TASK COMPLEXITY ON STUDENTS' SPOKEN PERFORMANCE BY EIGHGT GRADE STUDENTS OF SMPN 21 BANDAR LAMPUNG

(A Thesis)

By
RIZQI FITRIA MULYADI

MASTER IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING STUDY PROGRAM
LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY
LAMPUNG UNIVERSITY
BANDAR LAMPUNG
2017

TASK COMPLEXITY ON STUDENTS' SPOKEN PERFORMANCE BY EIGHGT GRADE STUDENTS OF SMPN 21 BANDAR LAMPUNG

By:
RIZQI FITRIA MULYADI

A Thesis

Submitted in a partial fulfillment of
The requirements for S-2 Degree

MASTER IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING STUDY PROGRAM
LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY
LAMPUNG UNIVERSITY
BANDAR LAMPUNG
2017

ABSTRACT

The aim of the current study was to investigate the effect of task complexity on students' spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF) and the relationship between students' perception of the task complexity and students' spoken/oral performance in terms of CAF. The subjects were the eighth grade students of SMPN 21 Bandar Lampung consisting of 30 students. The tasks in the form of dialogue were used to elicit the data. The result of the research showed that, The simple task complexity with manipulating task complexity along with two dimensions resource-directing (+few elements, +here and now, +no reasoning demands) and resource-depleting (+planning time, +single task, +prior knowledge) can be used to increase the students' complexity (syntactic and lexical complexity) and fluency on students' spoken performance. On the other hands, the complex task complexity with manipulating task complexity along two dimensions resource-directing (-few elements, -here and now, -reasoning demands) and resource-depleting (-planning time, -single task, -prior knowledge) can be used to increase the students' accuracy and complexity but decreased the fluency on students' spoken performance. Besides that, the students had problems in performing the task not only because of the level of task complexity (cognitive factors), but also because of the other factors such as task difficulty (learner factors e.g., confidence, motivation). This research suggested teachers to design a task with simple and complex of task complexity to improve students' achievement in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. Besides, it is expected that this study can inspire other researchers to have further research about task complexity.

Key words: *TBLT, task complexity, resource-directing and resource-depleting, CAF, students' perception*.

Research Title	:	**TASK COMPLEXITY ON STUDENTS' SPOKEN PERFORMANCE BY EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMPN 21 BANDAR LAMPUNG**
Student's Name	:	Rizqi Fitria Mulyadi
Student's Number	:	**1423042064**
Study Program	:	**Master in English Language Teaching**
Department	:	**Language and Arts Education**
Faculty	:	**Teacher Training and Education**

APPROVED BY

Advisory Committee

Advisor	Co-Advisor
Prof. Ag. Bambang Setiyadi, M.A. Ph.D.	**Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D.**
NIP 19590528 198610 1 001	NIP 19650706 199403 1 002

The Chairperson of Department of Language and Arts Education	The Chairperson of Master in English Language Teaching
Dr. Mulyanto Widodo, M.Pd.	**Dr. Flora, M.Pd.**
NIP 19620203 198811 1 001	NIP 19600713 198603 2 001

ADMITTED BY

1. Examination Committee

Chairperson : **Prof. Ag. Bambang Setiyadi, M.A. Ph.D.** .....

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

Examiners : I. **Dr. Ari Nurweni, M.A.** .....

II. **Hery Yufrizal, M.A., Ph.D.** .....

2. The Dean of Teacher Training and Education Faculty

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

3. Director of Postgraduate Program

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

4. Graduated on : **October 31st, 2017**

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN

Dengan ini saya menyatakan dengan sebenarnya bahwa:

1. Tesis dengan judul "Task Complexity on Students' Spoken Performance by Eighth Grade Students of SMPN 21 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 dikemudian 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, 05 December 2017
Yang membuat pernyataan,

Rizqi Fitria Mulyadi
NPM 1423042064

CURRICULUM VITAE

The researcher's complete name is Rizqi Fitria Mulyadi, but her friends call her Pipit or Kiki. She was born in Kotabumi, October 12th 1989. She is the second daughters of lovely couple from Bapak Drs.Is.Mulyadi Jaya (Alm) and Ibu Dra.Suhaila.M.Pd. She has two sisters; Febrian Jayanti and Mulia Agisni. She also has one brother namely Muhammad Arafat.

