International Journal of Language Academy
ISSN: 2342-0251

Volume 2/2 Summer
2014 p. 95/108

# THE EFFECTS OF TASK REPETITION ON THE FLUENCY, ACCURACY AND COMPLEXITY OF TURKISH EFL LEARNER' ORAL PRODUCTION

## Ödev Tekrarlarının Türk Öğrencilerinin Konuşmasındaki Akıcılık Doğruluk ve Kompleksliği Üzerindeki Etkisi

**Monireh AZİMZADEH**[1]

**Abstract**

This study aims to investigate the learners' ability in using their L2 knowledge in production. We investigated if there is a native like production when the need to focus on meaning has been decreased through task repetition, thus learners are free to attend to form, not from input which they receive but from their own internal system. Thus, the main concern of this research was to explore the impacts of task repetition on accuracy, fluency and complexity of EFL learners' oral production. We tried to investigate if learners were more accurate, more fluent or more complex as we repeated the same tasks for the second time after one week. This study was conducted with 60 EFL students (males and females) who were ELT students and medicine students at Ataturk University .To examine the effects of task repetition on fluency, accuracy, and complexity of learners, participants' performances on the first attempt and second attempt of the same task were recorded and scored. In order to answer research questions the data were submitted to statistical analysis including paired t-test. The results of t-test indicate that task repetition has a significant impact on the development of learners' oral production in terms of fluency and accuracy.

**Key Words:** *Task, Task Repetition, Fluency, Accuracy, Complexity.*

**Özet**

Bu çalışma dilin kullanımında ikinci dil bilgisinin dil öğrenenler tarafından kullanılabilme yetisini araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Konu tekrarı aracılığıyla anlama odaklanma ihtiyacının düşünülerek dil öğrenenlerin girdi yoluyla değil kendi iç yönlendirmeleriyle yapıyı kullanabilmeleri sonucu ana dil benzeri bir üretimin söz konusu olup olmadığını araştırdık. Bu çalışma Atatürk Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi ve İngilizce Öğretmenliği bölümünde okuyan altmış yabancı dil öğrencisi (baylar ve bayanlar) ile birlikte yürütülmüştür. Konu tekrarı ve türlerinin öğrencilerin akıcılık, doğruluk ve güçlük düzeyleri üzerine olan etkilerini ölçmek için katılımcılar, öyküleme grubu, bireysel konu grubu ve karar verme grubu olmak üzere üç gruba ayrıldı ve performansları aralıklarla ikişer kez kaydedildi ve puanlandırıldı. Katılımcılar araştırmanın amacı konusunda bilgi sahibi değillerdi. Performansları ayrı sınıflarda kaydedildi ve daha sonra bu kayıtlar belirli ölçütlere göre yazıya aktarıldı ve puanlandırıldı. Çalışmanın bulguları ödev tekrar akıcı ve doğru gelişimi üzerinde önemli bir etkiye sahip olduğunu göstermektedir.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** *Ödev, ödev tekrarlama, akıcılık, doğruluk ve komplekslik.*

[1] Phd student. Çukurova Üniversitesi, e-posta: monir.azimzadeh@gmail.com

## 1. Introduction

Second language acquisition researchers, curriculum developers, teacher trainers and language teachers have been interested in utilizing task-based language teaching (TBLT) all over the world in the past 20 years. To a great extent, it was developed in reaction to empirical account of teacher-centred, form-oriented second language classroom practice (Long& Norris, 2000).
Task-based Language Teaching presents the notion of "task" as a basic element of planning and teaching. So, it is vital to know what a 'task' exactly consists of. Tasks have been defined in different ways. Willis (1996) defines task as an activity where learners use the target language for a communicative purpose in order to achieve an outcome. In this definition, the concept of meaning is included in 'outcome'. Similarly for Nunan (2006) tasks have a non-linguistic outcome. He defines task as:

A piece of classroom work that involves learners in comprehending, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is focused on mobilizing their grammatical knowledge in order to express meaning, and in which the intention is to convey meaning rather than to manipulate form. The task should also have a sense of completeness, being able to stand alone as a communicative act in its own right with a beginning, middle and an end (p.17).

