

**KOMPLEKSITAS, AKURASI, DAN KEFASIHAN
DALAM PRODUKSI UJARAN BAHASA JEPANG:
STUDI KASUS PADA SISWA PROGRAM PELATIHAN TENAGA KERJA**

DISERTASI

diajukan untuk memenuhi sebagian syarat untuk memperoleh gelar Doktorat
Program Studi Linguistik Sekolah Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia



ANISA ARIANINGSIH

NIM. 2105035

**PROGRAM STUDI LINGUISTIK
SEKOLAH PASCASARJANA
UNIVERSITAS PENDIDIKAN INDONESIA**

2025

**KOMPLEKSITAS, AKURASI, DAN KEFASIHAN
DALAM PRODUKSI UJARAN BAHASA JEPANG:
STUDI KASUS PADA SISWA PROGRAM PELATIHAN TENAGA KERJA**

Oleh
Anisa Arianingsih

S.Pd. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, 2011
M.Pd. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, 2014

Sebuah Disertasi yang diajukan untuk memenuhi salah satu syarat memperoleh
gelar Doktor (Dr.) pada Program Studi Linguistik Sekolah Pascasarjana
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

© Anisa Arianingsih 2025
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
Agustus 2025

Hak Cipta dilindungi undang-undang.
Disertasi ini tidak boleh diperbanyak seluruhnya atau sebagian,
dengan dicetak ulang, difoto kopi, atau cara lainnya tanpa ijin dari penulis.

LEMBAR PENGESAHAN

ANISA ARIANINGSIH

**KOMPLEKSITAS, AKURASI, DAN KEFASIHAN
DALAM PRODUKSI UJARAN BAHASA JEPANG: STUDI KASUS
PADA SISWA PROGRAM PELATIHAN TENAGA KERJA**

Disetujui dan disahkan oleh panitia disertasi,

Promotor,



Prof. Dadang Sudana, M.A., Ph.D.
NIP. 196009191990031001

Ko-Promotor,



Prof. Nuria Haristiani, M.Ed., Ph.D.
NIP. 198209162010122002

Anggota Promotor,



Wawan Gunawan, M.Ed., Ph.D.
NIP. 197209162000031001

Penguji Internal,



Prof. Eri Kurniawan, M.A., Ph.D.
NIP. 198111232005011002

Anggota Promotor,



Prof. Cece Sobarna, M.Hum.
NIP. 196407281991031001

**Ketua Program Studi Linguistik
Sekolah Pascasarjana
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia**



Prof. Dadang Sudana, M.A., Ph.D.
NIP. 196009191990031001

ABSTRAK

Anisa Arianingsih (2025). Kompleksitas, Akurasi, dan Kefasihan dalam Produksi Ujaran Bahasa Jepang: Studi Kasus pada Siswa Program Pelatihan Tenaga Kerja.