She started her study from Kindergarten at TK Muslimin Kotabumi in 1994 and graduated in 1995. In the same year, she joined elementary school at SD Islam Ibnu Rusyd Kotabumi and graduated in 2001. She pursued her study at MTS and MA Ma'had Al-Zaytun Indramayu West Java and graduated in 2007. In that year, she was accepted as the college students of IAIN Raden Intan Lampung at English Education Program of Teacher Training and Education Faculty. In October 2011 she graduated from S1 English Education of IAIN Raden Intan Lampung. In September 2014, she was registered as a student of the 2nd batch of Master of English Education at Lampung University.

DEDICATION

I would proudly dedicate this thesis to:

- My beloved father and mother; Drs.Is.Mulyadi Jaya (Alm) and Dra.Suhaila.M.Pd
- My best sisters and brother; Febrian Jayanti, Mulia Agisni, and Muhammad Arafat
- My precious nephews and grandmother
- My beloved best friends
- My fabulous friends of the 2nd batch of Master of English Education
- My almamater University of Lampung

MOTTO

"Do not consider ourselves not able to before trying, learning, and practice".

(Unknown)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Alhamdulilah, praise is always to **THE ALMIGHTY ALLAH SWT** for the gracious mercy and tremendous blessing that always guides the researcher along her life. She believes that by the blessing and the grace of Allah SWT, she is able to accomplish this thesis, entitled "The Used of Task Complexity in Spoken Data by Eighth Grade Students of SMPN 21 Bandar Lampung" as one of the prerequisites to finish the S2 degree at Language and Art Department at Teacher Training and Education Faculty, University of Lampung. The researcher's invocation is also addressed to Prophet Muhammad SAW and his family.

She would like to express her sincere and great appreciation to all people and institution that without any support, motivation, and assistance, this thesis would never be complied. Her acknowledgement and gratitude go to Prof. Ag. Bambang Setiyadi, Ph.D., as the first advisor and Mahpul, Ph.D., as the second advisor who have given their suggestions, scientific knowledge, invaluable guidance, unlimited patience, and encouragement to the researcher during the completion of this thesis. Her thankfulness is also dedicated to Dr. Ari Nurweni, M.A., as the first examiner and Hery Yufrizal, M.A., Ph.D., as the second examiner for patiently giving much support, input, help, and correction to improve this thesis better. Her respect and sincere gratitude to Dr. Flora, M. Pd. as the Chief of Master of English Education Study Program, for her unconditional help, support, and motivation, and all lecturers of Master of English Education Study Program who have contributed during the completion process until accomplishing this thesis.

Her great indebtedness is also dedicated to her beloved father, Drs. Is. Mulyadi Jaya (Alm), and her mother, Dra. Suhaila, M.Pd. It is truly undoubted that loves, cares, timeless prayers during days and nights, are everything for her. And for her sisters and brother: Entuk, Nini and Apat, thanks for supporting during this thesis writing. Her sincere thanks are also dedicated to her big family, especially all of her grandmother and nephews; Siti Khodijah, Adzkia Saufa and M. Uwais Al-qorni who have been the source of inspiration for the researcher.

The unforgettable thanks are also given to the researcher's second batch fraternity in MPBI; Sulastri, Ferayani, Arifah, Harits, Endah, Tyas, Lutfan, Muetia, Uswatun, Bu Fitri Sus, Ms. Titis, Ms. Vivian, Efi, Iqbal, Ernaini and other friends who cannot be mentioned one by one, thanks for the beauty of togetherness. Many thanks are also addressed to the researcher's best friends, Rahmiati Isnaini, Tami Rozela, Siti Zulaikha and Hary for their inspiring, encouraging and motivating words and acts.

CONTENTS

III. RESEARCH METHOD

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Finally, the writer fully realizes that this thesis may contain some weaknesses. Therefore, constructive comments, criticisms, and suggestions are always appreciatively welcomed for better composition. Finally, the writer expects this thesis will be beneficial to the educational development, the reader, and particularly to those who will conduct further research in the same area of interest.

