



# **Utilizing an Integrative Tasks Based Strategy to Develop the TOEFL iBT Candidates' Language Skills Required for the Speaking Test**

**Sally Mohamed Saad El-Din Mostafa**  
English Language Lecturer, Department of Basic Sciences  
Modern Academy for Engineering and Technology



***Abstract:***

The purpose of this research is to develop the TOEFL iBT candidates' language skills required for the speaking test by utilizing an integrative tasks strategy based. The concerned language skills are listening, reading and speaking ones. The participants of the study included 30 students who were randomly chosen and divided into groups: treatment (N=15) and non-treatment (N=15). The treatment group received instruction using the integrative tasks based strategy with its three phases: pre task, on task, and post task. The tasks employed were listing, ordering and sorting, comparing, problem solving, and sharing personal experiences. Also, the objectives, time allowed, instructor's role, and learners' roles were determined within each section while administering the integrative strategy. On the other hand, the non-treatment group received their regular instruction. The instruments of the study were; achievement reading, listening and speaking tests, TOEFL iBT speaking test sample, and rubrics for scoring the independent and integrative speaking tasks for TOEFL iBT speaking test. Data were collected and t-test was used for the statistical analysis. Results indicated that there were statistically significant differences between the treatment and non-treatment groups in the achievement reading, listening, and speaking test as well as the whole TOEFL iBT speaking test sample favoring the treatment group. It was concluded that the present research provided evidence for the effect of the integrative strategy based on tasks on developing the language skills required for the TOEFL iBT speaking test.

**Key Words:** Integrative Tasks Based Strategy , language skills, TOEFL iBT speaking test.

**Introduction:**

The four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) are the mode where language is used for communication. Whenever the language learner communicates using the language, the combination of these skills is employed. Language learners can communicate using either the oral or the written language. In oral communication, messages are received through listening and responded by speaking, whereas in the written communication, they are received through reading and responded by writing. By means of listening and reading, language learners get information as the input of language, and by employing speaking and writing; they make language output based on the language inputs. In other words, reading and listening are receptive skills, while speaking and writing are productive ones (Richard and Schmidt, 2002). According to Harmer (2007), any of the four skills of the English language is rarely done in isolation and all of them demand considerable language activation on the part of the learner.

Speaking is a crucial part of the foreign language learning and teaching as it is considered the most difficult for many EFL learners to master because it needs the mastery of the linguistic and the cultural competence. Nunan (2003) states that speaking is a productive aural/oral skill and it consists of producing systematic verbal utterances to convey meaning. Hornby (2007) defines speaking as making use of words in an ordinary voice, uttering words, being able to use language expressing oneself in words and making speech.

Listening is the skill of understanding the spoken language. It is a vital component of the oral communication, or the interactive process where the individual takes the roles of speaker and listener through a verbal and non-verbal component. Listening is a psychological phenomenon that takes place on a cognitive level in our minds, and a social phenomenon that develops interactively between individuals and the environment surrounding them. Listening can be considered a complex process that needs to be understood to be taught and evaluated before being integrated with the phonological aspects and the speaking skill (Bueno, Madrid and McLaren, 2006).

Reading, like listening, is a decoding process where the language learner has to recognize graphic symbols and their corresponding vocal sounds. Reading is a complex process that involves many physical, intellectual, and often emotional reactions. Reading helps the learners to

understand the language in a written form and extract the thoughts, facts, meanings, and pieces of information as well. The six essential skills needed for reading are: decoding which is a vital step in the reading process, fluency, vocabulary, sentence construction and cohesion, reasoning and background knowledge, and working memory and attention (Kaya, 2015).

English language recent research tends to associate the integration of the four language skills with an improvement in the target language. Wallace, Stariha, and Walberg (2004) (cited in Zuniga, 2016) have proposed that the language skills' integration provides natural situations which in turn can help in enhancing listening, speaking, reading and writing in a single class for fostering the English language. Nunan (1999) also has supported this idea by clarifying the importance of the language skills integration in developing a genuine communicative competence and improving learners' language proficiency while participating in both linguistic and communicative activities promoting authentic language use.

The language teaching nowadays has become one of the most challenging professions. Teachers' centered teaching methods that focus only on teaching a knowledgeable content through translation or drills has been contested by approaches that are more communicative. The Task-Based Approach has recently acquired an enormous fame in the language learning and teaching field. This approach has actually become a remarkable topic in the second language acquisition field in terms of enhancing the process-focused syllabi as well as devising communicative tasks, where these communicative tasks work on fostering the learners' real language via real communicative situations. The popularity of the task-based learning approach may be attributed to the idea that most language learners taught by methods emphasizing mastery of grammar have not achieved an acceptable level of competency in the target language (Shehadeh, 2005).

Task-based teaching approach employs tasks as its main pedagogical tools to structure language teaching. It can be regarded as the clear enhancement of communication linguistics with its related principles in teaching. Task-based approach is deemed a powerful advanced learning method as it fosters the language skills required in the process of performing tasks. From one side, teachers are both instructors and guides, and from another side, language learners are both receivers and

main agents. Communication linguistics have admitted that using and applying language for performing meaningful tasks could foster and develop language teaching as they have illustrated that the language which is meaningful to learners can in turn pave the way for the learning process and make it easier. Freeman (2000) (cited in Hismanoglu 2011) has declared that as language learners are making effort to perform a task, they will have the chance to interact with their peers. Consequently, this interaction will facilitate language acquisition as learners are attempting to comprehend each other when presenting their own meanings.

Concerning the integration of the language skills, the International TOEFL test (TOEFL iBT) has presented several challenges in that field. This test measures all four academic English skills: reading, listening, writing, and speaking. The test consists of four sections, each measuring one of the basic language skills, while some sub-sections require integrating multiple tasks, and all tasks focus on the language used in an academic, higher-education environment (Norris,2020).

Context of the problem :

The researcher has been teaching the TOEFL (paper-based test) and International TOEFL preparation courses for more than fourteen years. Both courses are taught for adult language learners at different ages. While conducting these preparation courses and practicing the language, the researcher has observed that the speaking test is the most crucial section for all the language learners especially the TOEFL iBT speaking section. Actually, the examinees feel stressful, hesitant, and confused; this feeling is mainly attributed to the test's integrated tasks for evaluating speaking on what is read and listened. The use of these integrated tasks makes the TOEFL iBT speaking test not only different from other international English language tests, but also challenging for the examinees.

The researcher conducted a pilot study among thirty language learners; only twenty of them were preparing themselves to pass the TOEFL iBT test, and the rest ten-language learners were challenging themselves to improve their language skills. All of the thirty participants were asked to respond to a familiar topic for the first section of the test, then they are required to respond to an integrated speaking practice of three parts: reading, listening, and speaking. As for the third section of the test, the participants were also asked to respond to an integrated speaking test of

three parts: reading a passage, listening to an academic lecture, and speaking. The fourth and the final section, the language learners had to respond to an integrated test by listening to an academic lecture without reading then answering the question. The results revealed that the language learners in the first section could understand the topic but could not respond appropriately. In the second and the third sections, the participants faced many challenges in listing and sorting the pieces of information mentioned in the reading passage and comparing or identifying the points of similarities and differences between the reading and the listening part while performing speaking. In the fourth section, the language learners found a difficulty in summarizing and retelling the information they listened to in the academic lecture while speaking.

The aim of this research was to examine if the integrative strategy based on tasks would improve the participants' language skills required for the TOEFL iBT speaking test.

Based on the above fore mentioned discussion, the following research questions were proposed:

- 1) What are the language skills in reading, listening and speaking required for the TOEFL iBT speaking test?
- 2) What are the phases and the appropriate tasks utilized in the integrative strategy for the development of the language skills required for the TOEFL iBT speaking section?
- 3) To what extent will the integrative tasks based strategy improve the candidates' language skills required for the TOEFL iBT speaking test?

Literature Review:

The field of language teaching and learning has experienced numerous changes in the last few decades. New trends are attempting to promote communicative competence instead of mastering grammar, vocabulary, reading, writing, or listening in isolation. Many researchers and instructors have shown the benefits of integrating language skills, as they all state that learning English is more productive when students learn the four skills in a single lesson. According to Baturay and Akar (2007), integrating language skills is fundamental for learners to be competent in the second language and promote English learning naturally. This integration enhances EFL learning through constant practice and allows the language learners express their ideas through writing messages, understanding aural messages, and holding conversations.

Integration of Language Skills:

Several researchers have claimed that teaching language skills can never be conducted through isolable and discrete structural elements. They illustrated and clarified their perspective by identifying that language skills are scarcely used in isolation; for example, both speaking and listening comprehension are needed in a conversation, and in some contexts, reading and listening while taking notes to have a conversation. Ellis (2014) and Dickinson (2010) have mentioned that integrating language skills facilitates the improvement of linguistic and communicative abilities.

Researchers have stated that oral and written languages are not kept separate or isolated from one another in natural day-to-day experience. Instead, they often occur together where they are integrated in specific communication events. According to Chen (2007), the four language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing should be treated as integrated, independent, and inseparable elements of the language during the learning process itself. Similarly, Hungyo and Kijai (2009) have illustrated that the term “integrated” not only refers to language learning where all the four skills take place at the same time, but also to how the teacher, learner, and setting play their roles in the learning process. The integrated skill approach is a whole language approach where if a course deals with reading skills, then, it will also deal with listening, speaking, and writing skills. This approach is deemed as a comprehensive one where the English language is not only taught for academic purposes, but also for communication as well.

To achieve communication, Oxford (2001) suggests that the instructor’s teaching style must address the learning style of the learner from one hand, and the learner should be motivated, and settings must provide resources and values that powerfully support the language teaching from the other side. In other words, Oxford has identified four essential strands to achieve successful communicative language classes; these four elements are: the teacher, the learner, the setting, and relevant languages.

Hungyo and Kijai (2009) have mentioned that one of the merits of this approach is that it enables teachers to build the lesson plan around a theme or a topic based on the interest of learners and also on topics that are relevant to them. This in turn contributes in making lessons more dynamic for learners who can participate in different kinds of activities and interaction. Oxford (2001) has clarified that using the integrated skill

approach is also beneficial in exposing English language learners to authentic language and force them to interact naturally in the language. She also went farther to illustrate that these communicative situations would help the language learners to acquire the idea of richness and complexity of the English language.

Hungyo and Kijai (2009) cited in (Bastias, et al. 2011) have mentioned that the Integrated Skill Approach is a whole language approach where if a course deals with reading skills, then, it will also deal with listening, speaking, and writing skills. According to their words, this approach is deemed as one in which the English language is taught not just for an academic but also for a communication purpose. In other words, it considers the communicational goal that every language course should achieve by exposing learners to the richness and complexity of the language.