The center of researchers' debates in language teaching has been on how attention can be directed to one area of language production. According to Schmidt (1990) learners have accessible limited attentional capabilities and that if we choose to pay attention to one area of language production (e.g. accuracy), we may lose to concentrate on other areas. Selection between attention to form and attention to meaning has been considered as an important choice. A number of proposals have been made to show how some attention can be focused on form. It can be done through task design (Fotos & Ellis, 1991), pre-task and post-task activities (Doughty, 1991) and consciousness-raising activities (Willis, 1996).

In this regard task repetition seems to have useful effects on learner's performance. Numbers of proposals have been claimed by researchers on the effects of task repetition on oral production of learners. Task repetition is said to improve learners' accuracy and fluency in some cases and fluency and complexity in other cases. As Bygate (1999) suggests, learners primarily focus on message content and as soon as message content and the basic language required to encode it has been established, they switch their attention to the selection and monitoring of proper language.

In this study was conducted to explore the impacts of task repetition on accuracy, fluency and complexity of EFL learners' oral production. We tried to investigate if learners were more accurate, more fluent or more complex as we repeated the same tasks for the second time after one week.

## 2. Literature review

### 1.1. Task

Although researchers define task differently, none of these definitions are clear. As Samuda & Bygate (2008: 62) point out, while a widely agreed definition of the term is both desirable and necessary

... arriving at such a definition is not straightforward – a considerable part of the second language task literature has been concerned with the search for a precise, yet comprehensive definition of a "task".

In a similar way, Willis & Willis (2007, 2009) do not provide a 'watertight definition' (2007: 13) of a task, instead they present a set of principles to determine how 'task-like' activity is:

A task has a number of defining characteristics, among them: does it engage the learners' interest; is there a primary focus on meaning; is success measured in terms of non-linguistic outcome rather than accurate use of language forms; and does it relate to real world activities? The more confidently we can answer yes to each of these questions the more task-like the activity.

However, no one has found the Willis & Willis principles mainly useful. For example, Harmer (2009: 173) claims that these principles are 'less than helpful' and finds in this approach to defining tasks 'a lack of willingness to pin down exactly what is on offer' that is 'less than totally persuasive' (2009: 174).

Ellis claimed that, a task is a 'work plan'; that is, it takes the form of materials needed for researching or teaching language. But, Breen states that we should notice the differences between task -as-work plan and task-as-process, which is the activity that emerges when particular learners in a specific setting perform the task. Therefore, definition of task related to task-as-work-plan. Thus, he (Ellis, 2003) defined task as:

"A work plan that requires learners to process language pragmatically in order to achieve an outcome that can be evaluated in terms of whether the correct or appropriate prepositional content has been conveyed".

According to the definition stated above, learners should primary focus on meaning and utilize their linguistic resources, but it depends on the design of task which may make them to select particular form. So, a task like other language activities, involves productive or receptive, and oral or written skills, and also various cognitive processes.

Considering definitions mentioned above, it should be noticed that a task differs from an exercise. Bygate (2003, p. 176) defines 'exercises' as "activities which practice parts of a skill, a new sub-skill, a new piece of knowledge". In contrast, he defines 'tasks' as "activities which practice the whole integrated skill in some way". Similarly, Candlin (in Bygate et al., 2001, p. 235) defines 'exercises' as "serving as sequenceable preliminaries to, or supporters, of tasks", whereas 'tasks' are more inclusive activities, engaging students in a variety of interlocking processes, and encouraging them to "practice the integrated use of language, acquire language development strategies and use language meaningfully and creatively."

Likewise, Ellis stated that 'tasks' are activities that call for primarily meaning-focused language use. In contrast, 'exercises' are activities that call for primarily form-focused language use.

### 1.2. Task Repetition

There are various situations presented by researchers which are useful for doing task. Bygate (1996) offered situations such as task familiarity and task repetition. He mentioned that these factors are useful in learning L2. According to Yule (Yule et al., 1992) interlocutor experience is another beneficial situation for doing task .Maybe the most useful way in this respect is that of pre-task planning. Ellis (1987), for example, reports that if tasks are included with arrangement of planned discourse with rule-based language, accuracy will be developed, whereas if tasks are included with unplanned discourse, lexical performance will be increased. Crookes (1989) reports that planning time led to more complexity language production, but not on accuracy. Foster and Skehan (1996) argued the different impact of planning on task performance. They reported that the opportunity to plan (giving 10 minutes in pre-task planning) directed to much greater fluency, greater complexity and more accuracy.