Penelitian ini dilatarbelakangi oleh tantangan pembelajaran bahasa Jepang yang dihadapi oleh pemelajar pemula pada program pelatihan tenaga kerja, khususnya dalam aspek kompleksitas, akurasi, dan kefasihan (CAF) produksi ujaran yang sangat diperlukan untuk komunikasi di dunia kerja. Sementara itu, penelitian terdahulu yang mengkaji aspek CAF dalam produksi ujaran banyak dilakukan pada konteks formal. Aspek-aspek tersebut tidak terkecualikan pentingnya pada program pelatihan intensif yang justru sangat vital dalam mengukur kompetensi komunikasi bahasa Jepang. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk meneliti bagaimana perkembangan aspek CAF dalam konteks pelatihan intensif bahasa Jepang di Lembaga Pelatihan Kerja (LPK) dan faktor-faktor yang memengaruhinya. Metode yang digunakan adalah metode campuran dengan desain eksplanatori sekuensial, yakni pengumpulan dan analisis data kuantitatif terlebih dahulu yang dilanjutkan dengan eksplorasi kualitatif. Penelitian dilakukan secara longitudinal terhadap 18 siswa program pelatihan tenaga kerja selama lima bulan, dengan data dikumpulkan melalui tes produksi ujaran bahasa Jepang yang terdiri dari monolog dan dialog, kuesioner, dan observasi. Analisis data kuantitatif melibatkan pengukuran CAF melalui metrik linguistik, sedangkan data kualitatif dianalisis untuk mengidentifikasi faktor internal dan eksternal yang memengaruhi performa ujaran. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terjadi peningkatan signifikan dalam ketiga dimensi CAF, dengan kefasihan mengalami perkembangan paling cepat, diikuti oleh akurasi, dan kompleksitas. Faktor-faktor yang berkontribusi terhadap perkembangan ini mencakup motivasi tinggi pemelajar, lingkungan pembelajaran komunikatif, dukungan instruktur, serta keterpaparan terhadap praktik komunikasi nyata dalam bahasa Jepang. Interaksi antarelemen CAF juga ditemukan tidak selalu linier, menunjukkan adanya *trade-off* terutama antara kompleksitas dan akurasi. Implikasi dari penelitian ini mencakup penguatan strategi pengajaran berbasis tugas, integrasi pelatihan linguistik dan budaya secara simultan, serta pentingnya evaluasi longitudinal terhadap performa lisan pemelajar. Penelitian ini juga menegaskan validitas kerangka CAF sebagai alat ukur efektif dalam konteks pembelajaran bahasa kedua untuk kebutuhan profesional. Penelitian selanjutnya disarankan untuk melibatkan pemelajar yang lebih beragam, menggunakan tugas-tugas komunikatif yang bervariasi, dan mengintegrasikan berbagai perspektif dalam teori pemerolehan bahasa kedua guna mencapai pemahaman yang lebih komprehensif. Selain itu, menganalisis perkembangan bahasa pemelajar setelah mereka tinggal di Jepang akan memberikan perspektif mengenai keberlanjutan dan penerapan praktis keterampilan komunikatif dalam konteks kehidupan nyata.

Kata kunci: kompleksitas, akurasi, kefasihan, bahasa jepang, produksi ujaran, pelatihan tenaga kerja, pembelajaran bahasa kedua

ABSTRACT

Anisa Arianingsih (2025). *Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency in Japanese Speech Production: Case Study among Students in the Vocational Training Program.*

This study was motivated by the challenges faced by beginner learners of Japanese in workforce training programs, particularly in terms of the complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) of speech production, which are essential for communication in the workplace. Meanwhile, previous studies examining CAF aspects in speech production have mostly been conducted in formal contexts. These aspects are no less important in intensive training programs, which are particularly vital for assessing Japanese language communication competence. The aim of this study is to investigate how CAF aspects develop in the context of intensive Japanese language training at a Vocational Training Institution (LPK) and the factors influencing them. The method used is a mixed-method approach with a sequential explanatory design, involving the collection and analysis of quantitative data followed by qualitative exploration. The study was conducted longitudinally over five months with 18 students in a workforce training program, with data collected through Japanese language speech production tests consisting of monologues and dialogues, questionnaires, and observations. Quantitative data analysis involved measuring CAF through linguistic metrics, while qualitative data were analyzed to identify internal and external factors influencing speech performance. The results of the study showed a significant improvement in all three dimensions of CAF, with fluency developing the fastest, followed by accuracy and complexity. Factors contributing to this development included high learner motivation, a communicative learning environment, instructor support, and exposure to real-life communication practices in Japanese. Interactions between CAF elements were also found to be non-linear, indicating trade-offs, particularly between complexity and accuracy. Implications of this study include strengthening task-based teaching strategies, integrating linguistic and cultural training simultaneously, and the importance of longitudinal evaluation of learners' oral performance. This study also confirms the validity of the CAF framework as an effective measurement tool in the context of second language learning for professional needs. Future research is recommended to involve more diverse learners, employ varied communicative tasks, and integrate multiple perspectives in second language acquisition theory to achieve a more comprehensive understanding. Moreover, examining learners' language development after their stay in Japan would yield perspective into the continuity and practical application of communicative skills in real-life contexts.