Segregated vs integrated language skills:

Up to the end of the 1970s, the four language skills were taught in isolation. This was due to the predomination of the traditional language teaching methods including the Grammar Translation Method, Structuralism Approach, The Direct Method, The Audio-Lingual Method, Total Physical Response, and the Natural approach. In the segregated-skill approach, language skills were isolated for instructional purposes as the mastery of discrete language skills like reading or speaking is seen as the key to successful learning. Therefore, in that approach, the four language skills are taught separately, and both the materials and activities were usually designed focusing on only one specific skill ignoring the others. Consequently, language learners were not prepared to utilize the language as a means of communication in every day life (Pardede,2019)

Skill segregation is reflected in ESL/EFL programs that offer classes with titles such as “Intermediate Reading”, “Basic Listening Comprehension”, “Advanced Writing”, “Pronunciation”, “Grammar I and II” and so on. The use of discrete skills approach in ESL/EFL classroom was challenged by the emergence of the communicative language teaching (CLT) at the end of the 1970s. Widdowson (1978), the first advocate of language skills integration, pointed out that the language use takes place in the form of discourse and in specific social contexts, not in discrete units. The idea was supported by other linguistics emphasizing that teaching language skills can not be

conducted through separate structural elements. They believed that the learners should develop receptive and productive skills in both spoken and written discourse. In other words, the four language skills should be learned interactively.

Carols (1990) posited that the integration of skills in the language classroom is simply a series of activities or tasks that use any combination of the four skills in a continuous and related sequence. In addition, Richards and Schmidt (2002) stated that “integrated approach is the teaching of the language skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking, in conjunction with each other. Thus, in the integrative skills approach, the learning of only one skill can lead to mastering one or more other skills. For example, speaking may be pursued by relating both writing and reading in the language teaching/learning process (Brown, 2001).

**Advantages of Integrated Skills Teaching:**

The integrated skill approach, as contrasted with the segregated skill approach, exposes ESL/EFL learners to authentic language and challenges them to interact naturalistically in the language. The integrated skill approach stresses that English is neither an academic interest object nor a key for passing an exam; instead, English becomes a real means of interaction and sharing among people. As a result, language learners rapidly gain a true picture of the richness and complexity of the English language as employed for communication. This approach allows instructors to track the language learners’ progress in multiple skills at the same time (Oxford, 2001).

Carols (1990) cited in Pardede (2017) has described four advantages for the integrated skills approach. According to his words, these merits are stated as follows:

The integration skills approach provides continuity in teaching and learning the English language as all the tasks are closely connected and bonded with each other.

Activities in the integrated skill approach are designed in a way to provide input before output.

It provides realistic learning as skills integration helps in improving the four skills within a realistic communicative framework.

It can motivate the language learners and increases their self confidence while using the language.

Kebede (2013) has also listed some of the merits of integrated skills teaching. For example, it provides more purposeful and meaningful learning at all proficiency levels, as it contributes to consistent teaching and better communication. Integrated skills teaching brings variety into the classroom; instructors can weave and merge the language skills cooperatively. It can enable the learners manage the language and easily transfer the acquired knowledge of the other areas. He also has gone farther to assert that this approach promotes language learning and has a positive effect as it helps the learners develop their communicative competence and provides exposure to authentic language learning environment, so the students can interact naturally with the intended language. Integrated skills approach aids the language learners enhance their critical thinking; they can analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information better.

Types of integrated- skill instruction:

The activities applied by the instructors in the integrated approach are real-life activities and situations, and as a result, an interactive learning environment is created. Instructors face the language learners with communicative situations that can help them realize the importance of learning a foreign language. Oxford (2001) has stated that there are two types of integrated-skill instruction; those are Content-Based Language Instruction and Task-Based Instruction.

In Content-Based Instruction, language learners practice all the language skills in a highly integrated communicative method. It is valuable at all levels of proficiency, but the nature of the content might differ by proficiency level. For beginners, the content often involves basic social and interpersonal communication skills, but for the intermediate and upper intermediate levels, the content can become increasingly academic and complex. In content-based language instruction, learners practice language skills while engaging with activities focusing on a specific subject.

In Task-Based Instruction, language learners' basic pair work and group work are often used to increase the learners' interaction and collaboration. For example, they can work together to write and edit a class newspaper, develop a television commercial, enact scenes from a play, or even take part in other joint tasks. More structured cooperative learning formats can also be used in task-based instruction. Task-based instruction is relevant to all levels of language proficiency, but the nature

of the task varies from one level to another. In task-based language instruction, learners are involved in activities that require comprehending, producing, manipulating, or interacting in authentic language. The learners work together to solve a problem, complete a task, create a product...etc. As a result, structured cooperative learning techniques, like peer editing and sequence chains, are often employed in task-based instruction (Oxford, 2001).

**Task-Based Instruction/ Language Teaching:**

Task-based language teaching is based on a language learning theory rather than a language structure one. As it proposes the tasks' use as a central component in the language classroom, this is because the tasks provide better contexts for activating the learner's acquisition process and promoting the second language learning as well. Similarly, Richards and Rodgers (2001) (cited in Sh gehadeh,2005) found out that the tasks are believed to enhance various processes of negotiation, modification, rephrasing, and experimentation. They regarded all the previous processes to be the heart of the second language learnin.

Linguistics who conducted various task research have identified several descriptions for the term "task". Breen (1989) conceptualizes the task as any structural language-learning endeavor having a special objective, convenient content, a particular working procedure, and a range of outcomes for the task takers. Willis (1996) argues that tasks are activities performed when the language learners use the target language for a communicative purpose to achieve an outcome. Skehnn (1998) shed light on four key characteristics concerning the definition of the "task". He has mentioned that the task is an activity where the meaning is basic and principal, a problem to solve is a prerequisite, the performance is outcome evaluated, and a real world relationship should exist. Candlin (2001) has recognized that tasks themselves are regarded as being potentially of differential levels of demands on learners, in terms of cognitive load, language difficulty, and conceptual content. According to his words, the tasks can require variable completion times and be undertaken in a variety of contexts and conditions.

Nunan (2004) has illustrated that the concept of "task" has turned into an essential element in syllabus design, classroom teaching and learner assessment. According to his words, task-based language teaching has pedagogically strengthened these principles and practices: a) Requiring a needs-based approach to content selection. b) Emphasizing learning

communication via interaction in the target language. c) Introducing authentic texts into the learning situation. d) Offering and providing chances for learners to focus on the language learning process as a whole. e) Fostering the learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning; and f) Linking between both the language learning and the language use outside the classroom.

Ellis (2009b) has gone further when declaring that a language teaching activity has to meet four criteria to be regarded as a task. In her perspective, the task must focus initially or primarily on meaning, have a gap; in other words, the learner must do something to finish the task, force the learners to rely on their own resources; either linguistic or non-linguistic ones, and finally, it should have an outcome. A classroom task is an activity having a particular goal and it contains communicative language use in the process. Because the task here has a certain relationship with the extra linguistic world, it goes beyond the common classroom exercise. Discourse coming out from the task is intended and directed to be similar to the one that emerges naturally in the real world (Ellis, 2000).

Characteristics and features of task-based teaching:

Scrivener (2011) has clarified that task-based learning is a variant of communicative language teaching that bases work cycles around the preparation for, doing of, and reflection and analysis of tasks that reflect real life needs and skills. The features of the task-based language teaching have been determined and summarized as follows:

The focus is on the process rather than the product.

Basic elements are purposeful activities and tasks emphasizing both communication and meaning.

While being engaged in the activities and tasks, learners learn language by interacting communicatively and decisively.

Activities and tasks can be either those ones needed by the learners in real life or others that have a pedagogical purpose specific to the classroom.

According to the degree of difficulty and complexity, the task-based syllabus's activities and tasks are sequenced and organized.

The difficulty of a task depends on a range of factors including the learner's previous experience, the task's complexity, the required language to undertake the task, and the available degree of support. (Feez, 1998).

The core of language learning is mainly based on engaging learners in activities involving real communication. Moreover, activities enabling the learners to use the target language for conducting meaningful tasks imply learning and lead to meaningful communication (Mart, 2018b). Immersing learners in tasks provides them opportunities to negotiate meaning and communicate effectively, as being involved in a task work enables learners to pay more attention to comprehension, manipulation, and production. The interaction of learners in the target language propels their learning forward; it has been argued that task-based language teaching is student-centered as learners are active recipients of language knowledge taking a central role in their own learning (Yildiz, 2020).

Task-based language teaching approach's benefits in empowering language teaching and learning:

Advantages of task-based language teaching:

Concerning the merits, Ellis (2009) has mentioned many benefits of the task-based language teaching in foreign language learning. Ellis explained that task-based language teaching offers the chance for natural learning within the classroom context. Although it stresses meaning over form, it can also make the learning form more obviously defined, it enables the learners to have a fertile input of the target language. Besides, it is motivating, consistent with a learner-focused educational philosophy while permitting the instructor to guide the educational situation, contributes to the communicative fluency enhancement while not disregarding accuracy, and can be organized strategically together with a more traditional approach.

Task-based language teaching syllabus is a learner-centered one. Instead of relying on the passive transference of knowledge from the instructor to the student, learning occurs through active engagement and reflection termed "experiential learning". Language learners here learn how to process and transform information by themselves. Besides, tasks may also be tailored to learners' interests ensuring that the level of complexity remains appropriate to promote the communicative aspect of language (Nunan, 2004 cited in Houghton, 2018).

Willis et al. (2007) mentioned that the strength of task-based syllabi lies in that they offer chances for students to utilize their language at their stage of development, as most researches have indicated that language learning is internal and not external. Evidence proposes languages are learnt in developmental sequences, where one stage of

acquisition must be achieved before the next. However, the structure of these sequences remains obscure, and their existence does not mean classes should be based on mastery learning. As a result, task-based language learning has proved to enable the learners to use their language at their developmental stages.

Task-based syllabi also provide lesson templates to students who need to learn language efficiently but with enough variety of motivation and interest. According to Skehan (1996), tasks are realistic communicative motivators where students need to be acquainted with what to expect in their class to reduce anxiety, lessen load, and maintain interest. Furthermore, throughout the varied tasks, both of the grammatical and functional points reappear numerously, which in turn provide students with opportunities to restructure them in various contexts. This was termed naturalistic recycling by Long (2014).

Challenges of task-based language teaching:

Researchers were also concerned with the obstacles and challenges of task-based language teaching. For example, Hatip (2005) has listed some of those challenges as follows:

Task-based learning challenges lie mainly in the ways or methods of conducting the instruction. In other words, there are no problems concerning the potential powerfulness of this instructional content.

