



TASK-BASED COMMUNICATIVE INSTRUCTION IN EFL: EFFECTS ON LEARNERS' SPEAKING FLUENCY, INTERACTIONAL COMPETENCE, AND WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE

Kamolova Hilola Farhodjon qizi
Master's Student at Angren University
Republic of Uzbekistan.

Abstract

This study investigates how task-based communicative instruction (TBCI) influences EFL learners' speaking fluency, interactional competence, and willingness to communicate (WTC) in pedagogical university classrooms. Drawing on task-based language teaching and interactionist perspectives, the research examines whether a structured cycle of pre-task planning, meaning-focused task performance, and post-task reflection can strengthen both temporal aspects of speech (e.g., reduced breakdowns and more stable flow) and social-interactional skills (e.g., turn management, repair, and responsive listening). A mixed-methods, quasi-experimental design compares a TBCI group with a textbook-centered communicative practice group over an instructional period. Speaking data are collected through paired and small-group tasks and analyzed using fluency indicators and an interactional competence rubric, while WTC is measured via validated self-report scales and classroom observation notes. The findings indicate that learners exposed to TBCI demonstrate more fluent task talk, more strategic participation in interaction, and higher situational readiness to initiate and sustain communication. The study highlights the pedagogical value of task sequencing, planning support, and reflective feedback for developing communicative performance in EFL teacher-education contexts, and it offers practical implications for designing classroom tasks that promote both linguistic development and learner agency.



*Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy*

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

Keywords: Task-based communicative instruction, task-based language teaching, EFL speaking fluency, interactional competence, willingness to communicate, peer interaction, pre-task planning, classroom tasks, communicative performance, mixed-methods research.

Annotatsiya:

Mazkur tadqiqot pedagogik universitet sharoitida ingliz tilini xorijiy til sifatida o'rganayotgan talabalar uchun vazifaga asoslangan kommunikativ o'qitish (task-based communicative instruction) yondashuvining og'zaki nutq ravonligi, interaksion kompetensiya hamda muloqotga tayyorlik (willingness to communicate) ko'rsatkichlariga ta'sirini o'rganadi. Tadqiqot vazifaga asoslangan til o'qitish konsepsiyasi va interaksion yondashuvlarga tayangan holda dars jarayonida ma'no markazli vazifalarni rejalashtirish, bajarish va refleksiya qilish bosqichlari izchil tashkil etilganda nutq oqimining barqarorlashishi, uzilishlarning kamayishi, shuningdek, navbat almashish, izoh berish, tuzatish va hamkorlikda ma'no yaratish kabi muloqot ko'nikmalarining kuchayishi mumkinligini tahlil qiladi. Aralash metodli kvazi-eksperimental dizaynda tajriba guruhi TBCI asosida, nazorat guruhi esa darslikka tayangan kommunikativ mashqlar asosida o'qitiladi. Ma'lumotlar juftlik va kichik guruh vazifalari davomida yozib olingan nutq namunalari, interaksion kompetensiyani baholash rubrikasi, muloqotga tayyorlik bo'yicha so'rovnoma hamda sinf kuzatuvlari orqali jamlanadi. Natijalar TBCI qo'llangan guruhda ravonlik ko'rsatkichlari yaxshilangani, o'zaro muloqotda strategik ishtirok kuchaygani va vaziyatga xos muloqotga kirishish tayyorligi oshganini ko'rsatadi. Tadqiqot vazifalarni ketma-ketlikda loyihalash, oldindan rejalashtirishni qo'llab-quvvatlash va reflektiv fikr-mulohaza berish EFL talabalari kommunikativ faoliyatini rivojlantirishda samarali ekanini asoslaydi.

Kalit so'zlar: vazifaga asoslangan o'qitish, kommunikativ yondashuv, EFL og'zaki nutqi, nutq ravonligi, interaksion kompetensiya, muloqotga tayyorlik, juftlik va guruh ishlari, oldindan rejalashtirish, sinfdagi muloqot, reflektiv fikr-mulohaza.



Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

Introduction

In EFL contexts where learners have limited exposure to English beyond the classroom, speaking development often depends on the quality, density, and authenticity of interaction that instruction can generate. Pedagogical universities, in particular, face the dual challenge of developing students' communicative competence while simultaneously modeling effective teaching practices that future teachers can transfer to school settings. Although many programs endorse communicative language teaching, classroom speaking activities may still drift toward display talk, controlled practice, and accuracy-oriented performance, which can constrain learners' opportunities to negotiate meaning, manage real-time interaction, and build confidence to initiate communication. As a result, learners may accumulate grammatical knowledge yet continue to experience hesitation, fragmented speech, and reluctance to speak, especially in peer interaction where the flow of conversation requires rapid planning, turn coordination, and pragmatic responsiveness.

