ABSTRACT

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has now been widely used in language teaching. Numerous studies with respect to TBLT have recently been concerned with testing Cognition Hypothesis. According to the Cognition Hypothesis, task complexity (cognitive factor) should be the sole basis of developing tasks in language teaching. It can be developed according to three variables of resource directing dimension, that is, +/- few elements, +/- here & now, +/- reasoning demand. The objective of the current study was to investigate the effects of the use of task complexity by manipulating resource directing dimension on students' oral production in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. The subjects were the ninth grade students of SMPN 11 Bandar Lampung consisting of 30 students. Eight types of tasks in the form of monologue were used to elicit the data. The result of the research showed that, the complex task 1 (- few elements, - here & now, - reasoning demand) had the highest complexity, Task 2 (- few elements, - here & now, + reasoning demand) had the highest accuracy, Task 7 (+ few elements, + here & now, - reasoning demand) had the highest fluency. This indicates that, increasing task complexity along with resource-directing dimension simultaneously pushes learners to greater complexity, but not accuracy and fluency. This research suggested teachers to design a task containing high complexity, accuracy, and fluency. Besides, it is expected that this study inspire other researchers to have further research about task complexity.

Key words: *TBLT, task complexity, resource-directing, CAF*.

THE USE OF TASK COMPLEXITY IN SPOKEN PERFORMANCE BY 9th GRADE STUDENTS OF SMPN 11 BANDAR LAMPUNG

By:
DWI RATIH AGUSTINA

A Thesis

Submitted in a Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for Master Degree in Language and Arts Department
of Teacher Training and Education Faculty

MASTER IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING STUDY PROGRAM
LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY
LAMPUNG UNIVERSITY
BANDAR LAMPUNG
2016

Research Title	: **THE USE OF TASK COMPLEXITY IN SPOKEN PERFORMANCE BY 9th GRADE STUDENTS OF SMPN 11 BANDAR LAMPUNG**
Student's Name	: Dwi Ratih Agustina
Student's Number	: 1423042007
Study Program	: Master in English Language Teaching
Department	: Language and Arts Education
Faculty	: Teacher Training and Education

APPROVED BY

Advisory Committee

Advisor	Co-Advisor
Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D.	**Dr. Flora, M.Pd.**
NIP 19650706 199403 1 002	NIP 19600713 198603 2 001

Language and Arts Education Department
Chairperson

Dr. Mulyanto Widodo, M.Pd.
NIP 19620203 198811 1 001

ADMITTED BY

1. Examination Committee

Chairperson : **Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D.** .....

Secretary : **Dr. Flora, M.Pd.** .....

Examiners : **I. Prof. Ag. Bambang Setiyadi, Ph.D.** .....

II. Dr. H. Muhammad Fuad, M.Hum. .....

2. Dean of Teacher Training and Education Faculty

Dr. H. Muhammad Fuad, M.Hum.
NIP 19590722 198603 1 003

3. Director of Postgraduate Program

Prof. Dr. Sudjarwo, M.S.
NIP 19530528 198103 1 002

Graduated on : **July 26th, 2016**

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN

Dengan ini saya menyatakan dengan sebenarnya bahwa:

1. Tesis dengan judul "The Use of Task Complexity in Spoken Performance by 9th Grade Students of SMP N 11 Bandar Lampung" adalah hasil karya sendiri dan saya tidak melakukan penjiplakan atau pengutipan atas karya penulis lain dengan cara tidak sesuai tata etika ilmiah yang berlaku dalam masyarakat akademik atau yang disebut plagiatisme

2. Hal intelektual atas karya ilmiah ini diserahkan sepenuhnya kepada Universitas Lampung

Atas pernyataan ini, apabila di kemudian hari ternyata ditemukan adanya ketidakbenaran, saya bersedia menanggung akibat dan sanksi yang diberikan kepada saya, saya bersedia dan sanggup dituntut sesuai hukum yang berlaku.

Bandar lampung, 27 Juli 2016
Yang membuat pernyataan,

Dwi Ratih Agustina
NPM 1423042007

CURRICULUM VITAE

The writer's name is Dwi Ratih Agustina. She was born in Bandar Lampung, August 10th, 1986. She is the second child of a harmonious couple Drs. H. Ramli and Hj. Siti Amini, S.Pd. She has two brothers and one sister named Rahmad Anggrianto, M. Hafizh Arrafi and Ade Agnesia.

She entered TK Kartini in 1991 before continuing her study to SD Negeri 2 Kupang Teba in 1992. Having graduated from the Elementary School in 1998, she went to SLTP Negeri 3 Bandar Lampung and graduated in 2001. She finished her High school at SMU Negeri 10 Bandar Lampung in 2004.

In that very year, she was registered as an S-1 college student of Lampung University at English Education Program of Teacher Training and Education Faculty through SPMB and graduated in 2009. Five years later she was registered as Post-Graduate Student at MPBI of Lampung University and graduated in 2016.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to:

- My beloved parents, Drs. Hi. Ramli and Hj. Siti Amini, S.Pd.
- My beloved husband, M. Yusuf, S.H.
- My parents in law, Paryoto, S.Pd.I., M.M. and Sri Murni, S.Pd., M.M.
- My siblings and brother in law, Rahmat Anggrianto, Ade Agnesia, Muhammad Hafizh Arrafi, and Abdul Ghoni.
- My lovely comrades English Department'04 and Postgraduate English Department'14.
- All my teachers and lecturers of English Department.
- SMP N 11 Bandar Lampung.
- My beloved *Green Campus*, Lampung University.

MOTTO

"… But lo! With hardship goeth ease.
Lo! With hardship goeth ease"

(Alam Nasyrah: 5-6)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer would like to acknowledge her endless and countless thanks to the most Gracious and Merciful, Allah SWT who always gives the best in this life and there is no doubt about it. Praise and salutation will always be upon our Prophet Muhammad SAW, the last messenger, the best figure of the universe. This thesis is presented to fulfil one of the requirements in accomplishing S2 Degree at the Department of Language and Arts of Teachers Training and Education Faculty in Lampung University.

The writer also would like to address her respect and sincere gratitude to Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D., her first advisor, for his criticism, motivation, and encouragement to the writer to think more scientifically and critically. Her gratitude is also addressed to Dr. Flora, M.Pd., her second advisor, for her assistance, ideas, guidance and revision in improving this thesis. Her thanks are extended to Prof. Ag. Bambang Setiyadi, Ph.D., as her examiner, for his encouragement, ideas, suggestions in supporting the writer to finish her thesis as soon as possible.

The writer also wants to extend her appreciation to Hj. Siti Robiyah, M.Pd., the headmaster of SMP N 11 Bandar Lampung, for permitting her to conduct the

research at the school. Besides, her thanks are rendered to all teachers and students of SMPN 11 Bandar Lampung for their support and participation.

The writer would like to address her deep and sincere gratitude to her beloved husband Muhammad Yusuf, S.H., for his assistance, ideas, guidance. Her beloved companions Postgraduate English Education Program'14. Thank you so much for being such great companions along the way in finishing this thesis.

The greatest honor and thankfulness would finally be dedicated to her beloved parents, Drs. H. Ramli and Hj. Siti Amini, S.Pd. It is truly undoubted that loves, cares, and timeless prayers during days and nights, patience and willingness to wait for the writer's graduation are very precions for her. Her sincere thanks and love are also extended to her siblings, Rahmat Anggrianto, Ade Agnesia, M. Hafizh Arrafi.

The writer hopes this research would give a beneficial contribution to the educational development, and to the reac

Bandar Lampung, Juli 2016

The writer,

Dwi Ratih Agustina

CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT ..... **i**

APPROVAL ..... **ii**

ADMISSION ..... **iii**

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN ..... **iv**

CURRICULUM VITAE ..... **v**

DEDICATION ..... **vi**

MOTTO ..... **vii**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **viii**

CONTENTS ..... **x**

TABLES ..... **xii**

FIGURES ..... **xiii**

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of The Problems 1
1.2. Problem of The Research 6
1.3. Objectives of The Research 7
1.4. Uses of The Research 7
1.5. Scope of The Research 8
1.6. Definition of Terms 9

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Concepts of Task-Based Language Teaching 11
2.2. Concepts of Tasks in Language Teaching 12
2.3. Concepts of Task Complexity 15
2.4. Manipulating Task Complexity 18
2.5. Spoken Performance 21

2.6. Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency 22
2.7. Previous Studies on Task Complexity 25
2.8. Theoretical Assumption 29
2.9. Hypotheses 30

III. RESEARCH METHOD

3.1. Research Design 31
3.2. Setting of The Research 32
3.3. Population and Sample 32
3.4. Research Procedures 32
3.4.1. Preparing The Tasks 32
3.4.2. Determining The Sample 34
3.4.3. Conducting The Tasks 34
3.5. Data Collecting Technique 36
3.5.1. Determining The Instrument 36
3.5.2. Recording The Students' Utterances 36
3.5.3. Transcribing and Coding The Students' Utterances 36
3.6. Validity and Reliability of The Instrument 37
3.6.1. Content Validity 37
3.6.2. Construct Validity 37
3.6.3. Reliability 38
3.7. Data Analysis 39
3.7.1. Complexity 40
3.7.2. Accuracy 42
3.7.3. Fluency 43
3.8. Hypothesis Testing 44