Task-based language learning involves a high level of creativity; consequently, the language instructor should be innovative and open-minded. If he/she is restricted to the traditional role or strategies or does not possess time and resources, this type of teaching may be impracticable. Instead, language instructors utilizing this approach should have the power to create, master the language communicative skills, manage the scheduled time, and organize the students' groups for implementing the tasks.

Task-based learning necessitates resources beyond the textbooks and related materials available in language classrooms.

Students, on the other hand, may face many obstacles using the task-based language teaching approach. They may refuse or object this type of learning, as they got accustomed to the traditional strategies where they were only receivers with no communication at all.

Some learners employ the mother tongue either when they face a difficulty in dealing with the foreign language or if the group is intolerant.

Other learners make an extensive effort to find the appropriate word and they get anxious about placing it in the discourse.

The serious hindrance or obstruction actually lies in learners' attaining fluency and accuracy of a foreign language while performing the tasks.

Complexity and sequencing of the pedagogic tasks:

Pedagogic tasks vary in level of complexity. A task may consist of just one or many activities; it may also involve some other tasks or sub-tasks as well. A simple task of only one activity is convenient for any syllabus or classroom, but a task with several activities involving other subtasks may be extremely demanding in terms of words and structures required for their implementation. It is obvious that language learners will find it easy when dealing with a simple communicative situation, as it is a task that requires only one activity. On the contrary, the requirements will overcome the language learners when being faced by a more complex chain of communicative sequences. Not only the language learners, but also the teachers will find similar difficulties in organizing and managing learning in such circumstances (Sanchez, 2004).

Ellis (2003) and Bygate (2008) have elucidated the pedagogic tasks; they have demonstrated the following specific characteristics:

A task is a work plan: A task as a work plan, or in other words, the task rubric as presented to the learner, has to include input and instructions as long as the task is in process. The focus here is on what the learner actually does in performing the task. There is also a complex interaction of the original task, learner work, and situation and learner perceptions.

A task involves a primary focus on meaning: Communication here is required to solve a problem or resolve some kind of gap. A focus on form is included in various ways; either through task design or implementation, comprising the provision of corrective feedback during task performance. It has been argued that the individual grammatical forms can play the role of content in language-focused tasks.

A task involves language use reflecting that used in the real world: In the case of English for specific purposes, needs analysis involving analysis of tasks performed in work places may determine real-world language use in pedagogic tasks (Long, 2015). Less authentic pedagogic tasks, information gap tasks commonly used in research and teaching,

may satisfy this criterion by encouraging communicative behavior types reflected in communication outside the classroom.

A task engages cognitive processes aiming at promoting language development: Robinson (2013) has mentioned that cognitive processes drawn on engaging with task-based interaction, such as selecting, reasoning, problem-solving, etc., can have implications for both the tasks' complexity and the language types applied in task-based interaction.

A task has a stated communicative outcome: The outcome can be distinguished from any underlying language development aims of a task, as the outcome of the task involves what the learner acquire when he/she accomplishes the task.

Language learning does not occur on a linear basis by adding simple elements to the more complex ones that are actually acquired. Tasks differ in their complexity and focus. Furthermore, Language tasks are not considered to be equal with other tasks that do not require the language use for their enhancement. For performing a particular task, specific language learners may have the required cognitive skills, but they may not have the linguistic skills to illustrate what they are doing in learning the foreign language. The most important and crucial point is that, the tasks based exclusively on linguistic skills may not be achievable or possible because, simply, learners lack precisely the language skills required, for example, they do not know the right words for the concepts they have in mind. Skehan (1996) has supported three types of tasks that should be introduced in a certain sequence: pre-task, during task, and post-task. According to his words, pre-task commences the sequencing by introducing the language needed for the task performance; this resembles the classical presentation stage where the activities included would be comprehension-type activities. Performance during the task happens when the task is picked and learners engage in fulfilling the task's goals. To attain that goal, manipulation of language is required and students must bear in mind several factors to proceed successfully; for example, cognitive complexity, degree of difficulty, and the correct management of the communicative pressure. Once the goal has been accomplished, post-task activities will refine what has been learnt.

As the implementation of tasks in real language learning classrooms admits variety, Willis (1996) has provided a more detailed description of

the task cycle in three phases that has always been regarded closer to real practice in the educational situations. The three phases are:

**Pre-task phase:** Willis suggested and illustrated various activities related to the presentation stage as most teachers do. This is the phase for strategic planning, acquiring or activating previously acquired knowledge. For example, this phase includes schema-building, schema-activation, and task modelling.

**The main task phase / Task cycle:** He mentioned here three stages: task, planning, and report. In all of those three stages, language learners are supposed to produce natural language, gain fluency and confidence in themselves. He also insisted in this phase on the need of the grammatical accuracy, as language learners pay more attention to the meaning and forget the grammatical correctness. In other words, the teacher in this phase monitors and identifies gaps in knowledge and language needs, while the students complete the task, plan how they will report the outcome, and report. Ellis (2014) has illustrated many categories of task, including input or output-based, focused or unfocused, one-way or two-way, open or closed, and convergent or divergent, allowing for fine control of details such as complexity and cognitive-loading.

**The post-task phase/ Language focus:** This phase emphasizes the specific language features as it can be regarded as a remedial final task, where language focus activities should have been the rule here in this phase. The language activities refer to semantics, lexis, morphology, syntax and phonology. Briefly, this is the language focus stage, where the learners analyze the outcomes of a task, evaluate it, and receive feedback.

#### **Pedagogical Implications:**

There are several proposals for task-based syllabi within a communicative paradigm, that either use tasks alone or task plus another unit of analysis. Concerning pedagogy, a unit of analysis is defined by Long and Crookes (1992) as a unit that organizes lessons and teaching materials. Taking English as an example, English course books prevalently utilize sentence-level grammar as their unit of analysis, with little connection to research findings into stages of acquisition or related cognitive processing.

**Approaches to task classification:** Tasks have been classified in various ways, according to: the types of task presented in course books (for example: listing, comparing, problem solving); genres; types of

cognitive processes required (information gap, opinion gap); and according to hypothesized potential for language learning (Ellis, 2003). Tasks which require various types of interaction or communication, and tasks that that can provide a range of opportunities for negotiation of meaning.

Aspects of task design: In accordance with the choices in the above task classification, the designer must account for the task input, implementation conditions, processes and outcomes to be afforded by a particular task. The input might be oral, written, or pictorial; implementation conditions are concerned with the types of interaction built into the task, as well as decisions related to task difficulty, such as the use of planning time or the level of the task's familiarity

Sequencing/ grading tasks: Familiarity with the task content, frequency of vocabulary, and how well-tuned this input is to the learners' level of proficiency are some aspects of task input which appear when grading tasks. Robinson (2013) has provided principles for sequencing tasks in terms of task complexity, based on performative demands; including planning time and prior knowledge, and conceptual demands; that starts with "here and now" tasks requiring no reasoning then moves to "there and then" tasks requiring casual reasoning.

Incorporating focus on form: Task-Based language teaching approach should be reactive and implicit via corrective feedback during task-based interaction.

Honeyfield (1993) cited in (Jack Richards, 2016) has offered the following considerations in designing the tasks: 1) Procedures, or what the learners have to do to derive output from input. 2) Input text. 3) Output required: a) Language items: vocabulary, structures, discourse structures, process ability, and so on. b) Skills, both macro-skills and subskills. c) Word knowledge or "topic content", and d) Text handling or conversation strategies. 4) Amount and type of help given. 5) Roles of teachers and learners. 6) Time allowed. 7) Motivation. 8) Confidence. 9) Learning styles.

In the literature to Task-Based Language Teaching, several attempts have been made to group tasks into categories, as a basis for task design and description. Willis (1996) has proposed the following six types:

Listing

Ordering and sorting

Comparing

Problem solving

Sharing personal experiences

Creative tasks

Pica, Kanagy, and Falodun (1993) have classified tasks according to the type of interaction that occurs in task accomplishment. They have introduced the following classification:

**Jigsaw tasks:** These involve learners combining different pieces of information to form a whole.

**Information-gap tasks:** One student or group of students has one set of information and another student or group has a complementary set of information where negotiation among the language learners must take place to complete an activity.

**Problem-solving tasks:** Students are given a problem and a set of information where they have to arrive to a solution for the problem.

**Decision-making tasks:** Students are given a problem for which there are a number of possible outcomes and they must choose one through negotiation and discussion.

**Opinion exchange tasks:** Learners engage in discussion and exchange of ideas.

**Learner roles:** There are a number of specific roles for language learners where some of them overlap with those general roles that are assumed for learners in Communicative Language Teaching, while the others are created by focus on task completion as a central learning activity.

Primary roles that are implied by task work are:

**Group participant:** Tasks will be done in pairs or small groups. This may require some adaptation for language learners who are more accustomed to whole class or individual work.

**Monitor:** Tasks are implemented as a means of facilitating learning; class activities are designed in a way to enable the students to notice how language is used in communication.

**Risk-Taker and innovator:** Many tasks will require language learners to create and interpret messages for which they lack full linguistic resources and prior experience. Students here will practice restating, paraphrasing, and using paralinguistic signals when appropriate. The skills of guessing from linguistic and contextual clues, asking for clarification, and consulting with other learners will also be developed. (Richards, 2016).

Teacher roles: There are also additional roles assumed for the instructors including:

Selector and sequencer of tasks: A central role of the teacher is in selecting, adapting, creating the tasks themselves, and then forming these into an instructional sequence in keeping with learner needs, interests, and language skill level.

Preparing learners for tasks: Instructors have to create activities including topic introduction, clarify task instructions, help students learn or recall useful words and phrases to facilitate task accomplishment, and provide partial demonstration of task procedures. Such cuing may be inductive and implicit or deductive and explicit.

Consciousness-raising: Learners have to acquire language through participating in tasks they need to attend or to notice critical features of the language they use and hear. (Ibid, 2016)

TOEFL Program History and TOEFL iBT Validity:

The TOEFL IBT test is the world's most widely respected English language assessment and used for admission purposes in more than 150 countries, including Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Since its initial launch in 1964, the TOEFL test has undergone several major revisions motivated by advances in theories of the language ability and changes in English teaching practices. The most recent revision, commenced in 2005, has contained a number of innovative design features, including integrated tasks that actually have engaged multiple skills to simulate language use in academic settings, and the test materials that reflect the reading, listening, speaking, and writing demands of the real- world academic environments (Norris, 2020).