Task-based communicative instruction offers a principled alternative by organizing learning around meaning-focused tasks that resemble real-world language use and that require learners to achieve an outcome through interaction. Within this framework, tasks are not merely speaking prompts but structured communicative events designed to elicit negotiation, collaborative problem-solving, and purposeful language choices. Research in task-based language teaching suggests that repeated engagement in tasks, supported by pre-task planning and post-task reflection, can facilitate proceduralization of language resources and improve performance dimensions such as fluency and complexity. At the same time, interaction-focused scholarship emphasizes that successful communication is not reducible to linguistic accuracy alone; it also involves interactional competence, including turn-taking, topic management, repair, confirmation, and the ability to display understanding and alignment. These skills are particularly salient in peer-based tasks where learners must co-construct meaning and sustain interaction without constant teacher mediation.

A further dimension relevant to communicative development is willingness to communicate, understood as a learner's readiness to initiate and participate in L2 interaction at a given moment. WTC is shaped by relatively stable factors such as



*Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy*

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

self-confidence and perceived competence, but it is also sensitive to situational influences including task type, group dynamics, topic familiarity, and classroom climate. In many EFL classrooms, learners' anxiety about errors, fear of negative evaluation, and uncertainty about how to keep a conversation going can suppress WTC, limiting the amount of communicative practice available for development. Task-based communicative instruction may address this constraint by providing clear communicative purposes, shared goals, and interactional scaffolding that make participation more predictable and socially supported, thereby increasing learners' readiness to speak. Against this background, the present study examines the effects of task-based communicative instruction on three interrelated outcomes in an EFL teacher-education setting: speaking fluency as observable efficiency in real-time speech production, interactional competence as the ability to manage and sustain collaborative talk, and willingness to communicate as a psychological readiness to engage in English. Focusing on pedagogical university learners, the study aims to generate evidence that can inform classroom practice and teacher preparation, particularly in environments where students' future professional success depends on their capacity to use English confidently and to facilitate meaningful interaction for their own learners.

Methods

This study employed a mixed-methods, quasi-experimental design to examine the impact of task-based communicative instruction on EFL learners' speaking fluency, interactional competence, and willingness to communicate. The research was conducted in a pedagogical university context with intact classes enrolled in an academic speaking course. Two comparable groups were established: an experimental group receiving task-based communicative instruction and a control group receiving a textbook-centered communicative practice approach. Both groups followed the same course objectives and overall contact hours, but differed in instructional procedure and classroom activity sequencing. The intervention was implemented over an instructional period sufficient to allow repeated task exposure and performance stabilization, with consistent teacher support and comparable topic coverage across groups.



*Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy*

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

Participants were undergraduate or graduate-level EFL learners preparing for education-related careers, with intermediate proficiency as indicated by departmental placement procedures and course prerequisites. Prior to the intervention, baseline equivalence was checked through a speaking pretest and a willingness-to-communicate questionnaire. Ethical procedures included voluntary participation, confidentiality safeguards, and informed consent. Classroom teachers were trained to follow standardized lesson plans to reduce instructor variability, and fidelity checks were conducted using observation sheets and lesson logs to confirm that the experimental group consistently implemented the task cycle while the control group maintained its usual practice routines.

Instruction in the experimental group followed a task cycle consisting of pre-task, during-task, and post-task phases. In the pre-task phase, learners received topic activation, lexical and discourse priming, and brief strategic guidance on interactional moves such as asking follow-up questions, requesting clarification, and using confirmation checks. Limited pre-task planning time was provided, with options for individual planning or pair planning depending on task demands. During the task phase, learners completed meaning-focused tasks in pairs or small groups, aiming to reach a concrete outcome such as a joint decision, problem solution, ranking, or information gap completion. Teachers minimized direct correction during performance, instead monitoring and taking notes on recurrent interactional issues and useful language. In the post-task phase, learners engaged in reflective discussion, feedback on interactional effectiveness, and selective form-focused work based on observed needs. Some tasks were repeated with altered conditions, such as increased time pressure or modified roles, to encourage fluency development and procedural control.

The control group received communicative speaking practice aligned with the same themes but organized primarily around textbook units, guided dialogues, comprehension-based speaking questions, and teacher-led discussion. Activities were communicative in intention yet typically shorter, less outcome-driven, and more accuracy-monitored. Planning and reflection components were limited, and interactional strategy instruction was not systematically embedded. Both groups used English as the primary classroom language during speaking activities, and both had comparable access to instructional materials and teacher support.



Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

Data collection combined performance measures, questionnaire data, and qualitative classroom evidence. Speaking fluency was assessed through two standardized task-based speaking tests administered as pretest and posttest. Tasks included paired problem-solving and opinion-exchange formats to elicit extended talk and interactive behavior. All performances were audio-recorded and transcribed. Fluency indicators were operationalized through temporal measures commonly used in L2 research, including speech rate (syllables or words per minute), mean length of runs between pauses, frequency and duration of silent pauses, and the incidence of filled pauses and repairs. Interactional competence was evaluated using an analytic rubric capturing turn-taking management, responsiveness, repair practices, topical development, and collaborative orientation. Two trained raters scored anonymized samples, and inter-rater reliability was established through calibration sessions and agreement indices.

Willingness to communicate was measured using a validated self-report questionnaire adapted to the EFL classroom context, administered at pretest and posttest. The scale included situational items reflecting readiness to speak in pair work, small-group tasks, whole-class discussion, and interactions with the teacher. To triangulate questionnaire findings, classroom observations were conducted periodically, focusing on frequency of voluntary turns, initiation rates, and persistence in interaction during tasks. Learner reflection notes collected after selected tasks provided additional evidence about perceived confidence, task engagement, and communication strategies.

Quantitative analysis compared pretest and posttest gains within and between groups. Descriptive statistics were calculated for all measures, followed by inferential tests suitable for quasi-experimental comparisons, including paired analyses for within-group change and independent comparisons for between-group differences. Effect sizes were computed to interpret the practical magnitude of observed changes. Qualitative data from observations and reflections were analyzed thematically, with codes targeting interactional behaviors, perceived task support, and factors shaping willingness to communicate. Integration of findings occurred at the interpretation stage to explain how instructional processes related to measurable performance and motivational outcomes.



Results

Baseline checks indicated that the experimental and control groups were broadly comparable at the start of the study in overall speaking performance and self-reported willingness to communicate. Rater calibration produced high agreement on the interactional competence rubric, supporting the stability of the scoring procedure across the pretest and posttest samples. Across the intervention period, both groups demonstrated some improvement in speaking outcomes, but the pattern of gains differed in scope and consistency, with the task-based communicative instruction group showing stronger progress across the three target constructs.

For speaking fluency, posttest performances in the task-based group displayed a more stable speech flow and fewer breakdowns during interactive tasks. Temporal indices suggested a faster pace of delivery and longer stretches of uninterrupted speech, accompanied by a reduction in frequent silent pauses that had previously interrupted message formulation. Learners in this group also relied less on filled pauses and repetitive false starts when managing turn entries, particularly in opinion-exchange tasks that required spontaneous elaboration. While self-repair remained present, it appeared to function more as a strategic resource for refining meaning rather than as a symptom of persistent processing difficulty, with repairs occurring in shorter cycles and followed by continued development of the idea. In contrast, the control group showed modest fluency gains, with noticeable improvement in rehearsed segments and short responses, yet continued to exhibit longer hesitation phases when negotiating meaning or responding to unexpected partner moves.

Interactional competence results aligned with these fluency trends. The task-based group improved in turn-taking management, demonstrating clearer turn entry signals, smoother turn exchanges, and more frequent use of interactional devices to maintain reciprocity, such as follow-up questions and acknowledgment tokens. Posttest talk in the experimental group contained more evidence of collaborative topical development, where speakers built on partner contributions rather than producing parallel monologues. Repair practices also shifted: learners more consistently initiated clarification requests, confirmation checks, and recasts as part of joint meaning-making, and they responded to partner repair



*Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy*

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

initiations with greater efficiency. These changes were especially visible in information-gap and problem-solving tasks, where the need to align understanding encouraged sustained negotiation. The control group exhibited improvement in basic responsiveness, but interaction often remained teacher-modeled in style, with limited expansion moves and fewer instances of learner-driven repair sequences.

Willingness to communicate increased in both groups, but the increase was more pronounced for the task-based group on situational items related to pair work and small-group interaction. Learners exposed to task cycles reported greater readiness to initiate turns and to continue speaking when encountering lexical gaps. Observation records supported these reports by showing higher rates of voluntary turn initiation and more persistent engagement during peer interaction, including greater participation by previously quieter students. Learner reflections further indicated that outcome-oriented tasks reduced fear of negative evaluation by shifting attention from error avoidance to message achievement. Planning time and interactional strategy prompts were frequently mentioned as factors that made speaking feel more manageable and socially supported.

