covariate)	0.050	1	0.050	0.284	0.610	0.31%
	Group	26.121	1	26.121	142.891	0.000	63.5%
	Error	15.274	85	0.184			
	Total	54.021	91				
Instrumental Orientation	Developmental (Covariate)	0.025	1	0.025	0.182	0.712	0.23%
	Integrative Orientation (Covariate)	0.368	1	0.368	2.624	0131	3.3%
	Instrumental Orientation (Covariate)	3.251	1	3.251	25.014	0.000	22.1%
	Travel Orientation (Covariate)	0.024	1	0.024	0.169	0.698	0.26%
	Group	45.321	1	45.321	329.514	0.000	81.7%
	Error	12.421	85	0.151			
	Total	86.325	91				
Travel Orientation	Developmental (Covariate)	0.097	1	0.097	0.386	0.528	0.5%
	Integrative Orientation (Covariate)	0.161	1	0.161	0.642	0.412	0.7%
	Instrumental Orientation (Covariate)	1.201	1	1.201	4.769	0.031	5.5%
	Travel Orientation (Covariate)	0.802	1	0.802	3.214	0.099	4.1%
	Group	38.021	1	38.021	149.247	0.000	65.5%
	Error	22.147	85	0.268			
	Total	88.145	91				

Table 4.11 shows that there is a significant difference ($\alpha = 0.05$) in favor of the experimental group in the adjusted means of the post-students' responses to the questionnaire dimensions based on the teaching method. The size effect for each teaching procedure (83% for the developmental orientation, 63.5% for the integrative orientation, 81.7% for the practical orientation, and 65.5% for

the travel orientation) indicates that TBLT had a positive effect on the questionnaire elements related to students' attitudes toward English.

DISCUSSION

Due to the manner of instruction, there is a statistically significant distinction ($\alpha = 0.05$) in favor of the experimental group between the two adjusted means of the students' scores. The fact that the TBLT program focused more on participant fluency than the individual learners' linguistic competency may help to explain the results. The tasks are essential to the learning process in task-based learning. The method is based on the notion that pupils learn more effectively when their focus is on the task at hand rather than the language they are using. The underlying premise of the approach is that students learn best when they are focused on the work at hand rather than the language they are using.

Similar to other communicatively oriented activities, the primary feature of the task-based framework is that it takes the learner from fluency to accuracy, whereas the traditional approach takes the student from accuracy to fluency. TBLT classes have a friendly, helpful, and non-threatening atmosphere.

Additionally, investigators who stressed the benefit of TBLT in enhancing speaking abilities concur with these findings. Lever and Willis (2004) noted that after relatively short courses, learners were able to utilize their new foreign language with fair levels of efficiency in real-world circumstances, and they progressed far more quickly with TBLT. While completing the exercises, learners engage in specific types of language use and mental processing that are beneficial for acquisition, according to Ellis (2000), Nunan (2006), and Willis (1996). Through TBLT, students also communicate with one another using the language. Additionally, TBLT improves the length, complexity, accuracy, and fluency of students' oral discourse, which in turn fosters communication (Cathcard, 1988; Bygate, 1996; Skehan and Foster, 1997; Birjandi).

The teaching style has resulted in a statistically significant difference ($\alpha = 0.05$) favoring the experimental group among the adjusted means of the mean scores on the attitudinal questionnaire for Iraqi EFL students.

This result makes sense because the students in the experimental group were taught the speaking material in a systematic way with regard to assessment, practice, and presentation. The researcher thinks that the program's layout significantly enhanced the pupils' views about English in the experimental group. Students appear to be more motivated to learn the language and to alter their unfavorable opinions of it when the work is divided into three stages, such as pre, during, and post, and specific assignments are assigned for each.

likewise, a better context for igniting the students' learning processes and inspiring them to participate in class activities—which would have ultimately changed their attitudes toward English—could have been provided by the use of tasks, student discussions, planning exercises like brainstorming, and report presentations. Undoubtedly, improved performance results in improved attitudes. According to Widdowson (1990), TBLT would improve students' attitudes and increase their motivation to participate in these activities.

Table 4.11 demonstrated that TBLT had a considerable impact on every aspect of the students' opinions regarding English. The results shown in this table suggest that TBLT is a successful teaching method that may improve students' attitudes toward the language. Prior to the start of the instructional program, the majority of students said they were not interested in the culture of English native speakers, that they did not enjoy traveling to English-speaking nations, and that they did not

think their fluency in the language would help them land a job. However, after the TBLT program was put into place, the students' opinions completely changed.

The majority of them highly agreed or agreed that learning English could improve their chances of landing a job in the future. They also expressed interest in reading about the cultures of English-speaking people and wanting to visit English-speaking nations to improve their language skills.

Researchers who highlighted how TBLT's varied activities can motivate students and alter their attitudes toward English as a foreign language also corroborate these findings. According to Bugler and Hunt (2002), TBLT increased the students' motivation to learn English because they perceived the experience as fulfilling, inherently fascinating, and advantageous from an educational standpoint. According to Lopes (2004), students who followed TBLT instructions were able to acquire English more successfully because they were able to apply it for task completion, information retrieval, problem solving, and conversation about their own experiences.

As stated by Lochana and Deb (2006), students benefited from TBLT in terms of both motivation and proficiency. According to Suxiang (2007), TBLT could promote students' potential for learning English and gradually increase their interest in the language. Tables 4.7–4.10 demonstrate that the teaching method in favor of the experimental group resulted in a statistically significant difference between the two adjusted averages of the post-students' answers on the attitudinal questionnaire at ($\alpha = 0.05$).