Keywords: *complexity, accuracy, fluency, Japanese language, speech production, workforce training, second language learning*

DAFTAR ISI

LEMBAR HAK CIPTA.....	i
LEMBAR PENGESAHAN	ii
SURAT PERNYATAAN KEASLIAN DISERTASI	iii
KATA PENGANTAR DAN UCAPAN TERIMA KASIH.....	iv
ABSTRAK	vii
ABSTRACT.....	viii
DAFTAR ISI.....	ix
DAFTAR TABEL.....	xii
DAFTAR GAMBAR	xiv
BAB I PENDAHULUAN.....	1
1.1 Latar Belakang Penelitian	1
1.2 Rumusan Masalah	8
1.3 Tujuan Penelitian	8
1.4 Manfaat Penelitian	9
1.5 Definisi Operasional.....	10
1.6 Sistematika Penulisan.....	11
BAB II TINJAUAN PUSTAKA.....	13
2.1 Psikolinguistik.....	13
2.2 Pemerolehan Bahasa Kedua.....	15
2.3 Produksi Ujaran.....	23
2.4 Pengukuran Produksi Ujaran Bahasa Kedua.....	28
2.5 Kompleksitas, Akurasi, dan Kefasihan (CAF).....	30
2.5.1 Kompleksitas (<i>Complexity</i>).....	33
2.5.2 Akurasi (<i>Accuracy</i>)	36
2.5.3 Kefasihan (<i>Fluency</i>).....	37
2.6 Unit Analisis CAF dalam Produksi Ujaran.....	38
2.6.1 Kalimat.....	39
2.6.2 Klausa.....	40
2.6.3 Kata	42

2.6.4 AS-Unit	45
2.6.5 Kesalahan (<i>Error</i>)	46
2.6.6 Perbaikan (<i>Repair</i>)	49
2.7 Faktor-faktor yang Memengaruhi CAF	50
2.8 Penelitian Terdahulu yang Relevan	53
2.8.1 Penelitian CAF dalam Bahasa Kedua	53
2.8.2 Penelitian CAF secara Longitudinal	55
BAB III METODE PENELITIAN.....	57
3.1 Desain Penelitian.....	57
3.2 Partisipan dan Tempat Penelitian.....	59
3.3 Instrumen Penelitian.....	61
3.3.1 Instrumen Pengumpulan Data.....	62
3.3.2 Instrumen Analisis Data.....	68
3.4 Prosedur Penelitian.....	69
3.5 Teknik Analisis Data.....	71
3.6 Gambaran Analisis.....	75
BAB IV TEMUAN	78
4.1 Perkembangan Kompleksitas, Akurasi, dan Kefasihan dalam Produksi Ujaran Bahasa Jepang pada Siswa Program Pelatihan Tenaga Kerja	78
4.1.1 Indikator Pengukuran Kompleksitas, Akurasi, dan Kefasihan	78
4.1.2 Perkembangan Kompleksitas, Akurasi, dan Kefasihan Produksi Ujaran Bahasa Jepang pada Setiap Partisipan.....	131
4.1.3 Rata-rata dan Laju Perkembangan Kompleksitas, Akurasi, dan Kefasihan Produksi Ujaran Bahasa Jepang pada Siswa Program Pelatihan Tenaga Kerja	183
4.1.4 Perhitungan Statistik Perkembangan Kompleksitas, Akurasi, dan Kefasihan Produksi Ujaran Bahasa Jepang pada Siswa Program Pelatihan Tenaga Kerja.....	204
4.2 Faktor-faktor yang Memengaruhi Kompleksitas, Akurasi, dan Kefasihan dalam Produksi Ujaran Bahasa Jepang pada Siswa Program Pelatihan Tenaga Kerja	225

BAB V PEMBAHASAN	247
5.1 Perkembangan Kompleksitas, Akurasi dan Kefasihan Produksi Ujaran Bahasa Jepang pada Siswa Program Pelatihan Tenaga Kerja	247
5.2 Faktor-faktor yang Memengaruhi Perkembangan Kompleksitas, Akurasi, dan Kefasihan pada Produksi Ujaran Bahasa Jepang pada Siswa Program Pelatihan Tenaga Kerja.....	256
BAB VI SIMPULAN, IMPLIKASI, DAN REKOMENDASI.....	268
6.1 SIMPULAN	268
6.2 IMPLIKASI.....	270
6.3 REKOMENDASI.....	273
DAFTAR PUSTAKA	275