As mentioned before, discovering situations, which a task is done such as task repetition, can be useful for L2 learning. Task repetition is mainly a kind of planning (Ellis, 2005, 2008) that refers to 'repetition of the same or slightly altered task – whether the whole tasks, or parts of a task' (Bygate &

Samuda, 2005, p. 43). Task repetition is said to lead to more fluency and complexity (Bygate, 2001). Probably because when learners already know:

What they are going to talk or write about they have more processing space available for formulating the language needed to express their ideas with the result that the quantity of the output will be enhanced and also the fluency and complexity (Ellis, 2003, pp. 246–47).

In fact, as the learners perform task for the first time, they are involved with the planning of content, i.e. processing the preverbal message (Bygate, 1996). They scan their memory for the language that is most suitable to the task; and this is how familiarity with the message content is recognized. However, on the second opportunity in task performance, because of familiarity with the message content, they have enough time to shift their attention from content to the selection and monitoring of proper language, which lead to more fluency, complexity and/or accuracy (Bygate, 1999).

Bygate states that the theoretical principles behind the hypothesis that task repetition may support language performance originated from the fact that 'part of the work of conceptualization, formulation and articulation which is done in the first occasion is kept in the learners' memory store and can be reused on the second occasion (2001, p. 29). All in all, to Bygate and Samuda (2005, p. 45), task repetition is essentially theorized as having two phases:

a first enactment of a task, in which learners are likely to organize the cognitive content, scope out the likely useful lexico-grammar, and process it in real time, generating an experientially derived multi-level schema to support subsequent linguistic work; followed by a second enactment, during which the speaker can build on the previous one.

One of the earliest renowned attempts to study task repetition is Bygate's (1996) study, which investigated the effects of exact repetition of a task on language production. In this study a participant was asked to watch a video cartoon and then to narrate it. Bygate reported that this form of repetition has a striking improvement in both fluency and accuracy (Bygate, 1996).

Later, Bygate (2001) compared the performances of 48 learners on a narrative and an interview on two occasions with a 10-week interval. He found that task repetition had a significant effect on fluency and complexity of learners' performances. The findings of this study that were strongly consistent with Bygate's (1996) results were also supported in study carried out by Bygate and Samuda (2005), which was based on the dataset in Bygate (2001).

Gass et al.'s (1999) study examined the impact of task repetition on linguistic output of L2 learners of Spanish. They tried to find out whether repeating (both same and slightly different) tasks causes more advanced language use. Gass et al. (1999) found that task repetition had an effect on the overall proficiency, partial accuracy in the use of estar, and lexical complexity.

Similarly, Lynch and Maclean had conducted another interesting study on task repetition (2000, 2001) in the context of English for specific purposes. They explored that task repetition had a positive impact on both accuracy and fluency in language production of learners.

But more recently Birjandi and Ahangari's study (2008) revealed that task repetition improves complexity and fluency, but less accuracy of the learners.

Based on the theoretical foundation and experimental proof discussed above, it can be hypothesized that task repetition supports complexity and fluency and in some cases fluency and accuracy of EFL learners' oral production. Bygate suggested that 'previous experience of a specific task aids speakers to shift their attention from processing the message content to working on formulations of the message'. It may also be assumed that since progress in the oral production of learners may be achieved by task repetition and careful online planning; using them simultaneously may help learners to produce more complex, accurate and fluent language than they may otherwise do. Also, some form of task repetition can enable learners to change their attention from the problem of conceptualization towards that of formulation. Task recycling seems to provide the basis for learners

to integrate their fluency, accuracy and complexity of formulation around what becomes a familiar conceptual base.

**2.2. Research Questions**

The following research questions were addressed in this study:

Question 1: what are the effects of task repetition on L2 learners' fluency?

Question 2: what are the effects of task repetition on L2 learners' accuracy?