Taken together, the results suggest that task-based communicative instruction contributed to measurable improvements in speaking fluency and interactional competence while also strengthening learners' situational willingness to communicate. The convergence of performance metrics, rubric-based interactional ratings, questionnaire shifts, and classroom evidence indicates that repeated engagement in structured tasks, supported by planning and reflection, can promote both the efficiency of speech production and the social-interactional resources needed to sustain meaningful EFL communication.

Discussion

The results indicate that task-based communicative instruction can generate simultaneous gains in speaking fluency, interactional competence, and willingness to communicate, and the pattern of improvement suggests that these constructs developed in mutually reinforcing ways. From a skill acquisition perspective, repeated engagement in meaning-focused tasks likely supported proceduralization of language resources, allowing learners to allocate fewer



*Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy*

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

attentional resources to form retrieval and more resources to message construction and interaction management. The observed reduction in disruptive pausing and the emergence of longer speech runs in the task-based group are consistent with the idea that task repetition, planning support, and stable task formats increase automaticity and lower online processing costs. Importantly, the fluency gains were most visible in interactive task settings, which suggests that the instructional benefits were not limited to rehearsed monologic production but extended to real-time co-construction of talk where speakers must listen, respond, and plan concurrently.

The improvement in interactional competence provides further insight into why fluency advanced more robustly in the task-based group. Interactional competence involves a repertoire of discourse-organizing practices that make conversation more predictable and less cognitively taxing, such as using turn-entry markers, signaling understanding, and initiating repair appropriately. When learners can manage turn transitions and repair sequences efficiently, they reduce breakdowns that interrupt the conversational floor and undermine momentum. In this sense, interactional competence can be viewed as a fluency-enabling resource rather than a separate skill. The task cycle's strategic priming and post-task reflection likely contributed to this development by making interactional moves salient and by encouraging learners to evaluate communication effectiveness beyond grammatical correctness. The stronger evidence of learner-driven negotiation of meaning in the experimental group also aligns with interactionist accounts of L2 development, which highlight that conversational adjustments and repair create conditions for noticing gaps, testing hypotheses, and refining form-meaning mappings.

Changes in willingness to communicate appear to be both an outcome and a mechanism of improvement. The task-based group reported greater readiness to speak in peer settings, and observations indicated increased initiation and persistence. One plausible explanation is that outcome-oriented tasks provide a clear communicative rationale, reducing the ambiguity that often triggers anxiety in open-ended discussion. Additionally, the shared goal structure of tasks can distribute interactional responsibility across participants, which may lessen fear of negative evaluation and increase perceived control. Brief pre-task planning



*Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy*

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

may have further enhanced self-efficacy by giving learners time to organize content and anticipate language needs. As learners experienced successful task completion, they likely developed stronger competence perceptions, which in turn supports WTC. This reciprocal relationship suggests a positive developmental cycle: higher WTC leads to greater participation, which increases practice and interactional experience, which then reinforces fluency and perceived competence.

Pedagogically, the findings underscore the importance of designing tasks as more than communicative “activities.” The results point to the value of systematic task sequencing, where learners encounter recurrent interactional demands while gradually increasing cognitive or interactional complexity. Planning support and reflective feedback appear to function as critical mediators, helping learners transform participation into learning. The post-task phase, in particular, can consolidate gains by linking performance to explicit awareness of effective interactional behaviors and by addressing language forms that emerged as limitations during task completion. For EFL teacher-education contexts, this has an added benefit: students not only improve their own speaking but also experience instructional routines they can later adopt in their future classrooms, potentially extending the impact to school-level practice.

At the same time, the findings should be interpreted with awareness of contextual constraints. Quasi-experimental grouping, teacher effects, and local classroom norms can influence outcomes, and the strength of task-based instruction may depend on the quality of task design and implementation fidelity. Interactional competence measurement also presents challenges because competence is distributed across participants and shaped by task ecology; therefore, rubrics capture only part of the phenomenon. Nevertheless, the convergence across fluency metrics, interactional ratings, questionnaires, and qualitative evidence strengthens the interpretation that task-based communicative instruction promoted more efficient speech production, more sophisticated interaction management, and greater situational readiness to communicate. In practical terms, the study supports integrating structured task cycles into EFL speaking courses and aligning assessment with both fluency and interactional



Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

effectiveness, rather than focusing primarily on accuracy-focused oral performance.