DAFTAR TABEL

Tabel 3.1 Partisipan Penelitian	60
Tabel 3.2 Kisi-kisi Instrumen Tes Monolog	63
Tabel 3.3 Kisi-kisi Instrumen Tes Dialog.....	64
Tabel 3.4 Kisi-kisi Instrumen Kuesioner.....	67
Tabel 3.5 Instrumen Analisis Pengukuran CAF.....	69
Tabel 3.6 Indikator Pengukuran CAF.....	72
Tabel 3.7 Pilihan Jawaban Skala Likert.....	74
Tabel 3.8 Pedoman Interpretasi Kuesioner.....	74
Tabel 4.1 Indikator Pengukuran Kompleksitas Sintaksis (Monolog).....	79
Tabel 4.2 Indikator Pengukuran Kompleksitas Sintaksis (Dialog).....	83
Tabel 4.3 Indikator Pengukuran Kompleksitas Leksikal (Monolog).....	89
Tabel 4.4 Indikator Pengukuran Kompleksitas Leksikal (Dialog).....	90
Tabel 4.5 Jumlah kesalahan (Monolog).....	92
Tabel 4.6 Indikator Pengukuran Akurasi (Monolog).....	98
Tabel 4.7 Jumlah Kesalahan (Dialog).....	99
Tabel 4.8 Indikator Pengukuran Akurasi (Dialog).....	104
Tabel 4.9 Indikator Pengukuran <i>Speed Fluency</i> (Monolog).....	106
Tabel 4.10 Indikator Pengukuran <i>Speed Fluency</i> (Dialog).....	108
Tabel 4.11 Jumlah Jeda (Monolog).....	109
Tabel 4.12 Jumlah Jeda (Dialog).....	111
Tabel 4.13 Jumlah Perbaikan (Monolog).....	113
Tabel 4.14 Jumlah Perbaikan (Dialog).....	121
Tabel 4.15 Rata-rata Perkembangan Kompleksitas Sintaksis (Monolog).....	184
Tabel 4.16 Rata-rata Perkembangan Kompleksitas Sintaksis (Dialog).....	186
Tabel 4.17 Rata-rata Perkembangan Kompleksitas Leksikal (Monolog).....	188
Tabel 4.18 Rata-rata Perkembangan Kompleksitas Leksikal (Dialog).....	191

Tabel 4.19 Rata-rata Perkembangan Akurasi (Monolog).....	194
Tabel 4.20 Rata-rata Perkembangan Akurasi (Dialog).....	196
Tabel 4.21 Rata-rata Perkembangan Kefasihan (Monolog).....	199
Tabel 4.22 Rata-rata Perkembangan Kefasihan (Dialog).....	201
Tabel 4.23 Analisis Multivariat Tes Monolog Sederhana.....	204
Tabel 4.24 <i>Pairwise Comparison</i> Kompleksitas Tes Monolog Sederhana.....	205
Tabel 4.25 <i>Pairwise Comparison</i> Akurasi Tes Monolog Sederhana.....	206
Tabel 4.26 <i>Pairwise Comparison</i> Kefasihan Tes Monolog Sederhana.....	208
Tabel 4.27 Analisis Multivariat Tes Monolog Kompleks.....	209
Tabel 4.28 <i>Pairwise Comparison</i> Kompleksitas Tes Monolog Kompleks.....	210
Tabel 4.29 <i>Pairwise Comparison</i> Akurasi Tes Monolog Kompleks.....	212
Tabel 4.30 <i>Pairwise Comparison</i> Kefasihan Tes Monolog Kompleks.....	213
Tabel 4.31 Analisis Multivariat Tes Dialog Sederhana.....	215
Tabel 4.32 <i>Pairwise Comparison</i> Kompleksitas Tes Dialog Sederhana.....	215
Tabel 4.33 <i>Pairwise Comparison</i> Akurasi Tes Dialog Sederhana.....	217
Tabel 4.34 <i>Pairwise Comparison</i> Kefasihan Tes Dialog Sederhana.....	218
Tabel 4.35 Analisis Multivariat Tes Dialog Kompleks.....	220
Tabel 4.36 <i>Pairwise Comparison</i> Kompleksitas Tes Dialog Kompleks.....	221
Tabel 4.37 <i>Pairwise Comparison</i> Akurasi Tes Dialog Kompleks.....	222
Tabel 4.38 <i>Pairwise Comparison</i> Kefasihan Tes Dialog Kompleks.....	224
Tabel 4.39 Hasil Kuesioner Faktor Individual.....	227
Tabel 4.40 Hasil Kuesioner Faktor Negosiasi.....	229
Tabel 4.41 Hasil Kuesioner Faktor Taktikal.....	230
Tabel 4.42 Hasil Kuesioner Faktor Afektif.....	232
Tabel 4.43 Hasil Kuesioner Faktor Pengetahuan.....	234
Tabel 4.44 Hasil Kuesioner Faktor Lingkungan.....	235