Question 3: what are the effects of task repetition on L2 learners' complexity?

**3.1. METHOD OF THE STUDY**

**3.1. Participants**

This study was conducted with 60 EFL students (males and females) , who were studying English language teaching and medicine at Ataturk University . They were between 20-25 years old and at intermediate level.

**3.2. Material**

Three task types were used in this study following Skehan and Foster (1999): Personal tasks (based on information that was well known to participants and that was so supposed to decrease the cognitive load of the task involved), narratives task (which were supported by visual material, but which required some degree of organization of material to tell a story effectively), and decision-making tasks (which required the ability to relate a set of reasons to a set of decisions that had to be made).

These three types of tasks were chosen for a number of reasons. First similar tasks have been used in other studies (e.g. Foster & Skehan, 1996; Skehan & Foster, 1997; Skehan & Foster, 1999; Foster, 2000 cited in Foster, 2001) and therefore it would be easier to compare the results of these studies with the results that were gained in other similar studies. Second, all of these tasks are monologic rather than dialogic, so they provide a basis for measuring performance of learner that are not affected by interactional variables. Finally, we wished to insure that the task was reasonably demanding on the participants and previous researches indicate that this can be achieved by these types of task.

Additionally, there are some reasons for choosing narrative task. Bygate (1999) claims that the narrative task invites "linguistically denser talk" (p.206), we expect that it make development in L2 production. The usefulness of using the narrative task in l2 research is advised by Kawauchy (2005). Her point is that such monological tasks as narration are cognitively demanding because the learners cannot ask help from their conversational partners. Referring to Ortaga (1999), Kawauchi emphasizes the fact that the narrative task effectively limits the range of individual variation in language use. (p.148)

As a personal task the following topic was used:

Sending somebody back to turn off the oven (Foster & Skehan, 1996).

It is the afternoon, you are at the university, and you have an important examination in fifteen minutes. You suddenly think that you haven't turned off the oven after cooking your lunch.

There is no time for you to go home. Explain to a friend who wants to help

• How to get to your house

- How to get into the house and get to the kitchen
- How to turn the oven off

For the second type of task, i.e. decision-making the following topic was chosen: You are going to be taken to a deserted island to live there for a month. You can only take three pieces of equipment with you. Tell us what you would like to take with you and give reasons for your choice and justify the decision. Decision-making tasks tend to involve the mobilization of sets of values to enable decisions to be made about conversational problems.

Finally, for the Narrative task, a lot of sources were examined in detail including course books and supplementary materials for teaching English and pictorial stories to find picture appropriate for the study. We tried to find those picture narratives which were clear enough and had an appropriate length, and also suitable to the level of participants i.e. weren't too difficult for the learners at intermediate proficiency level, and were culturally familiar for the participants. Then, a picture from "Beginning composition through picture" by Heaton was chosen as narrative task.

**3.3. Procedures**

Participants were divided into three groups and each group was given different task. Each participant came out of the class individually and went to a separate room with the researcher. They were required to narrate each of the tasks in turn. There was no time limitation; they were given enough time to look at the picture or think about the given tasks before they started narration.

When all of the participants finished their first performance, the second phase of the study began. After one week participants were required to do the same task again. The same process was repeated for the second time. Students hadn't been informed about the repetition of the task to reduce the practice effect.

**3.4. Accuracy Measure**

Although for general measures of accuracy, the percentage of error free clauses is frequently selected by researchers, Bygate (2001) recommends that calculating the number of errors per unit is the best way to measure accuracy since it does not obscure the actual occurrences of errors, as is the case with counting error-free units. Thus, in this research the incidence of errors per t-unit was selected to calculate the accuracy of participants.

**3.5. Fluency Measure**

Following Bygate (2001) fluency was measured according to temporal measure of three disfluencies, i.e., false start define as "number of utterances abandoned before completion", repetition define as "number of immediate and verbatim repetition of a word or phrase" and reformulation define as" number of repeated with some modification either to syntax, morphology, or word order".

**3.6. Complexity Measure**

Complexity was measured in terms of number of words per t-unit (Bygate, 2001; Daller, van Hout, & TreffersDaller, 2003). T-unit is defined as "a finite clause together with any subordinate clauses dependent on it" (Bygate, 2001, p. 35).