**Taylor and Angelis (2008) have provided a detailed description of the evolution of the TOEFL test construct and content over three stages of development in the following table:**

<b>Stages</b>	<b>Construct</b>	<b>Content</b>
The First TOEFL Test (1964-1979)	Discrete components of language skills and knowledge	Multiple-choice items assessing vocabulary, reading comprehension, listening comprehension, knowledge of correct English structure and grammar.
A Suite of TOEFL Tests (1979 – 2005)	Original constructs (listening, reading, structure, and grammar) retained but two additional constructs added – writing and speaking ability.	In addition to multiple-choice items assessing the original constructs, separate constructed-response tests of writing and speaking were developed – TWE test and TSE test
The TOEFL IBT Test 2005 - present	Communicative competence – the ability to put language knowledge to use in relevant academic contexts.	Academic tasks were developed that require the integration of receptive and productive skills such as listening, reading, and writing or speaking, as well as multiple-choice items for listening and reading.

Table (1) TOEFL test’s stages of development

Beginning in 1996, teams of experts were charged with the responsibility of designing a new TOEFL test that was really examining the communicative language use in academic contexts. The test design process began with the development of a general framework founded on the notion that the new test would measure the examinees’ English language proficiency in situations and tasks reflecting the university life

( Jamieson, Jones, Kirsch, Mosenthal, and Taylor 2000). Working papers that extended this conceptual framework to the four language domains, reading, listening, speaking, and writing, were written. Each of these working papers defined processes for designing test items that would reflect academic tasks and assess the test takers' proficiency within the relevant language domain.

Validity research for the TOEFL iBT test has been guided by an argument-based approach (Kane, 2001) that helps to lay out the different assumptions or claims explaining how the test is supposed to work to provide meaningful information about a test taker's academic communicative competence in English. It also establishes the types of evidence needed to support these claims. Initial validity evidence for the TOEFL IBT test is compiled according to the argument-based approach in the book edited by Chapelle, Jamieson, and Enrught (2008).

TOEFL iBT speaking test:

The TOEFL iBT Speaking test measures test-takers' ability to speak in English effectively in educational environments, both in and outside the classroom. It includes four tasks: one independent task for expressing an opinion on topics familiar to test takers and other three integrated tasks for evaluating speaking based on what is read and listened (ETS, 2008). The TOEFL iBT Speaking test also has represented a significant development and innovation in assessing speaking ability in its use of integrated tasks (e.g., campus situation and academic course topics) to mirror target language use domains (Bachman and Palmer, 1996). The use of integrated tasks makes that speaking test different from other international English language tests , where these integrated speaking tasks require test takers to synthesize and summarize information presented in reading (Yu, 2008, 2009, 2013a, 2013b) and listening materials (Frost, Elder, and Wigglesworth, 2012).

TOEFL iBT speaking test is divided mainly into four sections. The first section is an independent speaking test where the examiner has to explain a choice. The examiner is asked to give his/her opinion about a familiar topic in just 45 seconds where he/she has to read the topic and prepare his/her answer in only 15 seconds. To respond to this question, examiners should state clearly their opinions while giving reasons or details for supporting them. Examinees are recommended to bear in mind that their responses should be intelligible, well developed, coherent, and demonstrate effective use of grammar and vocabulary.

They also have to consider that there is no correct answer to the question in the first section of the IBT speaking test; the only important task is to make sure of stating their opinions and developing their responses with good examples and relevant details.

The second section of the iBT speaking test is an integrated speaking practice of three parts passage, conversation, and question that is usually related to campus issues. The examinee is asked to read an article, usually a campus related announcement, for only 45 seconds. Then, a conversation between two speakers will be played discussing the article. A question then is posed asking the examinee to discuss the speaker's opinion about the campus related announcement. The examinee has to prepare his/her answer in only 30 seconds and will be permitted only 60 seconds for response. In his/her response, the examinee should convey the speaker's opinion about the announcement clearly illustrating the reasons of the speaker's approval or disapproval. With all these tasks, the response should be intelligible, demonstrate effective use of grammar and vocabulary, and be coherent and well developed.

The third section is also an integrated speaking practice related to academic issues. It is divided into three parts: passage, lecture, and question. First, the examinee is asked to read a passage about an academic topic in just 45 seconds. Then comes the listening part where the examiner hears a lecture given by a professor, and finally, there is a question asking the examinee to provide examples, explain or illustrate an academic concept or issue by preparing his answer in 30 seconds and allowed to respond in 60 seconds. Examinees here do not need to repeat all the details mentioned in the reading passage or the lecture, but instead integrate points from both to answer the question completely.

The fourth and the final section of the iBT speaking test is also an integrated speaking academic practice of only two parts: a lecture and question. The examinee hears an academic lecture that may be in various fields, business, methodology, biology, marketing, psychology, geology, or engineering, then he/she is asked to respond to the question. The time allowed for preparing the answer is only 20 seconds and the response should be in only 60 seconds. In his/her response, the examiner should illustrate the played lecture clearly clarifying the main points and giving the sufficient details.

As it is an internet based test, so there are no real examiners listening and assessing the examinees in face-to-face communication. During the

four sections of the iBT speaking test, the examinee has to record his answers within the 60 seconds, the limited and permitted time for response for each section. Within the four sections, the examinees should be aware of mastering the speaking skills required for the test that are fluency, pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, appropriateness, organization of ideas, coherence and cohesion. As for the second and third sections, the examinee has to master some of the reading skills, such as, skimming, scanning, listing details, synthesizing, summarizing, and comparison.

Integrated tasks present several challenges. Weir (1990) cited in Barkaoul et al. (2012) mentioned three main problems with reference to integrated language tasks. First, performance on integrated speaking tasks depends on the successful comprehension of prior reading and listening tasks. Second, integrated tasks are difficult to construct, take, mark, interpret, and report results on. Third, too little is known about the relative advantage of enhanced validity gained by using integrated tasks versus the potential loss in reliability. The following table shows the tasks and the language skills required in the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT.

Task type	Task	Language skills required	Topic	Preparation time (in seconds)	Response time (in seconds)
Independent	1	Speaking	Familiar topic	15	45
	2	Speaking	Familiar topic	15	45
Listening, Reading, Speaking (LRS)	3	Listening, reading, and speaking	Campus-life situations	30	60
	4	Listening, reading, and speaking	Academic course content	30	60
Listening and Speaking (LS)	5	Listening and speaking	Campus-life situations	20	60
	6	Listening and speaking	Academic course content	20	60

Table (2) Tasks and language skills required for Speaking TOEFL iBT test

Language skills required for the speaking TOEFL iBT test:

Listening skills:

There are different types of listening in real life including: listening to announcements or to the radio, participating in a face to face conversation, a meeting, seminar or discussion, taking part in a lesson, and participating in a telephone conversation. Harmer (2007) has mentioned two different kinds of listening: extensive and intensive listening. On one hand, extensive listening is the type that language learners do for pleasure or some other reason. The audio material should then include texts learners can enjoy as they can understand them without the interfering of either the instructor or course material to help them. This kind of listening is very important from the motivational point of view as it increases dramatically when the language learners make their own choices about what they are going to listen. On the other hand, intensive listening is the type that students listen specifically to study the way English is spoken. It usually takes place in classrooms or language laboratories, and typically occurs when instructors are present to guide the language learners through any listening difficulties, and point them to the area of interest.

Listening is the ability to identify and comprehend what the speaker is saying through understanding his accent, pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and grasping his meaning. A particular list of sub components of listening has been mentioned as follows: a) discriminating between sounds, b) recognizing words, c) identifying stressed words and grouping of words, d) identifying functions (as apologizing in conversations), e) connecting linguistic cues to paralinguistic cues and to non-linguistic cues to construct the meaning, f) using background knowledge and context to predict and then confirm meaning, g) recalling important words, topics, and ideas, h) giving appropriate feedback to the speaker, and i) reformulate what the speaker has said. ([http:// thesis.univ-biskra.dz](http://thesis.univ-biskra.dz))(Chapter II: The Listening Skill)

For developing listening skills, several kinds of activities and strategies were mentioned. Hadfield (2008) has stated that one of them is “listening with a purpose”, which in turn can help the learners to adapt the way they listen to their aims and focus more on the information required to be extracted from the listening text. Another one is “listening for gist” where the instructor asks the learners a question or give them a task before they listen, so they can predict the information they are listening

for. The third one mentioned is “ listening for specific details” that is to listen with a clear purpose in mind, so the learners develop the ability to filter out any undesirable piece of information.

According to Raphael (2015), the listening skills required for the speaking section of the Ibt TOEFL test are:

Predicting content using the background knowledge and confirming meaning.

Recalling important words, topics, and ideas.

Listening for details and inferring meaning.

Summing up and reformulating what the speaker has said.

Reading skills:

Reading is a self-discovery process where readers interact with written materials by investing both cognitive and metacognitive efforts to decompose new knowledge so as to make or infer meaning (Kalayci, 2012). According to Block (1992), Reading is such a hidden process that it is often unnoticed in the language classroom. Teachers always believe that reading classes should be teacher-centered. Bedir (1998) suggested that if teachers adopt rote learning, learners are usually expected to tackle comprehension difficulties by themselves. According to his words, understanding the words and grammar is not enough while reading as the learners need to make logical connections between the ideas and information in reading.

According to Hadfield (2008), reading in the own language is very different from reading in a foreign language, as the mother tongue has different ways of reading depending on what is being read and why. Harmer (2007) has mentioned that there are two types of reading: extensive and intensive. Extensive reading is the type being done for pleasure, while the intensive one is the detailed focused type complemented with study activities, such as uses of vocabulary and grammar. In extensive reading, teachers need to have a program including materials, guidance, tasks, and libraries. On the other hand, in the intensive reading, instructors have to motivate language learners to read intensely engaging them with topics and tasks

Harmer also has declared that for understanding the reading texts, language learners have to perform some activities or use some strategies. Language learners should be able to:

a) scan the text: reading quickly while looking for specific information,

b) skim: identifying the general idea of the text while focusing briefly on a few words per line, headings or the first and the last sentence of the paragraph,

c) activate background knowledge: understanding a topic before reading,

d) predict: making mini-predictions throughout the whole reading, and

e) use linkers: utilizing transitions to show the structure of the text indicating a new piece of information is coming.

Kaya (2015) has stated the reading skills are: 1) Recognizing headings and subheadings. 2) Recognizing signal words or picking key words. 3) Identifying main ideas in paragraphs and short selections. 4) Determining the contextual clues for vocabulary. 5) Recognizing the genre and organization of the text. 6) Identifying the aim of the author and recognizing the arguments. 7) Scanning to locate specifically required information. 8) Understanding information not explicitly stated. 9) Summarizing.