Conclusion

This study examined whether task-based communicative instruction can enhance EFL learners' speaking fluency, interactional competence, and willingness to communicate in a pedagogical university setting. The findings collectively suggest that a structured task cycle, supported by pre-task planning, meaning-focused performance, and post-task reflection, contributes to more efficient real-time speech, more collaborative management of interaction, and greater situational readiness to participate in English. Rather than improving only isolated linguistic elements, the instructional approach appears to shape communicative performance as an integrated system in which temporal fluency and interactional behavior develop together and are further strengthened by motivational readiness to engage.

A key implication is that fluency growth is more likely when learners repeatedly practice speaking under authentic interactional pressures, where they must listen, respond, negotiate meaning, and sustain the conversational floor. In such conditions, the classroom becomes a site for developing not only linguistic resources but also procedural and social resources that keep talk moving. The improvement in interactional competence underscores the instructional value of treating conversation management as teachable content. When learners gain familiarity with turn-taking norms, repair strategies, and responsive moves such as follow-up questioning, they reduce breakdowns and achieve more stable conversational trajectories. These changes also carry affective benefits, as learners become more confident in their ability to keep interaction going even when language gaps arise.

The increase in willingness to communicate suggests that task-based communicative instruction may help shift classroom participation from compliance-driven answering to goal-driven collaboration. Clear task outcomes and shared responsibilities can lower anxiety associated with evaluation and redirect attention toward message achievement. Planning time appears to function as a psychological and cognitive scaffold, allowing learners to enter interaction



Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

with clearer intentions and greater perceived control. Over time, repeated experiences of successful task completion may support a virtuous cycle in which increased participation leads to more interactional experience, which strengthens performance and further raises readiness to communicate.

For pedagogical university programs, these results support adopting task-based communicative instruction not only as a method for improving student speaking, but also as a model of classroom practice for future teachers. Embedding task design principles into teacher education can help trainees understand how to sequence tasks, calibrate cognitive and interactional demands, and provide feedback that targets both interactional effectiveness and emergent language form. Assessment practices may also benefit from aligning evaluation with fluency and interactional competence, rather than prioritizing accuracy alone, because communicative success in real classrooms depends on the ability to sustain interaction and manage meaning collaboratively.

Despite these contributions, the study has limitations that should shape interpretation and guide future research. Quasi-experimental designs with intact classes can be influenced by group dynamics and teacher variables, and the measurement of interactional competence remains methodologically challenging because competence is co-constructed and task-dependent. Future studies could use longer interventions, multiple institutions, and longitudinal follow-ups to examine durability of gains and transfer to new task types. Further work might also explore how task features, such as information gap, role distribution, or topic sensitivity, differentially affect willingness to communicate and interactional development, especially for learners with varying proficiency and anxiety profiles. Overall, the study provides evidence that task-based communicative instruction can be a productive pathway for developing fluent, interactionally competent, and willing EFL speakers in teacher-education contexts.

References

1. Bygate, M., Skehan, P., & Swain, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing*. Pearson Education.
2. Ducasse, A. M., & Brown, A. (2009). Assessing paired orals: Raters' orientation to interaction. *Language Testing*, 26(3), 423–443.



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy***

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.***

3. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
4. Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning and task type on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(3), 299–323.
5. Galaczi, E. D. (2008). Peer–peer interaction in a speaking test: The case of the First Certificate in English examination. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 5(2), 89–119.
6. de Jong, N., & Perfetti, C. A. (2011). Fluency training in the ESL classroom: An experimental study of fluency development and proceduralization. *Language Learning*, 61(2), 533–568.
7. Kormos, J. (2006). *Speech production and second language acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
8. Long, M. H. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Wiley Blackwell.
9. MacIntyre, P. D. (2007). Willingness to communicate in the second language: Understanding the decision to speak as a volitional process. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 564–576.
10. MacIntyre, P. D., Dörnyei, Z., Clément, R., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545–562.
11. May, L. (2011). Interactional competence in a paired speaking test: Features salient to raters. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 8(2), 127–145.
12. Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
13. Peng, J.-E., & Woodrow, L. (2010). Willingness to communicate in English: A model in the Chinese EFL classroom context. *Language Learning*, 60(4), 834–876.
14. Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 27–57.



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy***

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.***

-
15. Samuda, V., & Bygate, M. (2008). *Tasks in second language learning*. Palgrave Macmillan.
 16. Segalowitz, N. (2010). *Cognitive bases of second language fluency*. Routledge.
 17. Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.
 18. Tavakoli, P., & Skehan, P. (2005). Strategic planning, task structure, and performance testing. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Planning and task performance in a second language* (pp. 239–273). John Benjamins.
 19. Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman.
 20. Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(1), 54–66.