The explanation for this outcome is that the control group's students received traditional instruction without engaging in any tasks or activities. Rather, they were just responding to questions posed by the teacher, which were typically contained in the book. However, the experimental group's pupils had to actively participate in negotiating the assigned tasks and activities, which meant that they needed to communicate more (Labov, 1972; Milroy, 1987).

CONCLUSION

The study's results led us to the conclusion that task-based language instruction (TBLT) enhances students' speaking abilities and shapes their perceptions of the language. It is evident that when classroom practice was structured and real, as it is in TBLT, the students' speaking abilities developed more. For the Iraqi, the pupils performed better. Iraqi students get knowledge about Western culture, but they do not acquire self-knowledge. In traditional educational settings. This is because students must actively participate in all of the tasks and activities that make up TBLT. Teachers might take on different roles in tasks related to TBLT. Nunan (1989) and Richards and Rodgers (2001) defined the following roles as those of teachers: task selector/sequencer, learner preparer, pre-task consciousness raiser regarding form, mentor, nurturer, strategy-instructor, and support giver.

The books that are used to teach English are Authentic Iraqi texts that meet the requirements and interests of Iraqi students should thus be created by teachers and added to the existing curriculum. The study's findings demonstrate that, in spite of the critique that the pupils might not be eager to communicate openly, students' complexity, fluency, and correctness have greatly increased as a result of TBLT. This could be explained by the teachers' careful planning of the assignments in accordance with the three stages of the tasks.

Iraqi EFL students generally struggle with their English language education, and the majority of them fail the English matriculation test. The absence of exposure to real English may be partly to blame for this. This lack of exposure to real-world English may be addressed by TBLT, which provides students with opportunities to practice their language skills in a stress-free classroom environment while utilizing a variety of exercises related to real-world responsibilities. Students get additional time

through TBLT methods to talk with other students or the teacher about the task issue using their personal experiences.

Iraqi schools are currently implementing a new curriculum that attempts to improve students' performance in four areas of language learning: language, culture, and literary appreciation; social interaction; and information access. The English advisory group realized that social interaction needed to be covered in the new curriculum because English is a language of communication. The goal of the social interaction domain is to help students communicate both orally and in writing with English-speaking people in any location and in any language (Ministry of Education, 2002). The study's findings demonstrate how TBLT enhances students' spoken social interactions. This finding supports the theory that Total Behavior Based Language Training (TBLT) is among the best instructional strategies for improving students' ability to speak English fluently and accurately.

REFERENCES

1. Al Nashash, A. H. (2006). Designing a task- based program and measuring its effect on oral and written communicative skills among Jordanian EFL secondary stage students. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Amman Arab University.

2. Azadi, M., Jafarian, M., Saen, R. F., & Mirhedayatian, S. M. (2015). A new fuzzy DEA model for evaluation of efficiency and effectiveness of suppliers in sustainable supply chain management context. Computers & Operations Research, 54, 274-285 .Brand, C., & Götz, S. (2011). Fluency versus accuracy in advanced spoken learner language: A multi-method approach. International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 16(2), 255-275

3. Bugler, D. and Hunt, A. (2002). Implementing Task-base Language Teaching. In Richards J., and Renandya, W. (Ed.), Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

4. Bygate, M. (1996). Effects of task repetition: appraising the developing language of learners. In J. Williams and D. willis (Eds), Challenge and Change in language teaching (pp.134-146). London: Heinemann,

5. Bygate, M. (2008). Speaking. In C., Roland and D., Nunan (Eds). Teaching English to speakers of other languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

6. Carless, D. V., (2001). Factors in the Implementation of Task-Based Teaching in Primary School. Hong Kong: English department, Hong Kong Institute for Education.

7. Ellis, R. (2000). Task-based research and language pedagogy. Language Teaching Research,4,193-220

8. Ellis, R. (2003). Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

9. Joen, I. J. and Jung, W. H. (2006). Exploring EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching: A case study of Korean secondary school classroom practice. Retrieved March, 3, 2008from: http://www.asian efl. Journal. com.

10. Labov, W. (1972). Language in the Inner City. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.

11. Lochana, M. and Deb, G. (2006). Task based teaching: learning English without tears. Asian EFL Journal, 8(3), 140-154.

12. Milroy, L. (1987). Observing and Analyzing Natural Language. Oxford: Blackwell.

13. Ministry of Education, (2002) English curriculum: Principles and standards for learning English as a foreign language for all grades. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education.

14.   Nunan, D. (1989). Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom. New York: Cambridge University Press.

15.   Nunan, D. (2003). Task-Based Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

16.   Nunan, D. (2006). Task-based language teaching in the Asia context: Defining 'task'. Asian EFL Journal, 8(3), 12-18.

17.   Ortega, L. (1999). Planning and focus on form in L2 oral performance. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21, 109-148.

18.   Richards, J. and Rodgers, T. (2001). 'Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. (2nd ed.). Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

19.   Skehan, P. (2009). Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In Willis, J. and D. Willis (Eds). Challenges and Change in Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

20.   Skehan, P. and Foster, P. (1997). The influence of planning and post-task activities on accuracy and complexity in task-based learning. Language Teaching Research, 1 (3), 185-211.

21.   Suxiang, Y. (2007). A study of task-based language teaching on online English language teaching. Retrieved January,7, 2007,from www.Beiwaionline. Com/ 2huanti/ 07/ yth/2007-ppt/Yangsuxing.ppt.

22.   Widdowson, H. G. (1990). Aspects of Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

23.   Willis , D. and Willis, J. (1996). Challenge and Change in Language Teaching. Oxford: Heinemann.

24.   Willis, J. (1996). A Framework for Task-Based Learning. Harlow: Longman.