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1. Complexity, Accuracy, & Fluency of The Eight Tasks (1st Rater) 45
4.1.1. Syntactic Complexity (1st Rater) 45
4.1.2. Lexical Complexity (1st Rater) 50
4.1.3. Accuracy (1st Rater) 58
4.1.4. Fluency (1st Rater) 63
4.2. Complexity, Accuracy, & Fluency of The Eight Tasks (2nd Rater) 68
4.2.1. Syntactic Complexity (2nd Rater) 68
4.2.2. Lexical Complexity (2nd Rater) 72
4.2.3. Accuracy (2nd Rater) 78
4.2.4. Fluency (2nd Rater) 82

V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1. Conclusions 87
5.2. Suggestions 88

REFERENCES
APPENDICES

TABLES

Tables Page

3.1. Inter-Rater Reliability 39
3.2. Calculation of Lexical Words 41
4.1. Means of Syntactic Complexity (1st Rater) 46
4.2. Comparison Between Tasks in Syntactic Complexity 49
4.3. Means of Lexical Complexity (1st Rater) 50
4.4. Comparison Between Tasks in Lexical Complexity 55
4.5. Means of Accuracy (1st Rater) 58
4.6. Comparison Between Tasks in Accuracy 61
4.7. Means of Fluency (1st Rater) 63
4.8. Comparison Between Tasks in Fluency 67
4.9. Means of Syntactic Complexity (2nd Rater) 68
4.10.Comparison Between Tasks in Syntactic Complexity 71
4.11.Means of Lexical Complexity (2nd Rater) 72
4.12.Comparison Between Tasks in Lexical Complexity 76
4.13.Means of Accuracy (2nd Rater) 78
4.14.Comparison Between Tasks in Accuracy 81
4.15.Means of Fluency (2nd Rater) 83
4.16.Comparison Between Tasks in Fluency 85

FIGURES

Figures Page

4.1. Mean Differences of Eight Task in Syntactic Complexity
(1^{st} Rater) 47
4.2. Mean Differences of Eight Task in Lexical Complexity
(1^{st} Rater) 52
4.3. Mean Differences of Eight Task in Accuracy
(1^{st} Rater) 60
4.4. Mean Differences of Eight Task in Fluency
(1^{st} Rater) 65
4.5. Mean Differences of Eight Task in Syntactic Complexity
(2^{nd} Rater) 70
4.6. Mean Differences of Eight Task in Lexical Complexity
(2^{nd} Rater) 74
4.7. Mean Differences of Eight Task in Accuracy
(2^{nd} Rater) 80
4.8. Mean Differences of Eight Task in Fluency
(2^{nd} Rater) 84

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is concerned with backgrounds of the research, problem of the research, objectives of the research, uses of the research, scope of the research, and definition of terms clarified like the following,

1.1. Backgrounds of The Research

For many years, English teachers have started teaching English just as a repetition of drills and memorization of dialogues. However, today's world requires that the goal of teaching language should improve students' communicative skills, because, only in that way, students can express themselves and learn how to follow the social and cultural rules appropriate in each communicative circumstance (Kayi, 2006).

Furthermore, methods like Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) are inadequate in preparing students for natural communication out of the classroom. It is in line with the statement by Nunan (2004: 6), that these days it is generally accepted that language is more than a set of grammatical rules, with attendant sets of vocabulary, to be memorized. It is a dynamic resource for creating meaning. Those might be the trigger causing teaching methods focusing on forms have gradually been left.

Therefore, the meaning-focused instruction revealed as the reaction towards it. This reaction got supports from some researchers (Krashen and Terrell, 1995: 55), that language acquisition can only take place when a message is understood, i.e., when the focus is on what is being said rather than on the form of the message. Thus, this indicates that teachers just emphasize on students' ability to understand the meaning of the message and communicate naturally, without giving much attention to the linguistic components like syntax, morphology, and word-order.

However, language teaching experts (Ellis, 1993; Long, 1991; Richards, 1984; Rutherford, 1987 in Baleghizadeh 2010: 2) wondered whether meaning-focused instruction, without any emphasis on form, would be sufficient to ensure success in acquiring a second language. Some studies also doubted such kind of instruction, one of the examples, White (1991) in Baleghizadeh (2010: 2), argued that English learners of French as an L2 tend to make sentences which are ungrammatical in French, but acceptable in English. This fact is worrying since the ignorance of grammar in speaking may lead students to fossilization, and it will be harder to be repaired if the students are accustomed to using ungrammatical sentences for communication.

Due to the reasons above, to acquire foreign language, learners need such ideal activities or tasks which not only focus on forms but also meaning, that is focus on form. In Focus on Form (FonF), the meaning still becomes the primary but grammar will arise from the meaning itself. According to Long (1991) and Long and Robinson (1998) in Saeidi, Zaferanieh & Shatery (2012 : 72), both focus on forms and focus on meaning instructions are valuable, and should complement

rather than exclude each other. Focus on form instruction, in their view, maintains a balance between the two by calling on teachers and learners to attend to form when necessary, yet within a communicative classroom environment.

Hence, returning to Long's original consideration (1991) in Fotos (1998: 305) that task-based language instruction is particularly suitable for focus on form. Task-based instruction or known as Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) also provides learners with opportunities for interaction that enable learners to work to understand each other, and express their own meaning, and listen to language which may be beyond their present ability (Prabhu, 1987; Larsen & Freeman, 2000 in Mahpul, 2014: 11).

There have been many studies concerning the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching in speaking performance. Most of them are focused on trying out the Cognition Hypothesis proposed by Robinson. Robinson (2015) suggests that the tasks should be sequenced from simple to complex for learners. Then they are also developed based on three factors, that is, cognitive factors known as task complexity, interactive factors known as task condition, and learner factors known as task difficulty. Those three factors are called Triadic Componential Framework (TCF).

Nevertheless, Robinson (2001a: 29, 2003: 57), Robinson & Gilabert (2007: 163) suggest that cognitive factor (task complexity) should be the main factor in developing task-based learning because the other two factors are hard to be predicted in the beginning. According to Robinson, the cognitive factors (consisting of resource-directing and resource-depleting dimension) have an

important role in students' learning activities. Additionally, Robinson assumes that resource-directing dimension will specifically lead students to the linguistic aspect. On the other hand, the resource-depleting just influences the students' psychological condition. In the Triadic Componential Framework proposed by Robinson & Gilabert (2007), resource-directing includes three variables, that is, +/- here and now, +/- few elements, +/- reasoning demands, whereas, resource-depleting consists of +/- planning, +/- single task, and +/- prior knowledge variables.

Robinson also believes that those two dimensions (resource-directing and resource depleting) can be manipulated to facilitate students in enhancing their language skill. In addition, Robinson (2001a) argues that the task made complex by using resource-directing dimension will increase the students' learning performance in terms of complexity and accuracy, but decrease fluency. On the contrary, task made complex by using resource-depleting will decrease complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

Recently, some researchers (Gilabert, 2007; Shahreza, Dabaghi & Kassaian, 2011; Azizi, Asoudeh & Azar, 2012; Saeedi, Ketabi, Kazerooni, 2012; Mahpul, 2014) have manipulated task by combining the two dimensions but none of them manipulated all variables of each dimension. Besides, Crespo's study (2011) just focused on manipulating task complexity in one dimension, that is, resource directing but there is only one variable of the dimension manipulated, that is, reasoning demand. In contrast to Crespo, Madarsara & Rahimy (2015) just focused on resource-dispersing, that is, prior-knowledge.

Based on the previous studies above, none of them manipulated the task complexity by combining the three variables of resource-directing dimension. Thus, this research focused on resource directing by combining all aspects of it. It was done due to the reason that resource-directing refers to cognitive/conceptual demands requiring attention and working memory that directs learners to focus on linguistic form, but resource-dispersing dimension does not direct learners to any linguistic form (Robinson, 2001a: 31).

Besides, the previous researchers mostly designed the task using narrative text, whereas, this research used procedure text. It was done since procedure text is the material taken from KTSP curriculum in Standard Competence 4, Basic Competence 4.2. Based on the curriculum, it is expected that students can express the meaning in the form of monologue in the form of procedure text.

Furthermore, this research examined the effects of task complexity manipulated along with resource-directing in the spoken performance of the ninth grade students of SMPN 11 Bandar Lampung in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. It was done because many researchers and language practitioners believe that the constructs of L2 performance and L2 proficiency are multi-componential in nature and that their principal dimensions can be adequately, and comprehensively, captured by the notions of complexity, accuracy and fluency (e.g. Skehan 1998; Ellis 2003, 2008; Ellis and Barkhuizen, 2005 in Housen & Kuiken, 2009: 1). As such, complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF) have figured as major research variables in applied linguistic research. CAF have been used both as performance descriptors for the speaking and written assessment of

language learners as well as indicators of learners' proficiency underlying their performance; they have also been used for measuring progress in language learning.