Reading skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL IBT test are:

Picking key words

Identifying main ideas in the reading passages and the announcements

Making connections and inferences

Summarizing and retelling (Raphael, 2015)

Speaking Skills:

Brown (1994) labels speaking as the most challenging skill for students because of the set of features that characterize oral discourse: a) contractions, vowel reductions and elision, b) the use of slang and idioms, c) stress, rhythm and intonation, and d) the need to interact with at least one other speaker. English speaking skills are defined by Scrivener (2005) as an international means of communication that are necessary for effective interactions amongst people across the world. The most demanding, complicated and multi-faced speaking skills are vocabulary, grammar, culture, genre, speech acts, register, discourse, and phonology. Kusnierek (2015) has illustrated that speaking is one of the most difficult skills the language learner can possess; this is because it demands an extreme practice and exposure to the target language. Speaking can also be perceived as a complicated process as fluency is a prerequisite to communicate smoothly with a native speaker in the target language. Not only do language learners need practicing, but also

understanding the linguistic elements required for verbal interaction and communication.

The main speaking skills are accuracy and fluency; they include other sub-skills. Accuracy comprises using correct pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary. Fluency involves: a) competence in language usage, b) listening, comprehending, responding, and communicating effectively, c) language production using markers in spoken discourse, d) introducing an idea, developing an idea, transition to another idea, concluding an idea, and emphasizing important information, e) asking for information and making suggestions, and f) making comparisons, planning and organizing information and reacting to others. (Al- Maghrebi, 2014)

In teaching speaking, the instructor has a different role that varies from only being a controller, guide and facilitator. Houhou (2013) has declared that the instructor can also be a controller, organizer, assessor, prompter, participant, resource, tutor, and observer or investigator. According to her words, the instructor can have several roles in teaching speaking for the language learners. For example, he/she can act as a controller in a few stages that are introducing new language/rules, restating directions/orders, explaining, giving feedback, or helping learners practice easily in communicative activities. Other role that can be performed and allocated in different stages by the instructor while teaching speaking to the language learners is the organizer. In the introductory stage, the instructor engages or familiarizes the learners with the new topic or activity by discussion or brainstorming. Then in the instruction stage, the organizer provides precise demonstration and checks the language learners' understanding. In the initiation stage, the organizer reminds the language learners with the instructions or the permitted time for performing the activity without intervening. In the feedback stage, the final comment and feedback on the oral activity are presented.

Speaking skills required for the speaking section in the Ibt TOEFL test:

Fluency

Usage of appropriate advanced vocabulary

Grammar and accuracy of sentence structure

Pronunciation

Making comparisons and organizing information. (Raphael,2015)

Research hypotheses:

Based on the survey of the fore mentioned literature the following research hypotheses could be formulated:

There would be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment and non-treatment groups of the language learners in the language skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT for the post speaking test sample in favor of the treatment group.

There would be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment and non-treatment groups of the language learners in the reading skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT favoring the treatment group.

There would be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment and non-treatment groups of the language learners concerning the listening skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT favoring the treatment group.

There would be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment and non-treatment groups of the language learners in the speaking skills favoring the treatment group.

There would be an effectiveness for the integrative tasks based strategy on developing the candidates' language skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT.

Methods:

Research Participants:

The research participants included thirty (30) language learners; only twenty of them were preparing themselves to be examined the TOEFL iBT exam, while the rest ten participants were challenging themselves to improve their speaking skills. Those thirty participants were divided into two groups; treatment and non-treatment ones. Each group involved fifteen (15) language learners who were approximately at the same age (from 18 to 23 years old); some of them were high school graduates who were rushing to pass the TOEFL iBT with a score of 85 out of 120 to be admitted in the American University in Egypt (AUC). Others were trying to pass the exam with the same score for academic purposes related to scholarships in different countries. While the rest managed to join the experiment to challenge themselves. All of the participants were of the same level in language; they all were in level (11) as upper intermediate level. Their levels were determined after a placement test conducted by

the instructor. The experiment was held in the American Center for Language and Technology (ACLIT) in a month.

Instructor:

The researcher conducted the experiment herself, as she has been teaching English conversational courses for adults for twenty years and instructing the International TOEFL, Academic/General IELTS, and Paper based test TOEFL since 2008. The research is a PhD holder in TEFL ,and has been working as a Lecturer in Modern Academy for Engineering and Technology since 2017.

Study Instruments:

Achievement reading test: A reading test designed by the researcher with reading passages adopted from real speaking TOEFL iBT tests. The questions of the achievement reading test were designed by the researcher to assess the reading skills required for the speaking section (see appendix (1)). To ensure the test's validity, TEFL experts judged the achievement reading test and some of the questions were modified. As for the reliability, the test retest method was used . The test was administered and after two weeks it was readministered to the same group. The correlation between the results of the two administrations was 0.85, which is considered a high level of reliability.

Cronbach's Alpha	Number of items
0.852	19

Achievement listening test: A listening test was designed by the researcher to assess the required skills for the speaking section of the TOEFL ibt test. Only the listening recordings were adopted from the real TOEFL iBt tests, but the questions were designed by the researcher (see appendix (2)). TEFL experts judged the questions for the validity of the test. The test retest method was applied for measuring the reliability. The test was administered and readministered after two weeks for the same group. The correlation between the results of the two administrations was 0.805, which is a high level of reliability.

Cronbach's Alpha	Number of items
0.805	14

Achievement speaking test: Questions for the achievement speaking test were designed by the researcher to assess the speaking skills required for the speaking section of the TOEF iBt test. The test was assessed

according to the TOEFL iBT speaking rubric (see appendix (3)). To ensure validity, TEFL experts judged the questions. Reliability was measured using the test-retest method, the test was administered and readministered for the same group in two weeks with a correlation of 0.749 between the results of the two administrations.

Cronbach's Alpha	Number of items
0.749	5

TOEFL iBT speaking test sample assessed according to the TOEFL iBT independent and integrated speaking rubrics. (See appendix (4))

TOEFL iBT integrated and independent speaking rubrics adopted from Educational Testing Services (ETS) (2019) to assess the language skills required for the speaking section. (See Appendices (5 and 6)).

The iBT (International TOEFL) speaking course:

The whole preparation course for the International TOEFL test is taught in sixty three hours that lasts for seven weeks, three sessions every week, each of three hours. Thirty six hours are assigned for the reading , writing and listening skills. Twenty seven hours are specified for practicing only the speaking skills with its integrated tasks. By the end of these twenty seven identified hours, the language learners should respond fluently expressing their own opinions and the speakers' ones freely in both the familiar topics and campus announcements in section two successively. Language learners should also determine the points of comparison and discussing them in section three, and clarify or illustrate the main points in the academic lectures in section four.

The actual conduction of the speaking sessions went through these procedures:

Section One:

Objective/ Output required: Language learners have to respond to a familiar topic covering all the aspects required in just 45 seconds. Students should be able to use appropriate vocabulary and sentence structures. They also are required to organize their ideas logically while speaking to respond smoothly with no sudden jumps and to give a coherent speech as well.

Time allowed : Preparing the answers in 15 seconds and responding in only 45 seconds.

Instructor's role: Selector and sequencer of the task, preparing the learners for it, and motivator.

Learners' role: Brainstorming and eliciting ideas related to the mentioned topic, hearing a recording of a parallel task being done before, organizing their ideas logically while answering, and responding using appropriate advanced vocabulary.

Procedures :

Pre-task: Introduction to the topic and task:

The instructor divides the language learners into three groups each of five students.

The instructor writes a familiar topic on the board asking all the students in the three groups to think of ideas related to the topic. Every group is going to write these ideas in a piece of paper and hand it in to the instructor.

The instructor will highlight useful words and phrases and provide more ideas for the students without teaching new structures.

The language learners will hear a recording of a similar task and be given a preparation time to think how to perform the task.

On Task: The Task Cycle:

The language learners in each group get started to perform the task.

All the students in each group have to try all these five missions: generating ideas, organizing and connecting them in a coherent manner, choosing appropriate vocabulary to illustrate the topic, speaking and presenting the response, and commenting on the speech given. This can be done by switching roles each session while practicing.

The instructor walks round and monitors the groups encouraging them in a supportive way.

The instructor helps the language learners formulate their responses without intervening to correct the errors of form.

From each group, only one student will start speaking. This student is chosen according to his/her turn in the group to perform the speaking task. Other students are listening carefully and writing down their comments.

Post-task:

The instructor illustrates the points of weaknesses revealed during speaking; including correcting the mispronunciation as well as the grammatical mistakes of the sentence structures, misuse of the repetitive words, weakness of too many pauses, and the natural fillers.

The instructor plays a recording of a response to the same topic performed by a native speaker asking the language learners to compare the difference in ways of doing the task.

The instructor emphasizes clarity, organization, accuracy, and time management as essential elements for the presentation.

Section Two:

Objective/ output required: The language learners are required to respond to an integrated speaking practice of three parts: reading a passage, listening to a conversation between two speakers discussing the passage, and answering the question related to both the passage and the listening. Students should understand and convey the speaker's opinion about the passage in a comprehensive logical speech. Students should be able to read the passage, identify main points, listen to the speakers in the listening part, and clarify their opinions by supporting their answers with details.

Time allowed: Reading the passage in only 45 seconds, listening, then preparing the answer in 30 seconds, and responding in only 60 seconds.

Instructor's role: Selector and sequencer of the task, preparing the learners for it, and motivator.

Learners' role: Students are proposed to list, order and sort, summarize, clarify, and restate the information mentioned in both the reading passage and the listening part; responding with appropriate advanced vocabulary and supporting their answers with details or reasons.

### **Procedures:**

#### **Pre-task:**

The instructor asks the language learners in the three groups to read the passage, mostly an announcement related to campus issues, in 45 seconds.

The language learners are supposed to list, classify, and identify the main points mentioned in the passage, and write them in papers handing them in to the instructor.

The instructor will discuss these determined main points with the three groups clarifying the most important points.

The instructor will ask the each group to provide synonyms for some words in the announcement and to summarize the passage or the announcement in their own ways.

On Task: The Task Cycle:

The instructor plays the listening part asking every student in the three groups to take notes.

Students in each group commence preparing their answers. Each group exchange opinions and ideas to clarify and support their answer.

The instructor walks round and monitors the groups encouraging them in a supportive way.

The instructor helps the language learners formulate their responses without intervening to correct the errors of form or misunderstanding of the speaker's opinion in the listening part.

From each group, only one student will start speaking. This student is chosen according to his/her turn in the group to perform the speaking task. Other students are listening carefully and writing down their comments.