**4. Data Analysis**

This study was accomplished to discover the impact of task repetition on fluency, accuracy and complexity EFL learners' oral production. We explored if learner made less grammatical errors or were they more accurate when we repeated the task for the second time. Similarly, we examined the learners' fluency in the case of reformulation, repetition and false start, to discover if they were more fluent as we repeated the task with the interval of one week. Furthermore, we discovered if

participants utilized more word in the second performance. Therefore, their complexity improved in performing the task for the second time.

In order to answer research questions the data were submitted to statistical analysis including paired t-test.

**Table 4.1.**
***Descriptive Statistics for paired t-test***

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pre FluencyReformulation | 60 | ,77 | 1,125 |
| Post FluencyReformulation | 60 | ,68 | 1,000 |
| Pre FluencyFalseStart | 60 | ,18 | ,504 |
| Post FluencyFalseStart | 60 | ,17 | ,418 |
| Pre FluencyRepetition | 60 | 1,70 | 2,782 |
| Post FluencyRepetition | 60 | 1,02 | 1,761 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 60 | | |

The first research question in this study was concerned on the effect of task repetition on the fluency (repetition, replacement and false starts) of L2 production. A paired t-test was applied to answer this question. As the descriptive data in Table 4.1. shows, during the first performance, the mean score fluency (reformulation) of participants was .77, but in the second performance it has decreased to .68 as well as the mean score of fluency (false starts) has decreased from .17 in the first performance to .18 in the second performance. Although we notice the reduction in the fluency (false start) of the participants, the reduction is not too important.

Moreover, as the table 4.4. indicates the existing significant value for fluency (reformulation) (p=.60) is higher than the significant level (.05). In other words there is no significant difference between the first and second performance of participants. Therefore, there is no significant effect of task repetition on fluency (reformulation) of the participants. Similarly, as shown in table 4.4, since the significant level (.05) is lower than existing value for fluency (false start) (.82), there is no significant difference between the first and second performance of participants, therefore there is no significant effect of task repetition on fluency (false start).

Furthermore, as the descriptive data in Table 4.1. indicates, mean score fluency (repetition) of participants reduced from 1.70 in the first performance to 1.02 in the second performance. As it has been mentioned before, in the case of fluency measurement which is actually a disfluency measurement in this study, the results will be better if we gain smaller scores .Hence, we notice an

improvement in the fluency (repetition) of participants in the second performance . Likewise, the difference between the participants' fluency in the case of repetition was significant (t (59) =2/49, p=.015). It means that performing the same task for the second time with the time interval of one week had a significant effect on the improvement of participants' fluency.

As a result, we conclude that performing task for the second time had a significant impact on the improvement of participants' fluency (repetition), but not fluency (reformulation), fluency (false start).

**Table 4.2.**

***Descriptive statistic for paired t –test***

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pre Accuracy | 60 | 1,68 | 1,73 |
| Post Accuracy | 60 | ,97 | 1,04 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 60 | | |

In this study, the main effect of task repetition on speech production is seen in accuracy measure which is the basic of research question 2. As has been indicated before, accuracy has been measured through the number of errors per t-unit, so if we gain smaller score, the accuracy will be better. Looking at the mean scores of accuracy measures during the two performances in descriptive data in table 4.2., we notice that there has been a significant decrease in the amount of accuracy score in the second performance. In the first performance, it has been 1.68, but in the second performance it has decreased to .97, which shows that in the second performance participants made less error than the first performance and there is an improvement and reduction in the number of errors in the participants' second performance.

Similarly, the result obtained from t-test presented in table 4.4 shows that the main effect of task repetition was significantly meaningful for accuracy measure( t(59)=3.39, p.001), since the value score of accuracy was lower than significant level (.05).