After combining the three variables of resource-directing dimension, there were eight types of tasks assessed to the students in the form of monologue. It was used since according to Davis (2007: 179), a monologue is a generally uninterrupted speech or narrative that tells a complete story or expresses a complete line of thought. Hence, it was easier to analyze the students' voice record since there was only one person speaking per task without any interruption.

In sum, the previous studies about manipulating task complexity have not analyzed all aspects in research-directing optimally, moreover, most of them used narrative text as the material. Thus, this research investigated the effects of the use of task complexity in spoken performance by manipulating the three variables of resource directing dimension simultaneously with procedure text as the material. This might be the gap that was filled through this study.

1.2. Problem of The Research

As the concern of this research, there is a main problem of the research formulated as follows:

> "What are the effects of the use of task complexity in spoken performance, by 9th grade students of SMPN 11 Bandar Lampung in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency?"

1.3. Objectives of The Research

The objectives of the research will be as follows:

1. To find out the effects of the use of task complexity in spoken performance by 9th grade students of SMPN 11 Bandar Lampung in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency."
2. To develop the use of task complexity through the different way of manipulating the variables of resource-directing dimension.

1.4. Uses of The Research

This research will be useful both practically and theoretically,

1. Practically

Hopefully, this research will be useful for English teachers, students, and also schools.

a. Teachers

Through this research, teachers will know what to do in designing the task and what type of task complexity that can be beneficial to enhance students' oral production.

b. Learners

Since task-based language teaching focuses on form, students will be facilitated and enriched with various kinds of tasks that provide them with communicative activities without ignoring the grammatical rules. Hopefully, this research will

make them more active to communicate in English. Besides, it will improve the students' ability in producing grammatical sentences.

c. Schools

The result of this research can be used as a consideration for schools, whether a certain type of task will always be applied to improve the learners' oral production or not.

2. Theoretically

The result of this research supports the previous theories about task complexity and develops the theories concerning the use of task complexity in EFL context.

1.5. Scope of The Research

This research was conducted at SMPN 11 Bandar Lampung. The sample taken was the ninth grade students of Junior High School. There was one class that became the sample of this research, it was IX I. In this research, the researcher distributed eight kinds of tasks, which had been manipulated along with resource-directing dimension.

The material for that process was procedure text. The researcher had tried to find out the effects of the use of task complexity on students' oral production in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. Thus, the data collected were in the form of students' utterances that were transcribed and analyzed so as to find out the complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

1.6. Definition of Terms

Definition of terms is useful in order to avoid misunderstanding of the terms and limit the width of the research.

1. Task Based Language Teaching

Task Based Language Teaching is an approach which provides communicative activities but do not avoid an explicit focus on grammatical structure.

2. Task Complexity

Task Complexity is the result of the attention, memory, reasoning, and other information processing demands imposed by the structure of the task on the language learner (Robinson, 2001a: 29).

3. Spoken Performance

The way how people use language in actual speech production, which results interaction among speakers and hearers.

4. Complexity

Complexity is 'the extent to which learners produce elaborated language', and is often concerned with syntactic and lexical aspects (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005 in Inoue, 2010: 3).

5. Accuracy

Accuracy is the ability to avoid error in performance, possibly reflecting higher levels of control in the language as well as a conservative orientation, that is, avoidance of challenging structure that might provoke error (Skehan & Foster,

1999 in Mahpul, 2014: 43). The definition shows that accuracy refers to the structure of the language used.

6. Fluency

Fluency is the rapid, smooth, accurate, lucid, and efficient translation of thought or communicative intention into language under the tempspeaking constraints of on-line processing (Lennon, 2000 in Mahpul, 2004: 45). In other words, fluency refers to smoothness of conveying the message while communicating.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter includes related literature, previous studies, theoretical assumption and also hypotheses formulated based on the theories. They are as follows,

2.1. Concepts of Task-Based Language Teaching

Task-Based Language Teaching was, initially, a proposal for improving pedagogy with only a slight foundation in empirical research into the SLA processes (Robinson, 2011: 4). Arising out of pedagogic proposals for a greater emphasis on communicative activities in language teaching (Brumfit & Johnson, 1979; Skehan, 2003; Valdman, 1978, 1980; Widdowson, 1978 in Robinson, 2011: 4), TBLT places the construct of "task" at the center of curricular planning. Thus, TBLT emphasizes on utilizing the tasks in teaching and learning classroom that stimulate students to communicate.

In addition, Task- Based Language Teaching (Long,1985 in Madarsara & Harimiy, 2015: 247) is considered as an approach to language teaching that atttempts to produce native- like accuracy within a communicative classroom, in which task is the unit of analysis. This means that, it enables learners to communicate but does not ignore the grammar of the target language.

Nunan (2003) in Yousefi, Mohammadi, Mansour (2012: 1436) points out that task-based language teaching is an approach to the design of language courses in which the point of departure is not an ordered list of linguistic items, but a collection of tasks. It draws on and reflects the experiential and humanistic traditions as well as reflects the changing conceptions of language itself. Therefore, tasks become the core of this approach, and the appropriate tasks which contain form-focused instruction are needed.

In the TBLT framework presented here, form-focused work is presented in the form of enabling skills, so called because they are designed to develop skills and knowledge that will ultimately facilitate the process of authentic communication. In the framework, enabling skills are of two kinds: *language exercises* and *communicative activities* (Kumaravadivelu 1991, 1993 in Nunan, 2004: 22). However, this research will emphasize more on holding communicative activities through tasks which also rely on students' knowledge to do such kind of communicative tasks.

Concerning the theories above, Task-Based Language Teaching is an approach that emphasizes on form-focused instruction covered in tasks. The tasks used should facilitate the students with communicative activities in the classroom, but do not avoid teaching grammar explicitly.

2.2. Concepts of Tasks in Language Teaching

There have been many concepts of tasks defined by the researchers based on their studies in a number of ways. Pica et al (1993) in Mahpul (2014: 1) characterizes

tasks in two ways, that is, tasks oriented toward goals and tasks as work or activities. Tasks oriented toward goals are intended for learners to achieve an outcome and to carry out a task with a sense of what they need to accomplish through their talk or action. Meanwhile, tasks as work or activities refer to learners' active role in performing the tasks whether they are working individually or in pair or groups.

Long (1985) in Nunan (2004: 2) frames his approach to task-based language teaching in terms of target tasks, arguing that a target task is, a piece of work undertaken for oneself or for others, freely or for some reward. Thus examples of tasks include painting a fence, dressing a child, filling out a form, buying a pair of shoes, making an airline reservation, borrowing a library book, taking a driving test, typing a letter, weighing a patient, sorting letters, making a hotel reservation, writing a cheque, finding a street destination and helping someone across a road. In other words, by 'task' is meant the hundred and one things people do in everyday life, at work, at play and in between.

The definition of target tasks elaborated above seems to be non-technical and non-linguistic. It just describes the sorts of things that the persons face in their daily life, thus the language used tends to be based on situational context.

In another case, when the target tasks are transformed from the real world to the classroom, tasks become pedagogical in nature. Richards, et al (1986: 2) in Nunan (2004) defines a pedagogical task as an activity or action which is carried out as the result of processing or understanding language (i.e. as a response). For example, drawing a map while listening to a tape, listening to an instruction and

performing a command may be referred to as tasks. Tasks may or may not involve the production of language. A task usually requires the teacher to specify what will be regarded as successful completion of the task. The use of a variety of different kinds of tasks in language teaching is said to make language teaching more communicative since it provides a purpose for a classroom activity which goes beyond the practice of language for its own sake.

In this definition, it can be seen clearly that the tasks will take place inside the classroom in which the students will do such activities created by the teacher. The tasks should be communicative activities since the focus is how to use the language for the sake of communication.

Breen (1987) in Nunan (2004: 3) offers another definition of a pedagogical task, that is, any structured language learning endeavour which has a particular objective, appropriate content, a specified working procedure, and a range of outcomes for those who undertake the task. 'Task' is therefore assumed to refer to a range of workplans which have the overall purposes of facilitating language learning – from the simple and brief exercise type, to more complex and lengthy activities such as group problem-solving or simulations and decision-making. This definition is very broad, implying as it does that just about anything the learner does in the classroom qualifies as a task.

In addition, Ellis (2003) in Nunan (2004: 3) defines a pedagogical task as a workplan that requires learners to process language pragmatically in order to achieve an outcome that can be evaluated in terms of whether the correct or appropriate propositional content has been conveyed. To this end, it requires them

to give primary attention to meaning and to make use of their own linguistic resources, although the design of the task may predispose them to choose particular forms. A task is intended to result in language use that bears a resemblance, direct or indirect, to the way language is used in the real world. Like other language activities, a task can engage productive or receptive, and speaking or written skills and also various cognitive processes.