Post-task:

The instructor illustrates the points of weaknesses revealed during the language learners' responses including: mispronunciation, misinterpretation of the speaker's opinion, and the inability to bond between the information mentioned in the reading passage and the speaker's opinion related to it.

The instructors gives the groups the audio script of the listening part to the students determining the most important transitional words that can help in interpreting the text or rephrasing and identifying the speaker's opinion.

Two students from each group are supposed to role play and act as if they are the two speakers in the listening part.

The instructor replays the listening part again to help the students get the whole idea.

The instructor then asks other students from each group to perform the speaking task just for getting sure that the students got the idea.

Section three :

Objective/ Output required: The language learners have to respond to an integrated speaking test of three parts: passage, lecture, and question; both of the passage and the lecture are related to academic issues. Language learners should understand the reading passage, then get the points of differences or similarities between the reading passage and the academic lecture; illustrating and clarifying that in their speaking task with giving examples and details.

Time allowed: Only 45 seconds are allowed for reading the passage, and after listening the lecture, students are permitted to prepare their answers in only 30 seconds and respond in 60 seconds.

Instructor's role: Selector and sequencer of the task, preparing the learners for it, and motivator.

Learners' role: Students have to list, order, and sort the pieces of information mentioned in both the reading passage and the academic lecture. They also have to compare between the similarities and differences in the pieces of information mentioned, restating them in their own words and supporting their answers with examples and details in appropriate advanced vocabulary.

Procedures:

Pre-Task:

The instructor asks the language learners in the three groups to read the passage of the academic lecture in just 45 seconds asking them to identify and classify the main points in the passage. The academic lecture is mainly in biology, geology, psychology, marketing, methodology, or engineering fields.

The instructor asks the language learners to guess the meanings of the new vocabulary and to think of synonyms for these words.

Students in the three groups have to write the main classified points in a table of two columns, one for pieces of information mentioned in the reading passage and the other for those that will be stated in the listening section. Each group will hand in these tables to the instructor.

The instructor discusses these identified points for preparing the students to the listening section creating a table on the board determining the most appropriate main points in the reading passage.

The instructor reminds the language learners with some transitional words could be used in making comparisons.

On Task: The Task Cycle:

The instructor plays the listening part, an academic lecture, asking every student in the three groups to take notes.

Students in each group commence preparing their answers. Each group exchange opinions and ideas to clarify and support their answer.

The instructor walks round and monitors the groups encouraging them in a supportive way.

The instructor helps the language learners formulate their responses without interfering to correct the errors resulting from their misunderstanding of the professor's words in the academic lecture or even in the discomposing in making comparisons.

Following the turn, only one student in each group will start performing the speaking task clarifying the points of similarities or differences in the pieces of information mentioned in both resources, while the others will write down their comments.

Post-Task:

The instructor asks the language learners who were writing their comments to start speaking revealing their opinions.

The instructor then highlights the points of weakness and strengths in the language learners' responses concerning the mispronunciation, appropriate vocabulary usage, connecting and bonding of ideas, coherence, logical order in organizing and comparing the pieces of information mentioned in both the passage and the listened lecture, and the convenient usage of linking transitions.

The instructor replays the listening part again confirming the points of differences and similarities illustrating how rephrase them in the speaking task.

The instructor then enables the language learners to read the audio script of the professor's talk in the academic lecture asking them to spotlight the main points of comparison.

One of the language learners in each group will be chosen randomly to perform the speaking task correctly.

Section Four:

Objective/ Output required: The language learners have to respond to an integrated speaking test of only two parts: an academic lecture and a question. Language learners should identify and summarize the main points of the lecture while listening to it then explaining the lecture as a whole or clarifying certain points in it in their own words when responding to the question.

Time allowed: Only 20 seconds are permitted for preparing the answer and students should respond in 60 seconds.

Instructor's role: Selector and sequencer of the task, preparing the learners for it, and motivator.

Learner's role: Students have to identify, list, order, sort, and summarize the pieces of information stated in the lecture. They have to explain, and

rephrase them in appropriate advanced vocabulary supporting their answers with examples or details from the listened lecture.

Procedures:

Pre-Task:

The instructor prepares the language learners to determine and summarize the main points in a listened academic lecture with no reading passage in advance.

The instructor slowly reads an academic lecture, a rehearsal, which is not the one they are going to listen to in the real task.

Language learners are asked to determine what field the lecture is related to, and identify the main points in it.

These main points are discussed clarifying the most and the least important pieces of information stated in that rehearsal task.

The instructor then asks the three groups to listen carefully to the academic lecture identifying the main points in it.

On Task: The Task Cycle:

The instructor plays the listening academic lecture asking all the language learners in the three groups identifying the main points.

Students in each group commence preparing their answers. Each group exchange opinions and ideas to clarify and support their answer.

The instructor walks round and monitors the groups encouraging them in a supportive way.

The instructor helps the language learners formulate their responses without interfering to correct the errors resulting from their misunderstanding of the professor's words in the academic lecture or even in determining and summarizing the required pieces of information.

Respecting the turn, only one student in each group commences performing the speaking task identifying and summarizing the required information, while the others are taking notes for discussing their comments.

Post- Task:

The instructor asks the language learners who were writing their comments to start speaking revealing their opinions.

The instructor then highlights the points of weakness and strengths in the language learners' responses concerning the mispronunciation, appropriate vocabulary usage, connecting and bonding of ideas, coherence, logical order in identifying, organizing, and summarizing the pieces of information mentioned in the listened lecture.

The instructor replays the listening part again confirming the main required points to be summarized illustrating how rephrase them in the speaking task.

The instructor then enables the language learners to read the audio script of the professor's talk in the academic lecture asking them to spotlight the required points.

One of the language learners in each group will be chosen randomly to perform the speaking task correctly.

Results of the research, discussion and interpretation:

This part includes the results of the research and the discussion in the light of the research problem and hypotheses. The results were obtained through administering the achievement reading, listening ,and speaking tests, as well as the TOEFL Ibt speaking test sample. All of these tests are administered for both the treatment and non-treatment groups.

Pre-test results:

Comparison between the mean scores of the language skills required for the TOEFL iBT speaking test sample for both the treatment and non-treatment groups in the pre test:

Table (3): Comparing the mean scores of the language skills required for the speaking test of the TOEFL IBT test sample for both the treatment and non-treatment groups:

Group	N	Mean	SD	T-value	Significance level	df	Significance
Treatment	15	12.733	3.136	0.368	0.01	28	Non-significant
Non-treatment	15	12.533	3.159	0.368	0.01	28	Non-significant

The previous tables showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment and non-treatment groups in the pre/ TOEFL iBT speaking test sample; as their means were (12.733) and (12.533), which meant that they were at the same level before conducting the experiment. Also it was noticeable that (T-value) was not significant, as it was (0.368).

Comparison between the mean scores of the reading skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT speaking test for both the treatment and non-treatment groups in the pre test:

Table (4): Comparing the results of the reading skills required for the speaking section of TOEFL iBT test for both the treatment and non-treatment groups:

Group	N	Mean	SD	T-value	Significance level	df	Significance
Treatment	15	11.054	3.478	0.474	0.01	28	Non-significant
Non-treatment	15	11.261	3.316	0.474	0.01	28	Non-significant

The above table revealed that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment and non-treatment groups in the achievement test of the reading skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT. This means that the two groups were at the same level at the beginning of the experiment as the language learners' scores ranged from (11.04) to (11.261) and it can be noticed that the scores were low as well as t—value which was 0.474.

Comparison between the mean scores of the listening skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT speaking test for both the treatment and non-treatment groups in the pre test:

Table (5): Comparing the results of the listening skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT test for both the treatment and non-treatment groups:

Group	N	Mean	SD	T-value	Significance level	df	Significance
Treatment	15	12.416	4.083	0.366	0.01	28	Non-significant
Non-treatment	15	12.800	4.091	0.366	0.01	28	Non-significant

The previous table demonstrated that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of both the treatment and non-treatment groups concerning the achievement listening test for the listening skills required in the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT speaking test. T-value was not significant as it was (0.366), the scores of the two groups ranged from (12.416) and (12.800) that means that the two groups were at the same level before conducting the experiment.

Comparison between the mean scores of the speaking skills required for the speaking TOEFL iBT test for both the treatment and non-treatment groups in the pre test:

Table (6): Comparing the results of the speaking skills required for the TOEFL iBT speaking test for both the treatment and non-treatment groups:

Group	N	Mean	SD	T-value	Significance level	df	Significance
Treatment	15	12.933	3.582	0.154	0.01	28	Non-significant
Non-treatment	15	13.100	3.426	0.154	0.01	28	Non-significant

The previous table showed that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment and non –treatment groups in the achievement speaking test of the speaking skills required for the TOEFL iBT test before conducting the experiment as their scores were (12.933) and (13.100), which illustrates that they were at the same level. Also T-value was not significant as it was (0.154).

Post-test results:

Comparison between the results of the post TOEFL iBT speaking test sample for both the treatment and non-treatment groups:

Paired sample t-test was used to compare the performance of the treatment and non-treatment groups of the post TOEFL iBT speaking sample test. The purpose of this sample test was to identify whether the participants’ language skills required for the speaking section of the test have been improved after conducting the integrative strategy based on tasks. This was performed by testing the first hypothesis of the research which stated that:

“There would be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment and non-treatment groups of the language learners in the language skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT for the post speaking test sample in favor of the treatment group.”

Table (7): Comparing the results of the post TOEFL iBT speaking test sample for both the treatment and non-treatment groups:

Group	N	Mean	SD	T-value	Significance level	df	Significance
Treatment	15	28.798	4.87	5.864	0.01	28	Significant
Non-treatment	15	15.001	6.65	5.864	0.01	28	Significant

The previous table showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups favoring the treatment group. It is clear from the revealed results that the mean score of the treatment group is higher than that of the non-treatment group, as it was (28.798) for the treatment and (15.001) for the non-treatment. T-value indicated that the language learners in the treatment group achieved progress and improvement, as it was (5.864) at significance level (0.01). Therefore, it can be concluded that the first hypothesis was accepted.

Comparison between the results of the post achievement-reading test for both the treatment and non-treatment groups:

To test the second hypothesis of the research, an achievement-reading test was administered to compare between the performance of the treatment and non-treatment groups before and after employing the integrative strategy based on tasks. The second hypothesis states that:

“There would be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment and non-treatment groups of the language learners in the reading skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT favoring the treatment group.”

Before conducting the experiment, the participants were all at the same level concerning the reading skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT test. On the contrary, the post-test results of the treatment group showed that the language learners’ required reading skills have been highly improved.