***Table 4.3.***

***Descriptive statistic for paired t -test***

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pre Complexity | 60 | 41,53 | 20,55 |
| Post Complexity | 60 | 40,32 | 21,97 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 60 | | |

As the descriptive data in Table 4.3 shows, there has been a reduction in the complexity level of participants in the second performance. The complexity means score of the participants in the first performance was 41.53, but it reduced to 40.32 in the second performance. Besides, the results obtained from the paired t-test presented in Table 4.4 does not show any significant effect for accuracy measures in the case of task repetition (t (59) = .77, p=.44), since the existing significant value for complexity (p=.44) is higher than the significant level (.05). Thus, we concluded that task repetition has not a positive effect on the improvement of complexity knowledge of participants in this study.

**Table 4.4.**
***Paired Samples Test***

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig.(2-tail |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | Mean | Std. Deviat | Std. Err Mean | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 | Pre FluencyReformulation<br>Post FluencyReformulatio | ,08 | 1,25 | ,16 | -,24 | ,40 | ,51 | 59 | ,60 |
| Pair 2 | Pre FluencyFalseStart<br>Post FluencyFalseStart | ,01 | ,59 | ,07 | -,13 | ,17 | ,21 | 59 | ,82 |
| Pair 3 | Pre FluencyRepetition<br>Post FluencyRepetition | ,68 | 2,11 | ,27 | ,13 | 1,23 | 2,49 | 59 | ***,01*** |
| Pair 4 | Pre Accuracy<br>Post Accuracy | ,71 | 1,63 | ,21 | ,29 | 1,14 | 3,39 | 59 | ***,001*** |
| Pair 5 | Pre Complexity<br>Post Complexity | 1,21 | 12,18 | 1,57 | -1,93 | 4,36 | ,77 | 59 | ,44 |

As the descriptive data in Table 4.3 shows, there has been a reduction in the complexity level of participants in the second performance. The complexity means score of the participants in the first performance was 41.53, but it reduced to 40.32 in the second performance. Besides, the results obtained from the paired t-test presented in Table 4.4 does not show any significant effect for accuracy measures in the case of task repetition (t (59) = .77, p=.44), since the existing significant value for complexity (p=.44) is higher than the significant level (.05). Thus, we concluded that task repetition has not a positive effect on the improvement of complexity knowledge of participants in this study.

Finally, we concluded that repetition of task for the second time with an interval of one week improves learners' accuracy and fluency (repetition). So, we will have a fluent and accurate language production if we recycle the task for the second time.

In order to enrich the analysis, the transcripts of 2 participants were selected to illustrate the effects of task repetition on L2 speech performance. The pauses were not measured and are signaled with (…) in the excerpts.

**First performance**

*My topic is about…… you are when I am going to be taken to a desert desert desert island to live there for a month,…..what can I only……I can take only 3, five piece of equipment with myself and I will talk about it, first of all I will take water,……. because without water I can't live longer. Second I will take light for cooking meal meal. Third I will take gun for kill animal for eating something and meanwhile for protect myself. Forth one I will take……I will take a dog. Of course it should be kanga. When I want to sleep, it will protect me. And the fifth one fifth one, I will take…..it is enough*

**Second performance**

*If I will be taken a deserted island, I will bring with myself firstly, water because without water we can't live longer. Second I will take light for cook meal, prepare something. Third I will bring axe for cutting something or for hunt hunting animals, fish, any way and the forth one I will bring or I will take dog for protect myself, when I were I am sleeping. That is all. I will take this only.*

As can be seen in the transcript, in the first performance participant made a lot of hesitations and repetitions since as was mentioned by Bygate, he was trying to scan his memory for the language which was appropriate to the task. As it takes time to find a suitable language for the task, he was somehow nervous and anxious as he was performing the task. But, on the second performance of the same task, since he was familiar with the tsk and he had more time to shift his attention from content to choose suitable language for the task, he was so relax and that is why he made less repetition or even no repetition and hesitation. Also as can be realized the first performance of participant was more complex but in the second performance as he tried to make a meaningful and accurate utterances, he lost complexity at the expense of fluency and accuracy. Subsequently as the data analysis of result indicated repetition of task for the second time improves learners' fluency in the case of repetition and accuracy.