Last but not least Nunan (2004: 4) states that a pedagogical task is a piece of classroom work that involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is focused on mobilizing their grammatical knowledge in order to express meaning, and in which the intention is to convey meaning rather than to manipulate form. The task should also have a sense of completeness, being able to stand alone as a communicative act in its own right with a beginning, a middle and an end.

Based on the ideas explained above, the tasks used in this research include the pedagogical tasks since they are applied in the classroom context during the learning process. The tasks meant should concern communicative activities which let the students comprehend the target language and communicate with it for the real language use. Additionally, the task should also facilitate the students to use their grammatical knowledge in conveying the meaning.

2.3. Concept of Task Complexity

In the Cognition Hypothesis proposed by Robinson (2001a: 33), it is claimed that pedagogic task should be designed and sequenced on the basis of task complexity,

specifically in terms of the manipulation of cognitice factors. Robinson distinguishes between the term task complexity (cognitive factors) and task difficulty (learner factors), which were previously used interchangeably. Besides, he also distinguishes task complexity and task conditions (interactive factors). Therefore, Robinson proposes the Triadic Componential Framework composed from those three aspects. The components of Robinson's Triadic Framework can be seen as follows:

Task Complexity (Cognitive Factors)	**Task Conditions** (Interactive Factors)	**Task Difficulty** (Learner Factors)
a) resource-directing	**a) participation variable**	**a) affective variables**
e.g. +/- few elements	e.g. one-way/two way	e.g. motivation
+/- here and now	convergent/divergent	anxiety
+/- no reasoning demands	open/closed	confidence
b) resource-depleting	**b) participation variables**	**b) ability variables**
e.g. +/- planning	e.g. gender	e.g. aptitude
+/- single task	familiarity	proficiency
+/- prior knowledge	power/solidarity	intelligence
Sequencing criteria	----------	Methodological criteria
Prospective decisions about task unit		on-line decision about pairs and groups

According to Robinson (2001a: 29), task complexity is defined as the result of the attentional, memory, reasoning, and other information processing demands imposed by the structure of the task on the language learner. These differences in information processing demands, resulting from design charateristics, are relatively fixed and invariant. From this definition, Crespo (2011: 2) assumes that, firstly, tasks differ in their degree of complexity, which in turn affects L2 production. Secondly, the internal features of a task can be manipulated so that the effects of different factors on L2 production can be measured and later predicted.

Additionally, in the TCF, features affecting the cognitive complexity of the tasks can essentially be manipulated along two types of variables that affect resource allocation differently during L2 task performance:

1. *Resource-depleting variables*: related to performative and procedural demands (e.g. planning time, single/double task, or prior knowledge of task or topic). Increasing these variables makes great demands on learners' attentional and memory resources and, consequently, disperses them.
2. *Resource-directing variables*: related to cognitive and conceptual demands (e.g. number of elements, few elements, reasoning demands). It draws learners' attention to vocabulary and syntax encoding.

Resource-depleting variables should encourage faster and more automatic L2 access and use (i.e. therefore approximating real-life demands), but they do not direct resources to features of language code, whereas resource-directing variables direct learners' attention to forms needed to meet task demands, and therefore, they will use a wider lexical variety, more complex grammatical structures and more accurate speech, usually at the expense of fluency.

However, concerning task complexity, Skehan (1998) in Skehan (2003: 5) proposes that attentional resources are limited, and that to attend to one aspect of performance (complexity of language, accuracy, fluency) may well mean that other dimensions suffer. Skehan and Foster (1997, 2001) in Skehan (2003: 5) argue for the existence of tradeoffs in performance, such that, typically, greater fluency may be accompanied by greater accuracy or greater complexity, but not both. Further, in Mahpul (2014: 23), Skehan predicts that tasks which are made

more difficult (more cognitively engaging), will decrease learners‟ L2 performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) because their attentional resources are forced to primarily focus on meaning rather than on form. This statement is contradictory with Robinson (2003: 45), arguing that increasing task complexity along the resource-directing dimension should elicit less fluent, but more accurate and complex production.

Regardless the controversy, this research kept focussing on the task complexity since it can be used to predict the task difficulty in advance, whereas the learner factors such as motivation, anxiety, confidence, etc., can not be used to predict it. Thus, in designing the task, it is better if the task complexity becomes the main consideration. Additionally, in this research the tasks designed by manipulating the task complexity in term of resource-directing dimension only, because it refers to cognitive/conceptual demands requiring attention and working memory that directs learners to focus on linguistic form.

2.4. Manipulating Task Complexity

As it is explained above, that the task complexity was only manipulated along with resource directing dimension, so in doing it, the three variables of the dimension, that is, number of elements, here-now/there-then, and reasoning demand, were combined and sequenced from simple to complex task. In other words, in manipulating the tasks, the researcher had increased and decreased the task complexity of all variables in the resource-directing simultaneously. The examples of task manipulation design are as follows:

Condition 1 : - Few Elements, - Here & Now, - Reasoning Demand

Condition 2 : - Few Elements, - Here & Now, + Reasoning Demand

Condition 3 : - Few Elements, + Here & Now, - Reasoning Demand

Condition 4 : - Few Elements, + Here & Now, + Reasoning Demand

Condition 5 : + Few Elements, - Here & Now, - Reasoning Demand

Condition 6 : + Few Elements, - Here & Now, + Reasoning Demand

Condition 7 : + Few Elements, + Here & Now, - Reasoning Demand

Condition 8 : + Few Elements, + Here & Now, + Reasoning Demand

Note:

- Few Elements : Students must arrange and discuss many pictures concerning to the topic.

+ Few Elements : Students must arrange and discuss fewer pictures concerning to the topic.

- Here & Now : Students must use past tense in making sentences.

+ Here & Now : Students must use present tense in making sentences.

- Reasoning Demand : Students must state their reasons while expressing their ideas

+ Reasoning Demand: Students do not need to state their reasons.

Concerning resource-directing dimension, there have been many studies about the variables of the dimension. They are as follows:

1. + Few Elements vs - Few Elements

The Cognition Hypothesis states that identifying few easily distinguished elements within a task is simpler than identifying many similar elements. It can be

claimed that relatively few researches have investigated the +/- few elements of The Cognition Hypothesis. In an oral interactive task, Robinson (2001b) manipulated the factor +/- few elements. From the research, it is revealed that the task containing few elements will increase fluency, but decrease accuracy and complexity. Meanwhile task containing many elements will increase accuracy and complexity, but decrease fluency.

2. + Here & Now vs - Here & Now

In his research, Rahimpour (2015) used +/- Here-and-Now as distinction between narratives performed when learners describe a series of event in the present tense while looking at pictures illustrating them (Here-and-Now), versus narratives performed from memory without looking at the pictures, and delivered in the past tense (There-and-Then). Thus, in this case, Here-and-Now refers to the usage of simple present tense, while There-and-Then refers to simple past tense. Based on the research, he found There-and-Then narratives led to more accuracy, than Here-Now task. Meanwhile Here-and-Now led to complexity and fluency.

Meanwhile, Robinson (1995: 100) found that increasing task complexity along resource-directing dimensions of cognitive complexity (e.g., +/- Here-and-Now) will be associated with simultaneous increase in lexical complexity and accuracy, but no significant differences for structural complexity.

3. + Reasoning Demand vs - Reasoning Demand

Prabhu (1987) in Mohammadi, Yousefi, & Afghari (2012: 20) claims that tasks requiring selective information transmission +*reasoning* to establish causality, and justification of believes are more complex than tasks requiring non-selective

information transmission, without these demands. Relating to this variable, Crespo (2011) in his thesis confirms that the task in which more reasons are demanded will decrease fluency, but increase accuracy. Additionally, there is no significant effect on complexity.

2.5. Spoken Performance

In this study, spoken performance refers to the performance of spoken language said by the language learners. As it was cited from an article of Queensland Government (2005), that spoken language is commonly understood as what a student says. Teachers are alert to how well students talk and listen in class. Furthermore, Doshi & Roy (2008: 1) assume that spoken language is one of the most intuitive forms of interaction between humans and agents.

Meanwhile, performance is considered to be the physical representation, usually in utterances of any type, of the human competence (Chomsky, 1965 in Jaimes, 2006). It refers to "how" someone uses language in actual speech production and comprehension (Fromkin and Rodman, 1981 in Wahyuni, 2014: 84).

Based on the theories about spoken language and performance, it can be summarized that spoken performance is the way how people use language in actual speech production which results an interaction. The spoken language performed was in the form of a monologue.

In this study, the students performed a monologue containing task complexity that was manipulated into eight types of tasks. A monologue was used since it is a

generally uninterrupted speech or narrative that tells a complete story or expresses a complete line of thought Davis (2007: 179). Besides, in a monologue, learners can stay with their own language and resources but they also have to rely on these. They do not receive other feedback and no interactional modifications will focus their attention to neither form nor meaning.