DAFTAR GAMBAR

Gambar 2.1 Tingkat Pemrosesan Ujaran.....	24
Gambar 2.2 <i>Model Adaptive Control of Thought</i> (ACT) Anderson.....	25
Gambar 3.1 Explanatory Sequential Design (Creswell dan Creswell, 2018).....	58
Gambar 3.2 Kerangka Analisis Penelitian.....	77
Gambar 4.1 Pola Perkembangan CAF Partisipan.....	132
Gambar 4.2 Laju Perkembangan Kompleksitas Sintaksis (Monolog).....	185
Gambar 4.3 Laju Perkembangan Kompleksitas Sintaksis (Dialog).....	187
Gambar 4.4 Perkembangan Kompleksitas Leksikal (Monolog).....	190
Gambar 4.5 Perkembangan Kompleksitas Leksikal (Dialog).....	192
Gambar 4.6 Laju Perkembangan Akurasi (Monolog).....	195
Gambar 4.7 Laju Perkembangan Akurasi (Dialog).....	198
Gambar 4.8 Laju Perkembangan Kefasihan (Monolog).....	200
Gambar 4.9 Laju Perkembangan Kefasihan (Dialog).....	203

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Adinda, Y. R. (2021). *Korelasi antara kecemasan berbicara dan kelancaran berbicara pada pemelajar bahasa Inggris*. (Skripsi). Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta.
- Astina, I. K., Marhaeni, A. A. I. N., dan Dantes, N. (2019). The effect of group investigation and achievement motivation on students' speaking competency. *International Journal of Language and Literature*, 3(1), 1–12.
- Barrot, J. S., dan Agdeppa, S. V. (2021). Complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) in second language writing: Investigating the effects of topic familiarity and linguistic scaffolding. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 18(3), 970–979.
- Biber, D., Gray, B., dan Poonpon, K. (2011). Should we use characteristics of conversation to measure grammatical complexity in L2 writing development? *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(1), 5–35.
- Bulté, B., dan Housen, A. (2012). Defining and operationalising L2 complexity. Dalam A. Housen, F. Kuiken, dan I. Vedder (Eds.), *Dimensions of L2 performance and proficiency: Complexity, accuracy and fluency in SLA* (hlm. 21–46). John Benjamins.
- Bulté, B., dan Housen, A. (2014). Conceptualizing and measuring short-term L2 fluency and accuracy. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 36(3), 357–386.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. Dalam J. C. Richards dan R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (hlm. 2–27). Longman.
- Canale, M., dan Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Creswell, J. W., dan Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (5th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition (2nd ed.)*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R., dan Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing Learner Language*. Oxford University Press.