Bandar Lampung, 29 October 2017

The Researcher,

Rizqi Fitria Mulyadi

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is concerned with the background of the research. It includes problems 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 Background of The Research

Learning English is often related to learning how to speak the language. As Ur (1996:134) states, speaking is not just 'any skill', it is arguably the most important and therefore should take priority in any language test. This indicates that speaking plays a crucial role in communication. However, teaching speaking at schools is often neglected in the class. In practice, many learners feel frustrated as they find that speaking in a foreign language is a complex matter. It is because speaking involves many factors. The ability to speak fluently presupposes not only knowledge of language features, but also the ability to process information and language on the spot (Harmer, 2001:269).

Nowadays, some different methods, approaches, and techniques are employed in order to encourage students to speak English. Well prepared lesson and clear instruction during the lesson are considered motivating. Some techniques used by the teachers recently are the ones characterized as communicative techniques. This emphasizes on the ability of the students more in negotiating the meaning

than in thinking much on the form of the sentences uttered during a conversation. It means that the teacher has bigger responsibility not only to teach the structure of sentences (then ask the students to speak with that grammar thing) but also to prepare the lesson well in order to encourage the students to speak and to be more communicative. It is in line with Nunan (2004: 6) who states 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 triggers that causing teaching methods focusing on forms have gradually been left.

Furthermore, meaningful language activities are the primary focus. Learners are actively involved in opportunities to practice the language with other learners for functional purposes and the focus is not on the forms of language, but rather on making meaning. Therefore, the shift from 'traditional' teaching practice to task-based learning is based on the belief that task-based approaches promote more effective language learning (Long, 1985; Swan, 2005; Shehadeh & Coombe 2010 in Mahpul 2014:10).

The development of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has involved a paradigm shift in language teaching and learning from the traditional, synthetic approaches in which language teaching has a primary focus on forms, discrete-learning, and teacher-centered activities to task-based approaches which actualize language as a means of communication, one which places the communication as the heart of teaching procedures (Van de Branden et al., 2009 in Mahpul 2014:11). This is because it is believed that task-based approaches in a classroom setting lead to successful second language learning.

Therefore, many scholars had investigated the task-based approach in their teaching and the results were positive. Lopez in Ismaili (2012:293) conducted an experiment based on task-based instructions instead of presentation-practice-production (PPP) approach for teaching English in two classes at a private school in the south of Brazil. He found that students using task-based instructions (TBI) learned English more effectively because they were using the language to do things, to access information, to solve problems, and to talk about personal experiences.

Similarly, Ismaili (2012:291) elaborates and analyzes the effectiveness of the task-based learning approach on the development of students' speaking skills in academic settings. The finding reveals that students can learn more effectively when their attention is focused on the task; therefore they are focused more on the language they use than on the grammatical form. Task-based learning enables students to be actively engaged with language in an authentic context and challenges them to build meanings and patterns which make them develop into autonomous learners.

Based on the explanation above which described about task based, as an English teacher, we should create a kind of learning activity which focuses on form rather than the forms. Thus, a focus on form (i.e., overtly drawing students' attention to linguistic elements as they arise in lessons where the overriding focus on meaning, or communication), as district from focus on forms refer to "discrete-point grammar teaching". 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.

There have been many studies concerning with the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching in speaking performance. Most of them are focused on trying out the Cognition Hypothesis proposed by Robinson. Furthermore, the Cognition Hypothesis distinguishes three factors. The first is task condition which refers to interactive demands of tasks, including participation variables (e.g., open vs. closed tasks, convergent/divergent, one way/two way) and participant variables (e.g., same vs. different gender, familiarity, power/solidarity). The second category of task difficulty has to do with individual differences in learner factors, such as working memory capacity, which can impact the extent to which learners perceive task demands difficult to meet. These factors, Robinson argued, explain why two learners may find the same task to be more or less difficult than each other. The last component, task complexity, refers to the cognitive demands of tasks, such as their reasoning demands (Robinson, 2001a:294). Those three factors are called Triadic Componential Framework (TCF).

The TCF divides task features affecting the cognitive complexity of tasks along two dimensions. Resource-directing dimensions of cognitive complexity will be associated with simultaneous increases in complexity and accuracy, but decrease fluency. On the other hand, increasing complexity along resource-depleting dimensions reduces attention and memory resources with negative consequences for production. Additionally, Robinson (2007:209) assumes that increasing task complexity along resource-directing dimension can recapitulate the effects of

conceptual development on linguistic performance. In contrast, the resource-depleting just influences the students' psychological condition. Furthermore, In the Triadic Componential Framework proposed by Robinson & Gilabert (2007:164), resource-directing includes three variables, that is, +/- here and now, +/- few elements, and +/- reasoning demands, whereas, resource-depleting consists of +/- planning, +/- single task, and +/- prior knowledge variables.