Due to the reasons above, the researcher assumes that monologue is easier to be analyzed since there is only one person who is speaking, so there will be no disturbance from other people's voice. In addition, even though, learners cannot get feedbacks from the interlocutors, but they can develop their own skill because they have to rely on themselves and monitor their speech.

2.6. Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF)

In TBLT research, complexity, accuracy, and fluency are regarded as the manifestation of learners' language performance (Mahpul, 2014: 39). Then, according to Housen and Kuiken (2009: 22), CAF emerge as principal phenomena of the psycholinguistic mechanisms and process underlying the acquisition, representation and processing L2 knowledge. Therefore, the speaking performance of this research will be measured in terms of CAF. They are explained as follows:

1. Complexity

Complexity is defined as the capacity to use more advanced language, with the possibility that such language may no be controlled so effectively. This may also involve a greater willingness to take risk and use fewer controlled language

subsystems. This area is also taken to correlate with a greater likelihood of restructuring, that is, change and development in the interlanguage system (Skehan & Foster, 1999 in Mahpul, 2014: 41). This means that complexity concerns to how students modify the language. This give the students a space to use the language for communication without any burden.

Besides, according to Ellis (2003) as cited by Housen & Kuiken (2009: 2), complexity is 'the extent to which learners produce elaborated language', and is often concerned with syntactic and lexical aspects of narrative performance. Thus, this research will also analyze complexity in terms of syntactic and lexical complexity.

Some researchers use T-units as the unit for analysis, however, Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) in Inoue (2010: 3) recommend using C-units or AS-units because they can take sub-clausal units into account. In addition, Foster, Tonkyn, and Wigglesworth (2000: 3) in Inoue, argue that AS-units are more reliable than C-units. This is because AS-units can clearly distinguish among false starts, repetitions, and self-corrections. Therefore, in this study AS-units are employed where units are necessary in the measures (the number of words per AS-unit and the average number of subordinate clauses per AS-unit). AS unit is a single speaker's utterance consisting of an independent clause, or sub-clausal unit, together with any subordinate clause (s) associated with either (Foster, 2000) in Mahpul (2014: 41).

In this study, syntactic complexity was measured by means of the total number of clauses per AS unit and by a subordination index: the ratio of subordinate clauses

per total number of clauses. While, lexical complexity was measured by calculating the ratio of lexical words to total number of words (Mahpul, 2014: 41).

2. Accuracy

Skehan & Foster (1999) in Mahpul (2014: 9), define accuracy as the ability to avoid error in performance, possibly reflecting higher levels of control in the language as well as a conservative orientation, that is, avoidance of challenging structure that might provoke error. The definition shows that accuracy refers to the structure of the language used.

Regarding accuracy, it was calculated by means of the total number of errors per AS-Units (Michel, Kuiken & Vedder 2007: 248), and the number of lexical errors as well as the total number of omissions (of articles, verbs, and subjects), both in relation to the number of AS units. In other words, accuracy can be calculated by counting the percentage of Error-Free AS-Unit (Mahpul, 2014).

3. Fluency

Fluency is the rapid, smooth, accurate, lucid, and efficient translation of thought or communicative intention into language under the tempspeaking constraints of on-line processing (Lennon, 2000) in Morris (2012: 1). Hence, the fluency focuses on the smoothness of conveying the message while communicating.

With respect to fluency, Yuan and Ellis (2003) in Mahpul (2014: 70) offer two measures, Rate A and Rate B. To measure fluency by using Speech Rate A, the number of syllables generated from task performance, divided by the total number of seconds used to complete the task and multiplied by 60; Speech Rate B, the

same calculation as for Rate B, but repetitions, reformulations, false starts, and comments in the L1 are excluded from the calculation.

Rate B is supposed to be more precise. It excludes elements such as repetitions or reformulations and through which learners sometimes try to gain time (Levkina, 2008: 85). For that reason, this research used Speech Rate B since it ignores the repetitions, reformulations, false starts, and comments in the L1, so the researcher only focused on the students' performance in L2.

2.7. Previous Studies on Task Complexity

There have been many studies conducted concerning the manipulation of task complexity in the tasks of speaking performance and writing performance. However, the researcher only reviewed the following studies which focused on spoken performance, since this study was conducted in that domain.

First of all, Michel, Kuiken, and Vedder (2007: 241) conducted a research on task-based performance in Dutch as a second language. He manipulated the factor +/- few elements and +/- monologic. From the research, it is revealed that the linguistic complexity and accuracy both increased in cognitively complex tasks while fluency decreased. The result confirmed the Cognition Hypothesis proposed by Robinson.

Furthermore, Rahimpour (2015) used +/- Here-and-Now as distinction between narratives performed when learners describe a series of event in the present tense while looking at pictures illustrating them (Here-and-Now), versus narratives

performed from memory without looking at the pictures, and delivered in the past tense (There-and-Then). Based on the research, he found There-and-Then narratives were more accurate. Meanwhile Here-and-Now led to complexity and fluency. Meanwhile, Robinson (1995: 100) assumes that increasing task complexity along resource-directing dimensions of cognitive complexity (e.g., +/- Here-and-Now) will be associated with simultaneous increases in complexity and accuracy,

Then, one of the studies on task complexity was conducted by Shahreza, Dabaghi, Zohreh (2011: 173) entitled "The Present Study Explored The Effects Of Task Complexity On The Occurrence of Language-Related Episodes During Learner-Learner Interaction of 40 EFL Students". In the study, task complexity was manipulated using two factors: (1) reasoning demands; and (2) number of elements. Participants performed four tasks of two types (picture narration and picture difference). The study bore mixed results; while in some versions of the tasks, complexity and the occurrence of LREs positively correlated, this pattern did not hold true for all the tasks and proficiency levels. Moreover, the observed increase was mostly in the number of lexical LREs than that of grammatical ones. However, this study did not concentrate on the speaking performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

Besides the study above, Crespo (2011) in his thesis analyzed the effects of increasing task complexity along reasoning demands on L2 speaking performance, factoring in individual differences in working memory capacity (WMC) and affective factors. Related to task complexity, Crespo just focused on

manipulating task complexity in resource directing, that is, reasoning demand. The result of the research confirmed that the task which is made much more complex, in which more reasons are demanded will decrease fluency, but increase accuracy. Additionally, there is no significant effect on complexity.

In contrast to Crespo's study, the study conducted by Azizi, Asoudeh & Ali (2012: 26) entitled "The Role of Task Complexity on EFL Learners' Speaking Production in English Language Institutions", investigated the effect of simple and complex tasks on Iranian L2 learners' speaking production in English language institutes in EFL context by measuring three aspects of learner production: accuracy, fluency, and complexity. They manipulated task complexity by combining resource-directing dimension in term of reasoning demand, and resource-dispersing dimension in term of prior-knowledge. The finding of this study revealed that the task made more complex by combining resource directing and resource dispersing results the highest accuracy and fluency in learners' speaking performance. On the contrary, the task made simpler by combining those two dimensions results the lowest accuracy, fluency, and syntactic complexity. Meanwhile, combining complex task and simple task from both domains results the highest syntactic complexity.

In line to Azizi, Asoudeh & Azar (2012) which combined resource-directing and resource-dispersing, Saeedi, Ketabi, Kazerooni (2012) conducted the impact of manipulating the cognitive complexity of tasks on EFL learners' narrative task performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency of their production. To this aim, by drawing upon Robinson's Triadic Componential Framework (TCF),

four levels of task complexity were operationalized. Sixty-five Iranian students studying English as a foreign language at the intermediate level participated in this research. The obtained results revealed that manipulating different dimensions of task complexity exerts differential effects on complexity, accuracy, and fluency of learners' narrative task performance. Additionally, it was shown that keeping tasks simple along the resource-dispersing dimension, while making them more demanding along the resource-directing dimension results in a simultaneous increase in complexity and accuracy.

Furthermore, Mahpul (2014: 8) had also conducted a research on task complexity by combining resource-directing and resource-depleting. He combined number of elements and familiarity variables. Nevertheless, the research did not see the effects of the task complexity in monologic task like the other previous studies, but in dialogic task. Additionally, the perception of students towards the task complexity also became his concern.

Last but not least, Madarsara & Rahimy (2015: 247) focused on resource-dispersing, that is, prior-knowledge. They manipulated task complexity by adapting a map task and a car task from the previous studies. In that study, learners were provided picture stories about familiar and unfamiliar maps. The finding of the research showed that the task sequence and complexity were effective in enhancing EFL learners' complexity, fluency and accuracy of the speaking production. However, the most significant difference was found in the complexity of the speaking production.

Based on the previous studies above, the researcher conducted a slightly similar research but there was difference in the variables of dimension manipulated. To the researcher's knowledge, the existing studies mostly concerned about combining resource-directing and resource-depleting, and other studies just discussed about task manipulation in a particular dimension without manipulating all variables in one dimension. Thus, this research just focused on manipulating task complexity by combining three variables of resource-directing dimension. It was done since the cognitive factor, that is, resource-directing dimension leads learners more to the linguistic components, than resource-depleting. This might be the novelty that revealed through this research.