- Ellis, R., dan Yuan, F. (2005). The effects of careful within-task planning on fluency, complexity, and accuracy in L2 oral production. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(1), 1–27.
- Fathi, J., dan Rahimi, M. (2022). Exploring the impact of task complexity and task structure on L2 learners' CAF in oral narratives. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 26, 1–17.
- Fenyi, M., Kiss, T., dan Márkus, Z. (2023). Investigating CAF measures in EFL learners' oral performance across task types. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 14(2), 317–327.
- Foster, P. (1998). A classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(1), 1–23.
- Foster, P., dan Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning and task type on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(3), 299–324.
- Foster, P., dan Tavakoli, P. (2009). Native speakers and task performance: Comparing effects on complexity, fluency, and lexical diversity. *Language Learning*, 59(4), 866–896.
- Gapur, M. F. (2017). *Kontekstualisasi Kaidah Interlanguage dalam Tulisan Pelajar Bahasa Indonesia sebagai Bahasa Kedua*. (Tesis). Universitas Indonesia, Depok.
- Gapur, M. F., dan Mulyadi, D. (2018). Sintaksis antarkalimat dalam karangan pelajar BIPA asal Australia. *Jurnal Gramatika*, 4(2), 193–206.
- Gilabert, R. (2007). Effects of manipulating task complexity on self-repairs during L2 oral production. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 45(3), 215–240.
- Gilabert, R., Barón, J., dan Llanes, À. (2009). Manipulating task complexity and its impact on learners' interaction during oral performance. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47(3), 367–395.
- Granena, G. (2018). Cognitive aptitudes for second language learning and the LLAMA Language Aptitude Tests. Dalam P. Robinson dan N. C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition* (hlm. 297–318). Routledge.
- Horiba, Y., Fukaya, R., dan Yamashita, J. (2021). A multidimensional approach to L2 writing: CAF, cohesion, and writing quality. *Language Learning*, 71(2), 395–437.
- Housen, A., dan Kuiken, F. (2009). Complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 461–473.

- Housen, A., Kuiken, F., dan Vedder, I. (2012). Complexity, accuracy and fluency: Definitions, measurement and research. Dalam A. Housen, F. Kuiken, dan I. Vedder (Eds.), *Dimensions of L2 Performance and Proficiency: Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency in SLA* (hlm. 1–20). John Benjamins.
- Houston, D. M. (2016). Measuring syntactic complexity in L2 writing: A longitudinal study of complexity, fluency, and accuracy. (Disertasi). Georgetown University, Washington D.C.
- Ishikawa, T., dan Mori, H. (2025). Affect and L2 performance in workplace-oriented language tasks: A study of Japanese language learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 46(1), 23–47.
- Kanda, M. (2015). Measuring lexical diversity in learner corpora: Validity and limitations. *Linguistic Research*, 32(1), 1–23.
- Kormos, J. (2006). *Speech Production and Second Language Acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kuiken, F., dan Vedder, I. (2007). Cognitive task complexity and written output in Italian and French as a foreign language. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 201–222.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2006). The emergence of complexity, fluency, and accuracy in the oral and written production of five Chinese learners of English. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(4), 590–619.
- Li, M. (2024). *Revisiting task complexity in L2 speaking: Interactions between reasoning demands and linguistic features*. Second Language Research. Advance Online Publication.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. Dalam W. C. Ritchie dan T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Language Acquisition: Vol. 2. Second Language Acquisition* (hlm. 413–468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Long, M. H. (2015). *Second Language Acquisition and Task-based Language Teaching*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Miyamoto, Y. (2019). Task effects on CAF measures in EFL learners' writing: A longitudinal study. *JACET Journal*, 63, 25–42.
- Norris, J. M., dan Ortega, L. (2009). Towards an organic approach to investigating CAF in instructed SLA: The case of complexity. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 555–578.