Table (8) Comparing the mean scores and results of both the treatment and non-treatment groups in the post achievement-reading test:

Skill	Group	N	Mean	SD	T-Value	Significance level	df	Significance
1)Picking key words	Treatment	15	8.600	1.069	4.368	0.01	28	Significant
	Non-treatment	15	3.266	1.284			28	
2)Identifying main ideas in the reading passag	Treatment	15	5.033	0.614	4.524	0.01	28	Significant
	Non-treatment	15	2.133	0.899			28	

Skill	Group	N	Mean	SD	T-Value	Significance level	df	Significance
es and announcements								
3) Making connections and inferences	Treatment	15	8.300	0.876	5.658	0.01	28	Significant
	Non-treatment	15	3.833	1.116			28	
4) Summarizing and retelling	Treatment	15	8.400	0.813	5.061	0.01	28	significant
	Non-treatment	15	4.933	1.362			28	
Total	Treatment	15	30.333	2.683	6.97	0.01	28	Significant
	Non-treatment	15	14.156	3.058			28	

The previous table has shown that there were statistically significant differences in the post achievement-reading test favoring the treatment group. The total mean scores of the treatment group is (30.333) while that of the non-treatment one is (14.156) with a high t-value of (6.97). The mean scores of the treatment group for each skill in the reading test was higher than that of the non-treatment group. The mean scores of the treatment group were (8.600), (5.033), (8.300), and (8.400) respectively for the four reading skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL IBT speaking test. While those of the non-treatment group were (3.266), (2.133), (3.833), and (4.933) respectively. Also, T-value indicated that the language learners in the treatment group improved the required reading skills as T-value was high for the four skills regarding the treatment group. T-value was (4.368) for the first skill, (4.524) for the second, (5.658) for the third, and (5.061) for the fourth. The difference between the mean scores in the first two skills was not that high as all the language learners in both groups were at the same level in practicing the language, all of them got used to pick the key words and identify the main ideas in the passages. On the other hand, the differences between the mean scores of both groups for the third and

fourth skill were high, which revealed that the integrative strategy has helped the language learners to improve the skills of making connections and inferences as well as summarizing and retelling.

Comparison between the results of the post achievement-listening test for both the treatment and non-treatment groups:

To test the third hypothesis of the research that stated: “There would be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment and non-treatment groups of the language learners concerning the listening skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT favoring the treatment group”, an achievement listening test was administered. The test was employed for both the treatment and non-treatment groups both before and after conducting the experiment.

Table (9) Comparing the mean scores and results of both the treatment and non-treatment groups in the post achievement-listening test:

Skill	Group	N	Mean	SD	T-Value	Significance level	df	Significance
1)Predicting content using background knowledge and confirming meaning	Treatment	15	6.133	1.53	5.505	0.01	28	Significant
	Non-treatment	15	2.733	1.84			28	
2)Recalling important words, topics ,and ideas	Treatment	15	6.633	0.85	5.602	0.01	28	Significant
	Non-treatment	15	3.400	0.86			28	
3)Listening for details and inferring meanings	Treatment	15	7.333	0.80	5.220	0.01	28	Significant
	Non-treatment	15	3.966	1.19			28	
4)Summing up and formulating what the speaker has said	Treatment	15	7.600	1.35	6.932	0.01	28	Significant
	Non-treatment	15	3.566	1.98			28	
Total	Treatment	15	27.699	2.98	6.585	0.01	28	Significant
	Non-treatment	15	13.665	3.87			28	

The results in the previous table revealed that there were statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the treatment and

non-treatment groups in the post achievement-listening test favoring the treatment group with a toatal mean of (27.699) and a high t-value (6.585). The mean scores of the treatment group for each skill was higher than that of the non-treatment group, as they were (6.133), (6.633), (7.333), and (7.600) respectively for the treatment group. While for the non-treatment group, they were (2.733), (3.400), (3.966), and (3.566) respectively. The results indicated that the language learners in the treatment group have improved the listening skills required for the TOEFL iBT speaking test. Language learners in the treatment group scored higher values in the first, third, and fourth skills. After employing the integrative strategy with its tasks, they were more able to predict the content using background knowledge, listen for details and infer meanings, and sum up and formulate the speaker’s words. T-value was also high, as it was (5.505), (5.602), (5.220), and (6.932) at significance level (0.01).

Comparison between the results of the post achievement-speaking test for both the treatment and non-treatment groups:

Concerning the fourth hypothesis of the study: “There would be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment and non-treatment groups of the language learners in the speaking skills favoring the treatment group”, T-test was administered for the treatment and non-treatment groups for checking the development of the required speaking skills for the TOEFL iBT test.

Table (10) Comparing the mean scores and results of both the treatment and non-treatment groups in the post achievement-speaking test:

Skill	Group	N	Mean	SD	T-Value	Significance level	df	Significance
1)fluency	Treatment	15	4.700	0.92	5.450	0.01	28	Significant
	Non-treatment	15	2.400	0.93			28	
2)Usage of appropriate advanced vocabulary	Treatment	15	5.166	0.70	4.892	0.01	28	Significant
	Non-treatment	15	2.400	0.50			28	
3)Grammar and accuracy of sentence structure	Treatment	15	6.933	1.31	5.63	0.01	28	Significant
	Non-treatment	15	3.933	1.72			28	

Skill	Group	N	Mean	SD	T-Value	Significance level	df	Significance
4)pronunciation	Treatment	15	6.233	0.89	3.863	0.01	28	Significant
	Non-treatment	15	4.600	0.81				
5)Making comparisons and organizing information	Treatment	15	5.133	1.52	5.505	0.01	28	Significant
	Non-treatment	15	2.733	1.84				
Total	Treatment	15	28.165	1.97	5.854	0.01	28	Significant
	Non-treatment	15	16.066	2.86				

The results of the previous table revealed that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment and non-treatment groups in the post achievement-speaking test favoring the treatment group. The total mean score of the treatment group was (28.156) while that of the non-treatment was (16.006). T-value was high with a value of (5.854). The mean scores of the treatment group in each skill was higher than that of the non-treatment group. The mean scores of the treatment group were (4.700) for fluency, (5.166) for usage of appropriate advanced vocabulary, (6.933) for grammar and accuracy of sentence structure, (6.233) for pronunciation, and (5.133) for making comparisons and organizing information, while those of the non-treatment group were (2.400), (2.400), (3.933), (4.600), and (2.733) respectively. For each skill, T-value was also higher favoring the treatment group. It is noticeable that T-value of the pronunciation skill scored the least among the other skills; this is because all the language learners in both groups were of the same level of English proficiency according to the placement test performed by the researcher before joining the two groups. On the contrary, T-value of the other skills were higher as the language learners' speaking performance of the treatment group has been developed after applying the integrative tasks based strategy.

Testing the effectiveness of the integrative tasks based strategy on developing the candidates' language skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT :

To test the fifth hypothesis of the research which stated: "There would be an effectiveness for the integrative tasks based strategy on developing

the candidates' language skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT", the mean scores of the treatment group results were compared before and after conducting the experiment. Results of the pre and post TOEFL iBT speaking test sample were calculate. Also  $\eta^2$  and Es were calculated to examine how the integrative task based strategy affected the performance of the treatment group.

Table (11): Testing the effectiveness of the integrative tasks based strategy on developing the candidates' language skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT :

Group	Measurement	N	Mean	SD	T-value	df	Significance	$\eta^2$	Es
Treatment	Pre-test	15	30.933	7.803	12.114	28	0.01	0.879	6.390
Treatment	Post-test	15	44.798	3.925		28			

The previous table showed that the integrative task based strategy proved to have an effect on improving the language skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT test. There was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the treatment group in the pre post TOEFL iBT speaking sample test favoring the posttest. The above table revealed that the mean of the post test was (44.798) which was higher than that of the pretest as it was (30.933). Also, T-value was highly significant, as it was (12.411).  $\eta^2$  and Es were also calculated and they were high enough to prove remarkable effectiveness of the integrative strategy based on tasks as  $\eta^2$  was (0.879) and Es was (6.390), and as a result the fifth hypothesis was accepted.

Interpretation of the results:

The previous tables and results have revealed that the integrative tasks based strategy has an effectiveness on developing the language skills required for the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT test. The total scores of the treatment group in whole tests were higher than those of the non treatment group. Consequently, the treatment group mean scores for each skill in the three tests were noticeably higher than those of the non treatment group.

The idea of switching roles and trying in turn the five missions of generating the ideas, organizing and connecting them in a coherent matter, choosing appropriate vocabulary, speaking and presenting the topic, and finally commenting on the speech has helped the language learners a lot to be more interactive. This is because every participant has

to perform all the tasks and not only specified for one mission, which in turn has enabled them to compete and learn from each other.

What also influences the language learners' scores is providing the treatment group with the audio scripts of the listening recordings and replaying the listening parts for more than one time. This has helped the participants to listen to all the stressed and reduced words in the conversations or the lectures, which in turn could improve their listening skills and enable them to be more relaxed and confident while listening. Time management has also played an important role; the language learners got practiced to pick the key words, organize the mentioned information, and recall, summarize, and retell the listened one fluently.

**Conclusions, Recommendations and Suggestions:**

The present part provides conclusions based on the study findings drawn from the results and the statistical data analysis. It also presents some recommendations and finally suggests some areas of further research.

From the results, it could be concluded that:

The integrative task based strategy is highly effective on developing the language skills required for the TOEFL IBT speaking test. These language skills are reading, listening, and speaking ones.

Dividing the students into groups has helped the students to share their experiences and elicit new ideas confidently as they were working with their peers.

Enabling the language learners to listen to a recording of a similar task as a kind of preparation was helpful in providing the participants with ideas to organize their responses and to learn the correct pronunciation of words.

Illustrating the points of weakness and strengths in the language learners' responses helped them realize their mistakes.

Asking the language learners to classify, list, identify, and discuss the main points in the announcements of the reading part helped them in predicting the listening section and in organizing their ideas and responses.

Providing the language learners with the audio script after the listening tasks to determine the most important transition words helped them in connecting their speaking and creating a coherent speech.

Identifying the time of response for the language learners and teaching them how to manage it helped them to list and order the most important main points in the academic lecture.

Making tables and sorting out the most important pieces of information mentioned in both the reading academic lecture and the listening one enabled the learners to make inferences correctly and deliver their answers in a correct manner.

Reading an academic lecture to the language learners as a rehearsal helped the participants to identify the academic topic of the lecture, which in turn enabled them to determine the required details in the listened academic lecture.

Summarizing helped the language learners to develop the topic logically.  
Recommendations:

The following recommendations can be proposed:

It is advisable to divide the language learners in groups and work in teams; as this has helped in improving the three language skills. Language learners were encouraged to elicit more ideas, identify the main points in the reading passages and the listening recordings, and develop the topics while speaking.