2.8. Theoretical Assumption

According to some theories, it can be concluded that drilling and memorizing a set of vocabularies are inadequate to teach language, especially English. However focusing on meaning only is also not enough, thus teaching should involve focusing both forms and meaning in order to achieve native-like accuracy.

Hence, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) also provides learners with opportunities for interaction that enable learners to work to understand each other, and express their own meaning, and listen to language which may be beyond their present ability. There have been many studies concerning the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching in speaking performance. Most of them are focused on trying out the Cognition Hypothesis proposed by Robinson.

In his hypothesis, Robinson suggests that cognitive factor/task complexity (consisting resource-directing and resource-depleting dimension) should be the main factor in developing task-based learning because it can be predicted in the beginning before designing the tasks. However, this research only focused on resource-directing dimension since it directs learners to linguistic form.

Additionally, Robinson assumes that task made more complex will increase accuracy and complexity but decrease fluency in the students' speaking performance. Thus, the researcher tried to manipulate task complexity by combining the three variables of resource-directing dimension. From this research, it is assumed that increasing task complexity of the three variables of resource-directing dimension simultaneously will increase complexity and accuracy but decrease fluency.

2.9. Hypotheses

Based on the literature review and the previous studies elaborated above, the hypotheses are formulated, as follows:

H_0. The use of task complexity in spoken performance has no significant effect on students' oral production in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

H_1. The use of task complexity in spoken performance has significant effects on students' oral production in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter includes research design, setting of the research, population and sample, research procedure, data collecting technique, validity and reliability of the instrument and data analysis.

3.1. Research Design

One group repeated measures design was carried out in this research. This kind of design was used since the tasks were administered to one group of students, but they performed eight times. There were eight levels of independent variables, and three dependent variables (Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency). Related to the independent variables, there were eight kinds of tasks administered to the students. They are as follows:

Condition 1 : - Few Elements, - Here & Now, - Reasoning Demand

Condition 2 : - Few Elements, - Here & Now, + Reasoning Demand

Condition 3 : - Few Elements, + Here & Now, - Reasoning Demand

Condition 4 : - Few Elements, + Here & Now, + Reasoning Demand

Condition 5 : + Few Elements, - Here & Now, - Reasoning Demand

Condition 6 : + Few Elements, - Here & Now, + Reasoning Demand

Condition 7 : + Few Elements, + Here & Now, - Reasoning Demand

Condition 8 : + Few Elements, + Here & Now, + Reasoning Demand

Each student's spoken performance was analyzed in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. Those three aspects were measured based on certain formula. Then, the results were found out by means of ANOVA. In the end *Post Hoc* Test was run to investigate the significant differences among the tasks.

3.2. Setting of The Research

The setting includes the time and the place of the research. This research was conducted in the academic year of 2015/2016, in January, 11th 2016. It was held at SMPN 11 Bandar Lampung, especially in IX I.

3.3. Population and Sample

There were nine classes of the ninth grade students in SMP N 11 Bandar Lampung. However IX I consisting of 30 students was taken as the sample. This class was chosen since the speaking ability of the students in the class was homogenous, in other words, their ability in speaking was almost similar. The data were got from the previous result of their speaking test.

3.4. Research Procedures

In doing the research, there were some procedures done. They are as follows:

3.4.1. Preparing the tasks

There were eight kinds of tasks given to the students. The material for the tasks was about procedure text. It was chosen based on the syllabus of KTSP for the ninth grade students of Junior High School. All the tasks were made by combining and manipulating the three variables of resource-directing dimension (number of elements, here-now/there-then, and reasoning demand).

The first task contained many elements, there & then, and reasoning demand. The second contained many elements, there & then, and no reasoning demand. The third consisted of many elements, here & now, and reasoning demand. The fourth comprised many elements, here & now, and no reasoning demand. The fifth combined few elements, there & then, and reasoning demand. The sixth was composed with few elements, there & then, and no reasoning demand. The seventh consisted of few elements, here & now, and reasoning demand. The last task contained few elements, here & now, and no reasoning demand. (Appendix I)

Before administering the tasks to the sample chosen, firstly they were tried out to some students who were supposed to have the same speaking ability as the students in IX I. This was done since the tasks designed were not valid and reliable yet.

During the try out, firstly the students had difficulties in finding the English for some words. Thus, the researcher gave ten minutes for them to find the words in the dictionary. In turn, the students were given the tasks. However, before the students performed the tasks, the researcher let them learn the instructions of the tasks. Then, they directly did the spoken performance based on the tasks.

In accordance with the result of the try out, it was known that, most students did not have any difficulty to do the tasks which obliged them to use sentence structure (present tense and past tense) in making sentences. Nevertheless, one of them (Student 3) still used imperative sentences to do some tasks. Additionally, concerning the reasoning demands, almost all students did not state their reasons of doing each step. They ignored the instructions which they thought hard to understand. Hence, in the real research, the researcher decided to let the students ask some questions if they were unable to comprehend the instructions. Moreover, the researcher used partly Indonesian to make students understand what to do.

3.4.2. Determining the sample

In determining the sample, the researcher chose IX I class which consisted of 30 students, due to the assumption that the class was homogeneous. The homogeneity was got from the result of their speaking scores in the second semester of the academic year 2014/2015 and also their speaking score in the previous material in the academic year 2015/2016.

3.4.3. Conducting the tasks

Before conducting the tasks, the researcher gave the eight tasks to each student. They were given ten minutes to learn the instructions of the tasks and find out the English of some words in the dictionary. They were also given a chance to ask about the instructions they did not understand, besides, the researcher used Indonesian to make the students comprehend the tasks. Nevertheless, they were given no time to practice. Hence, managing time well is a must in order to avoid practice effect which will influence the result of spoken performance.

After that the researcher collected the tasks from the students. Then, the 30 students were divided into five groups consisted of six students per group, and placed into five different rooms. This was done in order to make the activity run effectively and avoid the students from cheating.

Besides preparing the students, the researcher also prepared the assistants who guided the students in performing the tasks. They were four university students from IAIN who were having teaching practice in SMPN 11 Bandar Lampung. Thus, there were five teachers including the researcher who guided the students to do the tasks, so one teacher guided six students. Every teacher just needed to give the tasks to each student and recorded the students' voice by using a cellular phone.

While conducting the tasks, one student had to perform eight kinds of tasks, meanwhile, the other five students were waiting for their turns outside the room. This made the process of recording ran well since there was no disturbance from other students' voices. When the first student had finished doing the tasks, he/she must return to his/her class. It was done to avoid the other students cheating or asking for information from the first one.

In performing the tasks, firstly, the students arranged the jumbled pictures in a good order. Then they had to tell about the pictures orally. The differences among the tasks were in the number of pictures provided, the sentence structure that should be used, and also the reasons demanded. For further information, the examples of the tasks can be seen in Appendix 1.

3.5. Data Collecting Technique

The data collected were in the form of students' utterances. They were transcribed, coded, analyzed, and calculated. To answer the research questions, there were some steps done by the researcher, they are as follows:

3.5.1. Determining the instrument

The instrument for answering the research question was the tasks containing task complexity. There were eight different types of tasks with different levels of task complexity, as they were mentioned in the first step of research procedure.

3.5.2. Recording the students' utterances

To obtain the data, the researcher recorded the students' utterances by using recorder application in the cell-phone. Since there were 30 students who performed eight types of task / student, so there were 240 monologues recorded in the cellular phones.

3.5.3. Transcribing and coding the students' utterances

The students' utterances need transcribing. It means the spoken form must be transferred into the written form. Having done it, the written utterances were coded by certain symbols. They were coded into clauses, AS-unit, lexical words for complexity, number of errors for accuracy, and number of syllables and length of time for fluency. These two processes were carried out by the researcher.

3.6. Validity and Reliability of The Instrument

To get valid and reliable data, the instrument used should fulfill the validity and reliability. Regarding validity, the instrument should at least fulfill content validity and construct validity.

3.6.1. Content Validity

To fulfill the content validity, the material for the speaking task was taken based on KTSP curriculum (Curriculum 2006). Due to the reason, the procedure text in the form of monologue was chosen for the students' tasks. In the syllabus of KTSP, it is stated in Standard Competence 4, Basic Competence 4.2, in which the students are expected to express the meaning in the form of monologue by using language variations accurately, fluently, and acceptable to interact in the daily context in procedure and report text.

3.6.2. Construct Validity

The tasks given to the students were composed based on the theories of some experts and also experts' judgments in order to get construct validity. Since spoken performance was investigated, thus the tasks made were based on the theory of spoken language performance on the second chapter. Besides, because this research was included in TBLT research, thus the speaking performance was measured in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

Additionally, the tasks made should also be based on the theories of task complexity, especially the resource-directing dimension consisting of number of

elements, here-now/there-then, and reasoning demand. Due to the reason, each task consisted of the three variables that had been manipulated.