**Another transcript was chosen from a participant of decision-making narrators**

*Hi honey, I have forget the cook on the fire, could you help me. I have I have an an an important examination after five minutes…… I could not but I couldn't turn back….. could you help me, could you go to my house and could you turn off….. turn off fir turn off the oven. Ok to be a go to be go to this, you should get…. on G1 and you should get off….. in Yenishehir……when you….. come when you come Yenishehir you can get on get off the bus and you will meet a pink apartment and you should …..you should walk a street and the street….. I live at I live at the five floor floor floor you can come in and at the end of the corridor corridor you should come in and you should turn off the oven. See you thanks for your helps.*

**Second Performance**

*Hi darling. I have a problem, can you help me. I have an important exam after 15 minutes, but I cannot ….I forget a cook on the oven. I can't I can't turn turn back to the home. Please can you help me? To be able to go to my house, you should take on G1, when you come the single houses you should turn on left. …. you can see pink building. I am live on the fifth floor, you should open the door and walk in and go ahead. You should you will look you should see you will see the kitchen. You will see the oven in there. Can you turn off the oven Please? Thank you. See you later.*

Bygate(1999) stated while people are speaking, they utilize their processing capacity in two main ways: to manage the content, selecting what they are going to say and to execute plans by connecting meanings to forms while doing it. As can be seen in the transcript, first performance of participant was less fluent; she had a lot of repetition and false start in her utterances and she was not so accurate since she tried to manage the content in her mind to produce utterances. But in the

second performance, she had just familiar with the content so she tried to make accurate and fluent utterances and she lost complexity at the expense of fluency and accuracy. Subsequently as the data analysis of result indicated repetition of task for the second time improves learners' fluency in the case of repetition and accuracy.

**5. Conclusion and Discussion**

This study investigated the effect of task repetition on fluency, accuracy and complexity of EFL learners' oral production.

Results of this study showed that recycling task with the interval of one week improved participants' accuracy and fluency. These results are in line with the findings of studies of Gass et al.'s (1999) and Lynch and Maclean (2000, 2001). As discussed before, Gass et al.'s (1999) study examined the impact of task repetition on linguistic output of L2 learners of Spanish. They tried to find out whether repeating tasks cause more advanced language use. Gass et al. (1999) found that task repetition had an effect on the overall proficiency, partial accuracy of the learners.

Similarly, Lynch and Maclean had conducted another interesting study on task repetition (2000, 2001) in the context of English for specific purposes. They explored that task repetition had a positive impact on the improvement of both accuracy and fluency in language production of learners.

Also, the results of study are supported by information processing theory that human beings have limited attentional capacity (Anderson, 2000) which does not let the speakers to deal with all aspect of the language at the time of performing the task. Learners with low level of proficiency do not have a subsequent plan to help them to simplify the production of language (Farch & Kasper, 1986). When the learners perform the task for the first time, they involve with the planning of the content of the message. But, on the second performance of the task, they would be more concerned on the formulation of the task. Thus, this cognitive rehearsal increases accuracy and fluency of the learners.

The results of the study are also supported by Swain's (1985) output hypothesis, that in order to speak we have to speak. By repeating the task for the second time, learners may be pushed to discover their mistakes and try to correct them in the second attempt, because "under certain circumstances, output promotes noticing" (Swain, 1998, p. 67).

The current study has suggestions for both pedagogy and research. In the case of pedagogical, the results of this study propose that repetition can make an ideal balance between attention to form and attention to meaning. The finding of this study can be useful for language teachers and curricular designers. Since the findings of study show an increase on the accuracy and fluency of participants, teachers can notice the positive effect of task repetition and include rehearsal and task recycle in their daily teaching programs. Within the repeating of task for the second time learners can work with their language problem on a practically constant way.

Changing the interval between task repetitions or giving different task types might have various impacts on performance of the participants. A further research can be done by selecting different task types or by changing the interval of performing repetition of task. Also effects of task repetition on oral skills of participants were discovered in this study. Subsequent study can be done by examining effects of task repetition on other skills of participants.

**REFERENCES**

Ahmadian,M. and Tavakoli, M. (2010).*The effects of simultaneous use of careful online planning and task repetition on accuracy, complexity, and fluency in EFL learners' oral production*. Oxford University Press. 15(1) 35–59.