EFL instructors are recommended to apply the three phases while conducting the strategy and teaching to the language learners, (pre, on, and post tasks), as this enabled the participants to be more organized, focus more to the instructions, manage their time, and get a feedback that helped them to learn from their mistakes.

EFL instructors are advised to persist in asking the language learners to comment on each other's performance, which has kept all the participants alert and engaged in the integrative speaking task.

It is recommended to ask the language learners to search for synonyms to the words in the announcements or reading passages as well as providing them some that in turn can help in enriching the language learners' vocabulary and empowering their practice in language.

Language learners in groups are recommended to write down their ideas of a familiar topic, which could help them to share ideas and elicit more ideas. Also, writing these ideas on the board and discussing them while providing more could help to broaden the language learners' horizons.

Suggestions for further research:

It is suggested to conduct a study to investigate the effect of the integrative task based strategy on teaching the writing skills for the

TOEFL iBT writing exam; as the examinee has to master the listening, reading and writing skills in an integrative manner to pass the writing test.

The integrative task based strategy could be applied for teaching speaking for high school students in English Language schools; as being involved in tasks like acting will help the students to practice their English in a beneficial and an enjoyable manner.

The integrative task based strategy based on tasks can help in interpreting literary texts taught at schools, as the students can read the chapters of the literary work, watch the filmed scenes without subtitles and then work in groups while being involved in tasks to interpret the implied meanings.

The integrative task based strategy could be effective in teaching different kinds of writing; such as persuasive, argumentative, folktale, and autobiographical sketch. The language learners can prepare the topics and listen to different recording. Being gathered in groups and involved in tasks will help them discuss the topics and elicit more and more ideas that can help in creating different essays.

***References:***

- Al Maghrebi, F. (2014). Integrating Authentic Assessment into EFL Classroom to Enhance Oral Communication and Reduce Anxiety. Egyptian Association for Reading and Literacy, 2(153), pp.1-45 Al-Ahram Magazine press.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Barkaoul, K. , Brooks, L., Swain, M., and Lapkin, S. (2012). Test-Takers' Strategic Behaviors in Independent and Integrated Speaking Tasks. Applied Linguistics. Oxford University Press Pp. 304-324.
- Bastias, M. , Elena, E., Sepulveda, R., Munoz. S. , and Lorena, M. (2011). Integration of the Four Language Skills of the English Language and its Influence on the Performance of Second Grade High School Students. Universidad Del Bio-BIO.
- Baturay, M. H., & Akar, N. (2007). A new perspective for the integration of skills to reading. Dil Dergisi, 136, 16-27.
- Breen, M. (1989). The Evaluation Cycle for Language Learning Tasks. In Johnson, R.K. (Ed.). The second language curriculum. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, H.D. (1994). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). Teaching by principles. An interactive approach to language pedagogy (2nd Edition). New York: Pearson Education.
- Bueno, A, D. Madrid and N. McLaren, (eds). (2006). TEFL in Secondary Education. Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada
- Bygate, M., & Samuda, V. (2008). Tasks in second language learning. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Candlin, C.N. (2001). Afterword: Taking the Curriculum to Task. In Bygate, M., Skehan, P., & Swain, M. (Eds.) (2001). Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing. Longman: Harlow.
- Carol, R. (1990). At the Chalkface: Practical Techniques in Language Teaching. ELT Methodology. Longman.
- Dickinson, P. (2010). Implementing TBLT in a Japanese EFL Context: An Investigation into Language Methodology (Unpublished

- Master Thesis). University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom.
- Ellis, R. (2000). Task-Based Research and Language Pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 193-220.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford, U.K: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 221-246.
- Ellis, R. (2009b). Task-Based Language Teaching: Sorting Out the Misunderstanding. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 221-246.
- Ellis, R. (2014). Taking the Critics to Task: The Case for Task-Based Teaching. *Proceedings of the Sixth CLS International Conference Classic 2014*, Singapore, 103-117.
- Feez, S. (1998). *Text-based Syllabus Design*. Sydney: National Centre for English Teaching and Research.
- Freeman, (2000). cited in Hismanoglu, S. and Himanoglu, M. (2011). Task-Based Language Teaching: What Every EFL Teacher Should Do. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 15 (2011) 46-52.
- Frost, K., Elder, C., & Wigglesworth, G. (2012). Investigating the Validity of an Integrated Listening-Speaking Task: A Discourse-Based Analysis of Test Takers' Oral Performances. *Language Testing*, 29(3), 345–369. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532211424479>
- Hadfield, Jill & Charles. (2008). *Introduction to teaching English*. Oxford University Press. Eigel S. A. Portugal.
- Hatip, F. (2005). Task-based language learning. Available online at: <http://www.yde.yildiz.edu.tr/uddo/belgeler/inca-FundaHatip-TBL.htm>, accessed May 25, 2010.
- Harmer, Jeremy. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Pearson Education Limited. Essex, England.
- Honeyfield, J. (1993). Responding to task difficulty. In M. Tickoo (ed.), *Simplification: Theory and Practice*. Singapore: Regional Language Center. 127–138.
- Hornby, A. (2007). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Houghton, L. (2018). *The Strengths and Weaknesses the Task-Based Syllabus*. University of Birmingham.
- Houhou, I. (2013). *Enhancing EFL Learners' Speaking Skill through Effective Teaching Methods and Strategies, Case Study: Second Year LMD Students of EFL*. published M.A. Thesis, in *Language Sciences*. Mohamed Kheider University of Biskra.
- Hungyo, Josephine and Kijai, Jimmy. (2009). *The Effect of Integrated and Segregated Skills Approach on English Language Acquisition among Freshmen Nursing and Business Students in Mission College Thailand*. The Scriptor, *Journal of Arts and Humanities Department*. Thailand.
- Jamieson, J., Jones, S., Kirsch, I., Mosenthal, P., & Taylor, C. (2000). *TOEFL 2000 framework: A working paper (TOEFL Monograph No. 16)*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Kane, M. T. (2001). *Current Concerns in Validity Theory*. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 38, 319–342.
- Kebede, D. (2013). *The Implementation of Language Skills Integration in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Classes: Jimma College of Teachers' Education in Focus*. Unpublished Thesis. Jimma College of Teachers.
- Kuśnierek, A. (2015). *Developing Students' Speaking Skills through Role-Play*. *World Scientific News* 1 (2015) 73-111 EISSN 2392-2192. Available online at: [www.worldscientificnews.com](http://www.worldscientificnews.com)
- Long, M. H. (2015). *Second Language Acquisition and Task-Based Language Teaching*. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Mart, Ç.T. (2018b). *From Communicative Competence to Language Development*. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 8(2), 163-167.
- Norris, J. (2020). *TOEFL Research Insight Series: TOEFL Program History*. Vol. 6.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press. The United Kingdom.
- Oxford, R. (2001). *Integrated Skills in the ESL/EFL Classroom*. *The Journal of TESOL France*. Vol.1

- Pardede, P. (2017). Integrated Skill Approach in EFL Classrooms: A Literature Review. Proceeding of EED Collegiate Forum. UKI Press.
- Pardede, P. (2019). Integrated Skills Approach in EFL Classrooms: A Literature Review. Proceeding. EFL Theory and Practice: Voice of EED UKI. UKI Press.
- Pica, T., R. Kanagy, and J. Falodun. (1993). Choosing and Using Communicative Tasks for Second Language Instruction. In G. Crookes and S. Gass (eds.), *Tasks and Language Learning: Integrating Theory and Practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 9–34.
- Raphael, Ahmed. (2015). Five essential listening skills for English learners. Available at: <https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/five-essential-listening-skills-english-learners>
- Richards, J.C. and Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (3rd Ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Richards, J.C. (2016). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Second Edition. Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, P. (2013). Syllabus Design. In C. Chapelle (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sanchez, A. (2004). The Task-Based Approach in Language Teaching. *International Journal of English Studies (IJES)*, Vol. 4 (1), University of Murcia.
- Scrivener, J. (2005). *Learning Teaching; A Guide Book for English Language Teachers*. Oxford, MacMillan.
- Scrivener, J. (2011). *Learning Teaching*. 3rd edition. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Shehadeh, A. (2005). Task-based Language Learning and Teaching: Theories and Applications. Available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304698703\\_Task-based\\_Language\\_Learning\\_and\\_Teaching\\_Theories\\_and\\_Applications](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304698703_Task-based_Language_Learning_and_Teaching_Theories_and_Applications)
- Skehan, P., (1 996). A Framework for the Implementation of Task-Based Instruction. *Applied Linguistics*. 1996, 17(1) : 38-62.
- Skehan, P., (1 998). Task-based instruction. *Annual Review of 'Applied Linguistics*. 1998, 18: 268-286.
- Taylor, C., & Angelis, P. (2008). The Evolution of TOEFL. In C. A. Chapelle, M. K. Enright, & J. M. Jamieson (Eds.). *Building a*

- Validity Argument for the Test of English as a Foreign Language (pp. 27–54). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Weir, C. J. (1990). *Communicative Language Testing*. Prentice Hall.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Willis, J. (1996). A Flexible Framework for Task-Based Learning. In J. Willis and D. Willis (eds.), 235–256. *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann. 52-62.
- Willis, Jane. (1996). *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. London: Longman.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. Edinburgh: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd.
- Willis, J. R., & Willis, D. (2007). *Doing Task-Based Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ya-Chen, Su. (2007). Students' Changing Views and the Integrated-Skills Approach in Taiwan's EFL College Classes. *Education Research Institute*. Tainan, Taiwan.
- Yildiz, Y. (2020). Task-Based Language Teaching: An Approach in the Spotlight to Propel Language Learning Forward. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Educational Studies*, Vol.7, No. 1.
- Yu, G. (2008). Reading to Summarize in English and Chinese: A Tale of Two Languages. *Language Testing*, 25(4), 521–551. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532208094275>.
- Yu, G. (2009). The Shifting Sands in the Effects of Source Text Summarizability on Summary Writing. *Assessing Writing*, 14(2), 116–137.
- Yu, G. (2013a). From Integrative to Integrated Language Assessment: Are we there yet? *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 10(1), 110–114. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2013.766744>
- Yu, G. (2013b). The Use of Summarization Tasks: Some Lexical and Conceptual Analyses. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 10(1), 96–109. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2012.750659>
- Zuniga, E.C. (2016). Implementing Task-Based Language Teaching to Integrate Language Skills in EFL Program at a Colombian University. *Profile Issues in Teacher's Professional Development*, 18 (2), 13-27. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15546profile.v18n2.49754>.