3.6.3. Reliability

This research focused on the students' spoken performance, which belongs to subjective test, thus, the researcher used inter-rater to obtain more reliable data. The inter-rater was one of the Post-Graduate students of English Department in Lampung University. Before doing the calculation, firstly, the two raters attempted to have similar perception towards some terms related to complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

In scoring the students' spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency, the researcher did a discussion with the inter-rater when there were some significant differences found in the final scores. After the two scorings had been done, it was important to make sure that both results were reliable. Reliability of each task was examined by using statistical measurement of reliability in SPSS, that was, Cohen's Kappa. As it was stated by Landis & Koch (1977) in SPSS Tutorial (2008), the criteria of Kappa are as follows:

Kappa	Interpretation
< 0	Poor agreement
0.0 – 0.20	Slight agreement
0.21 – 0.40	Fair agreement
0.41 – 0.60	Moderate agreement
0.61 – 0.80	Substantial agreement
0.81 – 1.00	Almost perfect agreement

In this research, the result of inter-rater reliability of each task in terms of complexity (Syntactic and Lexical), accuracy, and fluency can be seen in the following table,

Table 3.1. Inter-Rater Reliability

CAF / TASKS	Syntactic Complexity	Lexical Complexity	Accuracy	Fluency
1	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	0.828 (Almost Perfect)	0.927 (Almost Perfect)	0.897 (Almost Perfect)
2	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	0.965 (Almost Perfect)	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	0.897 (Almost Perfect)
3	0,964 (Almost Perfect)	0.862 (Almost Perfect)	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	0.691 (Substantial)
4	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	0.827 (Almost Perfect)	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	0.828 (Almost Perfect)
5	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	0.693 (Substantial)
6	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	0.965 (Almost Perfect)	0.956 (Almost Perfect)	0.897 (Almost Perfect)
7	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	0.897 (Almost Perfect)
8	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	1.000 (Almost Perfect)	0,930 (Almost Perfect)
Average	0.9955 (Almost Perfect)	0.9308 (Almost Perfect)	0.9854 (Almost Perfect)	0,8413 (Almost Perfect)

According to the data above, it can be concluded that the inter-rater reliability of the eight tasks was almost perfect in scoring the syntactic complexity, lexical complexity, accuracy, and fluency. It means the two raters had the same agreement in calculating the oral production. The calculation is in Appendix V.

3.7. Data Analysis

After the data needed were collected, then they were coded and counted in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. The explanation is as follows:

3.7.1. Complexity

This research analyzed complexity in terms of syntactic and lexical complexity, Syntactic complexity can be measured by means of the total number of clauses per AS unit and by a subordination index: the ratio of subordinate clauses per total number of clauses. However, this research just measured syntactic complexity by means of calculating the ratio of clauses to AS unit, like the previous study done by Michel, Kuiken, & Vedder (2007). AS unit is a single speaker's utterance consisting of an independent clause, or sub-clausal unit, together with any subordinate clause (s) associated with either (Foster, 2000) in Mahpul (2014: 41).

Syntactic Complexity

$$\frac{\text{Number of clauses}}{\text{Total number AS unit}}$$

Coding and calculating the syntactic complexity can be as follows:

> |I will to make instant noodle (C).| |I prepare mustard green, instant noodle, water and egg (C) because the ingredients easy to find it.| |Next, say... I rebus

> I... water in di... in the pan because *lebih mudah memasaknya*| |and then, I put instant noodle in the pan (C)| |and I stir (C) agar instant noodle *mengembang*| |and then, I... I... I *campurkan* spicy in the pan, agar... because *rasanya lebih enak*| |and then, I put eggs and mustard green in the pan (C)| |And I stir. (C)| |Instant noodle ready to serve. | (01 : 15)

Based on the example given, AS-units are separated by the vertical lines (||) and a clause is symbolized by "C" letter. In determining a clause, the verbs in Indonesian are not counted in, and group of words without verbs cannot be categorized as a clause. For that reason, the example of student's voice transcription contains nine AS-units and seven clauses, so the syntactic complexity can be calculated, as follows:

$$\frac{6}{9} = 0{,}67$$

While, lexical complexity was measured by calculating the percentage of lexical words to total number of words (Mahpul, 2014: 68).

Lexical Complexity

$$\frac{\text{Lexical words}}{\text{Total number of words}} \text{ X } 100\%$$

However, there are some points to consider in determining the lexical words.

Table 3.2. Calculation of Lexical Words

No.	Lexical Words	Examples

1	Full verbs, nouns, adjective, adverbs ending in *ly*	buy, houses, good, carefully
2	The verbs *have, do, be* except when used as Auxiliaries	I *have* much money
3	Wrongly conjugated verbs	Buyed
4	Words that have problems with number	Man, Men
5	Interjections	hi, hello, goodbye
6	Hyphenated words and contractions	I'm, I'd
7	Conjugated forms of verbs count as different types	do and did
8	Phrasal verbs	to get up
9	In preposition verbs	Interested in

Coding and calculating the lexical complexity can be as follows:

> I will to make instant noodle. I prepare mustard green, instant noodle, water and egg because the ingredients easy to find it. Next, {say...) I {rebus I}... water in {di... in} the pan because {*lebih mudah memasaknya*}and then, I put instant noodle in the pan and I stir {agar} instant noodle {*mengembang*} and then, I... {I... I *campurkan*} spicy in the pan, {agar...} because {*rasanya lebih enak,*} and then, I put eggs and mustard green in the pan, and I stir. Instant noodle ready to serve. (01 : 15)

In accordance with the transcription above, the underlined words are the lexical words, so it is known that there are 34 lexical words contained, and the total number of words is 70. In determining the total number of words, false starts, repetition, and words in mother tongue are excluded. Finally, the calculation of lexical complexity is as follows:

$$\frac{34}{70} \text{ X } 100\% = 48{,}57$$

3.7.2. Accuracy

Regarding to accuracy, it was calculated by means of determining the percentage of error-free AS-units to number of AS-units (Mahpul, 2014: 69). It is argued that it best represents the accuracy learner performance in terms of syntax, morphology, and native like lexical choice or word order.

$$\frac{\text{Error-free AS-units}}{\text{Total number of AS-units}} \text{ X } 100\%$$

The example of calculating accuracy is as follows:

> |I will ~~to~~ make instant noodle.| |I ~~prepare~~ mustard green, instant noodle, water and egg because the ingredients × easy to find ~~it.~~| |Next, {say...) I ~~{rebus I}~~... water in {di... in} the pan because {*lebih mudah memasaknya*}|and then, I put instant noodle ~~in~~ the pan| and I ~~stir~~ {agar} instant noodle {*mengembang*}| | and then, I... {I... I *campurkan*} spicy in the pan, ~~{agar...}~~ because {*rasanya lebih enak,*}||and then, I put eggs and mustard green ~~in~~ the pan,| | and I ~~stir.~~| |Instant noodle × ready to serve. | (01 : 15)

Having analyzed every sentence in the transcription above, there is no AS-unit which is error free, thus, the accuracy is 0.

3.7.3. Fluency

To measure fluency, this research implemented Speech Rate B in which the number of syllables generated from task performance, divided by the total number of seconds used to complete the task and multiplied by 60 (Mahpul, 2014: 70). For Speech Rate B, repetitions, reformulations, false starts, and comments in the L1 are excluded from the calculation. Thus, the researcher only focused on the students' utterances in L2.

$$\frac{\text{Number of syllables}}{\text{Total number of seconds}} \text{ X } 60$$

The calculation for fluency in this research is as follows,

> I (1) will (1) to (1) make (1) instant (2) noodle (2). I (1) prepare (2) mustard (2) green (1), instant (2) noodle (2), water (2) and (1) egg (1) because (2) the (1) ingredients (3) easy (2) to (1) find (1) it (1). Next (1), {say...) I (1) {rebus I}... water (2) in (1) {di... in} the (1) pan (1) because (2) {*lebih mudah memasaknya*}and (1) then (1), I (1) put (1) instant (2) noodle (2) in (1) the (1) pan (1) and (1) I (1) stir (1) {agar} instant (2) noodle (2) {*mengembang*} and (1) then (1), I (1)... {I... I *campurkan*} spicy (2) in (1) the (1) pan (1), {agar...} because (2) {*rasanya lebih enak,*} and (1) then (1), I (1) put (1) eggs (1) and (1) mustard (2) green (1) in (1) the (1) pan (1), and (1) I (1) stir (1). Instant (2) noodle (2) ready (2) to (1) serve (1). (01 : 15)

The transcription above contains 93 syllables, so the fluency is,

$$\frac{93}{75} \text{ X } 60 = 74{,}4$$

Having got the result of students' speaking performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency, the SPSS statistical package was run to investigate the difference of the eight tasks.

3.8. Hypotheses Testing

Hypotheses are restated as follows,

H_0. "The use of task complexity in spoken performance has no significant effect on students' oral production in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency."

H_1. "The use of task complexity in spoken performance has significant effects on students' oral production in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency."