Brown, C., & Yule, C. (1983). Teaching the spoken language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brumt, C.J., (1984). Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Bygate, M. (1996). Effects of task repetition: Appraising the development of second language learners. In J. Willis and D. Willis (Eds.), Challenge and change in language teaching (pp. 136-146) London: Macmillan.

Bygate, M. (1999). *Task as the context for the framing, re-framing and un-framing of language.* System, 27, 33-48.

Bygate, M. (1999). 'Quality of language and purpose of task: Patterns of learners' language on two oral communication tasks,' Language Teaching Research 3: 185–214.

Carter, R. (2001*). The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

DeKeyser, R. (2008). 'The complexities of defining complexity'. Paper presented at AAAL 2008, 1 April 2008, Washington D.C

Derwing, M. and J. Rossiter. (2003). 'The effects of pronunciation instruction on the accuracy fluency, and complexity of L2 accented speech,' Applied Language Learning 13: 1–18.

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

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

Ellis, R. (2006). The methodology of task-based teaching. Paper presented at the 2006 Asian EFL Journal Conference, Pusan, Korea.

Farch, C., & Kasper, G. (1986). Cognitive dimensions of language transfer. In E. Kellerman & M.S. Smith (Eds.), Cross linguistic influence in second language acquisition (pp.49-65). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Fotos, S. & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task-based approach. TESOL Quarterly, 25, 605-628.

Foster, P. (1999). Task-based learning and pedagogy. ELT Journal, 53(1), 69-70.

Foster, P., & Skehan, P. 1996. The influence of planning on performance in task-based learning. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18(3), 299-324.

Gass, S., Mackey, A., Alvarez-Torres, M., & Fernandez, M. (1999). The effects of task repetition on linguistic output. Language Learning, 49, 549-581.

Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1985). Task variation and non-native/non-native negotiation of meaning. In S. Cass and C. Madden (Eds.), Input in second language acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gass, S. M., & Madden, C. G. (Eds.). (1985). Input in second language acquisition. Row-ley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (1994). An integrated view of second language acquisition. In S.M. Gass & L. Selinker, Second language acquisition: An introductory course (pp. 295-308). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Heaton, J.B. (1975). Beginning composition through pictures. London: Longman.

Housen, A. and Kuiken, F. (2006) Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency in Second Language Acquisition. Applied Linguistics .461–473.

Krashen, S. (1985). The input hypothesis. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. (1996). Second language theory building: Letting all the flowers bloom! Language Learning, 46, 713-749.

Long, M.H., & Crooks, G. (1991). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. TESOL Quarterly, 26(1), 27-56.

Lynch, T., & Maclean, J. (2000). Exploring the benefits of task repetition and recycling for classroom language learning. Language Teaching Research, 4, 221-250.

Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. TESOL Quarterly, 32(1), 677-703.

McAllister, J., Cato-Symonds,S. and Johnson, B. (2001). Listeners' ERP responses to false starts and repetitions in spontaneous speech.

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

Nunan, D. (2005). Task-based language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Nunn, R. (2006). Designing holistic units for task-based teaching. Asian EFL Journal, 8(3), 69-93.

Oxford, R.L. (2006). Task-based language teaching and learning: An overview. Asian EFL Journal, 8(3), 94-121.

Pica, T. (1997). Second language teaching and research relationships: A North American view. Language Teaching Research, 1, 48-72.

Prabhu, N.S. (1987). Second language pedagogy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rieger, C. (2003). Disfluencies and hesitation strategies in oral L2 tests. pp. 41–44.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 11, 17-46.

Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. Applied Linguistics, 17(1), 38-61.

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1999). The influence of task structure and processing condition on narrative retelling. Language Learning, 49(1), 93-120.

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1997). Task type and task processing conditions as influences on foreign language performance. pp. 185-211.

Skehan, P. (2003) Focus on form, tasks and methodology. Computer assisted language learning. Vol, 16. Pp.391-416

Willis, J. (1996). A flexible framework for task-based learning. In J. Willis, & D. Willis (Eds.), Challenge and change in language teaching (pp. 52-62). Oxford: Heinemann.

**APPENDIX**

**Narrative Task**

Chosen from "Beginning composition through picture" by Heaton