- Noviyanthi, D., Sugirin, S., dan Supriyadi, S. (2020). Complexity, accuracy, and fluency of Indonesian EFL learners' spoken production: The effect of task complexity. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 5(1), 110–125.
- Ortega, L. (2003). Syntactic complexity measures and their relationship to L2 proficiency: A research synthesis of college-level L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(4), 492–518.
- Ortega, L. (2012). Interlanguage complexity: A construct in development. Dalam B. Kortmann dan B. Szmrecsanyi (Eds.), *Linguistic Complexity: Second Language Acquisition, Indigenization, Contact* (hlm. 127–155). De Gruyter.
- Pallotti, G. (2009). CAF: Defining, refining and differentiating constructs. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 590–601.
- Ramalingam, D., dan Jiar, Y. K. (2023). Task repetition and task complexity in L2 oral performance: Insights from Malaysian ESL learners. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 13(1), 91–113.
- Révész, A., dan Gurzynski-Weiss, L. (2021). Individual differences in second language task-based interaction: A synthesis and future directions. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 41, 175–194.
- Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 27–57.
- Robinson, P. (2007). Task complexity, theory of mind, and intentional reasoning: Effects on L2 speech production, interaction, uptake and perceptions of task difficulty. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 45(3), 193–213.
- Robinson, P. (2011). Second language task complexity, the Cognition Hypothesis, language learning, and performance. Dalam P. Robinson (Ed.), *Second Language Task Complexity: Researching the Cognition Hypothesis of Language Learning and Performance* (hlm. 3–38). John Benjamins.
- Saito, K., Tran, M., dan Suzuki, S. (2020). How does second language comprehensibility develop in classroom contexts? *Applied Linguistics*, 41(5), 708–738.
- Sakoda, K. (2006). *Observing Learners' Language*. In *Psychology of Language Learning* (Vol. 3, hlm. 2–14). 3A Corporation.
- Sakoda, K. (2006). *Second language acquisition study and teaching Japanese*. In *Psychology of Language Learning* (Vol. 3, hlm. 95–127). 3A Corporation.

- Sakoda, K., dan Kawaguchi, S. (2023). Japanese L2 corpora and SLA research. Dalam S. Kawaguchi, B. Di Biase, dan Y. Yamaguchi (Eds.), *Processability and Language Acquisition in the Asia-Pacific Region* (hlm. 144–162). John Benjamins.
- Sari, F. M., Rahmah, R., dan Putri, G. A. (2021). CAF analysis in speaking performance of Indonesian EFL learners. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(2), 1046–1057.
- Segalowitz, N. (2010). *Cognitive Bases of Second Language Fluency*. Routledge.
- Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(1), 38–62.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Skehan, P. (2009). Modelling second language performance: Integrating complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexis. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 510–532.
- Skehan, P., dan Foster, P. (1997). Task type and task processing conditions as influences on foreign language performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 1(3), 185–211.
- Skehan, P., dan Foster, P. (2001). Cognition and tasks. Dalam P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and Second Language Instruction* (hlm. 183–205). Cambridge University Press.
- Soebagijo, M., Rahardi, R. K., dan Wiratno, T. (2022). Analisis keakuratan sintaksis dalam teks lisan pemelajar BIPA tingkat dasar. *Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra*, 8(1), 15–26.
- Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Suzuki, S., dan Kormos, J. (2020). The role of task repetition and post-task activity in L2 fluency, complexity, and accuracy development. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(4), 540–560.
- Tanaka, K., dan Fujita, Y. (2022). Language anxiety and syntactic simplification in Japanese L2 speaking: An exploratory study. *Japanese Language Education Research*, 32(1), 45–67.
- Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning*, 30(2), 417–431.

- Tavakoli, P., dan Foster, P. (2008). Task design and second language performance: The effect of narrative type on learner output. *Language Learning*, 58(2), 439–473.
- Tjandra, D. (2013). *Sintaksis Jepang*. Binus Publishing.
- Tombalisa, M. (2022). Developmental patterns of syntactic complexity in L2 learners' narratives. *The Language Learning Journal*, 50(3), 391–405.
- Tsujimura, N. (2014). *An Introduction to Japanese Linguistics (3rd ed.)*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Vercellotti, M. L. (2013). Patterns of syntactic complexity in second language development: A longitudinal study. *Applied Linguistics*, 34(5), 653–680.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Wolfe-Quintero, K., Inagaki, S., dan Kim, H.Y. (1998). *Second language development in writing: Measures of fluency, accuracy, and complexity*. University of Hawaii Press.
- Xu, J., Zhang, W., dan Lu, X. (2023). Tracking CAF development in EFL learners' speaking across tasks. *System*, 113, 102987.
- Yan, X., Zhang, J., dan Wang, M. (2021). Task complexity and L2 performance: A multidimensional perspective. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(1), 78–97.
- Yusuf, M., Latief, M. A., dan Munir, A. (2023). CAF development in speaking performance: Evidence from Indonesian university students. *Journal of Language Education and Research*, 3(1), 45–60.