To test the hypotheses, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run. It was used to find out the statistical significance of mean differences. Then, in the table of ANOVA the comparison among the means could be clearly seen. In the end, *Post Hoc* Scheffe test was also done to find out the exact location of the mean differences. The hypotheses were analyzed at the significant level of 0.05 ($p < 0.05$).

V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This part describes the conclusions of the research and also the suggestions for the other researchers and English teachers who want to design a task for students. They are elaborated as follows,

5.1. Conclusions

With reference to the results and discussions of the current research, the use of task complexity simultaneously manipulated by increasing and decreasing resource-directing dimension in spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency by the ninth grade students of SMPN 11 Bandar Lampung was partly in line with the Cognition Hypothesis.

The more complex the task, the more complex oral production the students produced in particular complexity (i.e. Syntactic Complexity and Lexical Complexity. However, the learners' oral production in term of accuracy did not support the Cognition Hypothesis.

Furthermore, the simplest task (Task 8) did not result in the fluent oral production. This should be due to the factor of familiarity. This indicates that familiarity influences learners' fluency.

5.2. Suggestions

In accordance with the conclusions above, suggestions for English teachers and further research are made as follows:

English teachers who want the students to have a high level of complexity in their oral production, the speaking task should be manipulated by increasing three variables of resource-directing dimension simultaneously. In other words, it is better to design a task containing many things to discuss, using simple past tense, and facilitating students to express their reasons.

In addition, the task that can make the students produce accurate oral production should contain many elements to discuss, and use simple past tense, but it is not important to ask the students to state their reasons. Last but not least, to make the students produce more fluent oral production, the task had better consist of few elements to discuss and use simple present tense. Another important thing to consider is that, teachers should pay attention to the familiarity factor of the task which can influence the result of fluency in oral production.

Meanwhile, a further research with respect to task complexity needs to take a number of factors to take into account. It is better to design the task by manipulating not only resource-directing dimension but also resource-depleting dimension. In other words, there will be such a complex combination between all variables of resource-directing and the variables of resource-depleting in one task.

Additionally, most researchers concerning task complexity just focus on speaking and writing skill. Hence, it is expected that there are other researchers who will do

such a research which focus on reading or listening skill with various materials besides narrative and procedure text.

REFERENCES

Azizi, M., Fatemeh, A., & Ali, S.A. (2012). The Role of Task Complexity on EFL Learners' Oral Production in English Language Institutions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistic Studies,* Vol. 1 (1), 22-27.

Baleghizadeh, S. (2010). Focus On Form In An EFL Communicative Classroom. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language),* Vol. 4 (1), 119-128.

Crespo, M. R. (2011). *The Effects Of Task Complexity On L2 Oral Production As Mediated By Differences In Working Memory Capacity*. Barcelona: University of Barcelona. Unpublished Script.

Davis, James. (2007). Dialogue, Monologue, and Soliloquy in The Large Lecture Class. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, Vol, 19 (2), 178-182.

Doshi, F. & Nicholas, R., (2008). Spoken Language Interaction with Model Uncertainty: An Adaptive Human-Robot Interaction System. *Connection Science,* Vol. 00 (00), 1-21.

Fotos, S. (1998). Shifting The Focus from Forms to Form in The EFL Classroom. *ELT Journal,* Vol.52 (4), 301-307.

Gilabert, R. (2007). *The Simultaneous Manipulation Of Task Complexity Along Planning Time And +/- Here-And-Now: Effects On L2 Oral Production.* Barcelona: Universitat Ramon Llull. http://www.ub.edu/GRAL/pubs/Gilabert,%20R.%20Multilingual%20Matters%202007.pdf

Housen, A., & F., Kuiken. (2009). Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency in Second Language Acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 30 (4), 461–473.

Inoue, C. (2010). Investigating the Sensitivity of The Measures of Fluency, Accuracy, and Complexity and Idea Units with A Narrative Task. *Linguistic & Language Teaching*, Vol. 4.

Jaimes, J. (2006). *Competence and Performance in the EFL Teaching Setting*. Venezuela: Universidad de Los Andes.

Kayi, H. (2006). Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. 12 (11).

Krashen, S. D., Terrel, T. D. (1995). *The Natural Approach*. Macmillan: Prentice Hall.

Levkina, M. (2008). The Effects of Increasing Task Complexity along Planning Time and Few Elements on L2 Oral Production. *Thesis*. University of Barcelona: Barcelona.

Madarsara, M. A., & Ramin, R. (2015). Examining the Effect of Task Complexity and Sequence on Speaking Ability of Iranian EFL Learners. *Internationa Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, Vol. 4 (1), 247-254.

Mahpul. (2014). Task Complexity in Dialogic Oral Production by EFL Indonesian Learners. *Dissertation*. Curtin University.

Michel, M, F. Kuiken, S.C. Vedder. (2007). The Influence of Complexity in Monologic Versus Dialogic Tasks in Dutch L2. *IRAL*. Vol. 45, 241–259.

Michel, M, F. Kuiken, S.C. Vedder. (2012). *Task complexity and interaction: (combined) effects on task-based performance in Dutch as a second language.* http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/59268/1/Michel_et_al._2012_Eurosla_preprint.pdf

Mohammadi, E. G., Mohammad, H.Y., & Akbar, A. (2012). Task-Based Learning Research and The Cognition Hypothesis: The Case of Task Complexity. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 2 (12), 2593-2602.

Morris, S. (2012). The Influence of Working Memory on L2 Oral Fluency: An Exploratory Study. *MA Thesis*. Universitat de Barcelona: Barcelona.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-Based Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Queensland Government. (2005). Spoken Language: A Key to Life Long Learning. Woolloongabba: Disability Services Unit.

Rahimpour, M. (2015). Task complexity and Variation in L2 Learners' Oral Discourse. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/37621222_Task_Complexity_and_Variation_in_L2_Learner's_Oral_Discourse

Robinson, P. (1995). Task Complexity and Second Language Narrative Discourse. *Language Learning*, Vol. 45 (1), 99-140.

Robinson, P. (2001a). Task Complexity, Task Difficulty, and Task Production: Exploring Interactions in A Componential Framework. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 22 (1), 27-57.

Robinson, P. (2001b). Task Complexity, Cognitive Resources, and Syllabus Design: A Triadic Framework for Examining Task Influences on SLA. In P. Robinson (ed.), *Cognition and Second Language Instruction* (pp. 287-318). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://www.academia.edu/19025749/_2001_Task_complexity_cognitive_resources_and_syllabus_design_a_triadic_framework_for_examining_task_influences_on_SLA

Robinson, P. (2003). The Cognition Hypothesis, Task Design, and Adult Task-Based Language Learning. *Second Language Studies*, Vol. 21 (2), 45-105.

Robinson, P. and R. Gilabert (2007). Task Complexity, the Cognition Hypothesis and Second Language and Learning Performance. *IRAL*, Vol. 45, 161-176.

Robinson, P. (2011). Task-Based Language Learning: A Review of Issues. *A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, Vol. 61 (1), 1-36.

Robinson, P. (2015). The Cognition Hypothesis, Second Language Task Demands and the SSARC Model of Pedagogic Task Sequencing. *Domains and Directions in TBLT: Plenaries From A Decade of the International Conference*, 87-122.

Saeedi, M, Saeed, K., & Shirin, R.K. (2012). The Impacts of Manipulating Task Complexity on EFL Learners. *Gema Online Journal of Language Studies*, Vol. 12 (4), 1057-1075.

Saeidi, M., Elaheh, Z., & Hafez, S.(2012).On the Effects of Focus on Form,Focus on Meaning, and Focus on Forms on Learners' Vocabulary Learning in ESP Context. *English Language Teaching*, Vol. 5 (10), 72-79.

Sercu, L., De Wachter, E., & Peters et al. (2006). The Effects of Task Complexity and Task Conditions on Foreign Language Development and Performance. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 152, 55-84.

Shahreza, M. A., A. Dabaghi, & K. Zohreh. (2012). The Effects of Manipulating Task Complexity on the Occurrence of Language-related Episodes during Learner-learner Interaction. *Porta Linguarum* 17, 173-188.

Skehan, P. (2003). Task-Based Instruction. *Language Teaching*, Vol. 36, 1-14.

Soleimani, H. & Maryam, R. (2013). The Effect of Increase in Task Cognitive Complexity on Iranian EFL Learners' Accuracy and Linguistic Complexity: A Test of Robinson's Cognition Hypothesis. *Applied Research on English Language,* Vol. 3 (1).

SPSS Tutorials. (2008). Interrater Reliability (Kappa) Using SPSS. http://www.stattutorials.com/SPSS?TUTORIAL-SPSS-Interrater-Reliability-Kappa.htm

Wahyuni, D. (2014). Linguistic Competence and Speaking Performance of English Education Study Program Students of Sriwijaya University. *Journal of English Literacy Education*, Vol. 1 (2).

Yousefi, M.H., Ebrahim, E. G., Mansour, K. (2012). Task Complexity and Its Implication to Pedagogy. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 2 (7), 1436-1444.