Recently, Saeedi, Ketabi, & Kazerooni (2012:1057) investigate 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, by manipulating task with two dimensions that are, planning time, single task and here/now. 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, a finding which conforms to predictions.

Besides that, Azizi, Asoudeh, & Azar (2012:22) attempts to examine the effect of simple and complex tasks on Iranian L2 learners' oral production in English language institutes in EFL context by measuring three aspects of learner production: accuracy, fluency, and complexity. The focus is on manipulating two tasks that are prior knowledge and reasoning demand. The findings suggest that the cognitive complexity of a particular task influences the nature of learner oral production.

Masrom, Alwi & Daud (2015:33) investigates the relationship between the cognitive demands of task complexity and students' motivation towards several tasks using task-based instruction during asynchronous computer-mediated communication (CMC) writing tasks. The tasks were manipulated following two variables from the Cognition Hypotheses, along resource-directing (+/- causal reasoning demand) and resource-dispersing (+/- task structure) dimensions. The results showed that there was a correlation between task complexity and task motivation among learners. However, the correlation was only evident in lexical complexity production and no correlation was found for any of the syntactic complexity measures. This study was significant as it explored the roles of task complexity and task motivation in mediating the production of language. It also highlights how the manipulation of task complexity would encourage the production of the language in terms of its complexity.

In a different study, Michel et al. (2007:241) compared task complexity using monologue (one-way) and dialogic (two-way) tasks, manipulating the number of elements (+/- few elements) in L2 Dutch. The result showed that increasing task complexity resulted in more accurate, but less fluent oral production. Furthermore, the dialogic tasks triggered more accurate and more fluent oral production, but the production was structurally less complex.

In one of Robinson's studies (2001b:27), examining the effects of the cognitive complexity of task on language production and learner perception of task difficulty, in addition to the learners' language performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF). The learners were asked to rate their

responses to five perception questions from Robinson's questionnaire. The results showed that the manipulation of task complexity corresponded to the learners' perception of task difficulty. That is, the learners regarded the complex tasks as being more difficult and stressful than the simple tasks, and they also lacked of confidence to perform the complex tasks. However, there was no difference in the learners' interest and motivation according to task complexity. Interestingly, fluency correlated with learners' perceptions of their ability to complete the task in both the simple and the complex versions of the tasks.

Based on the previous studies above, none of them manipulated the task complexity by combining two dimensions of task complexity. Thus, this research focuses on resource-directing and resource-depleting by combining all aspects of both dimensions. It will be done due to the reason that a task complexity with the complex version resulting in less fluent, but more lexically varied language (Robinson, 2001b:52). However, as asserted by Robinson (2001b:35), synergetic effects of these resource-directing and resource-dispersing dimensions can be expected, such as Saeedi, Ketabi, and Kazerooni's studies (2012:1067) which show that comparison between task performances under different conditions revealed that reducing task complexity along resource-dispersing dimensions (i.e., +/-planning and +/- single task) and increasing it along the resource-directing one (i.e., +/- Here/Now) has *simultaneously* raised structural complexity and accuracy of production. The results indicated that participants had the optimum performance in terms of accuracy and fluency of their oral production.

Furthermore, this research was combining two dimensions (resource-directing dimension and resource depleting dimension), there were two types of tasks which

assessed the students' speaking in the form of dialogic. Besides, the previous researchers mostly designed the task using monologue tasks, whereas, this research used dialogue tasks. By using dialogic tasks the learners are able to share their ideas with their friend, interact to more than one participant and they have to work together in order to make the task completely. Ellis (2003) in Mahpul (2014:35) also suggests that dialogic discourse is better equipped to identify what a learner can and cannot do without assistance. It serves to create the inter subjectivity that enables verbal interaction to mediate learning.

Furthermore, Robinson (2001b:31) states that complexity and difficulty (learner factors) do not always have a fixed relationship to each other for two reasons. First, learners with different aptitudes may have different perceptions of the task difficulty and the differences in learners' inherent abilities can also be affected. Thus, it is important to explore learners' perceptions of task difficulty as a way to help explaining different language performance on tasks.

Furthermore, this research examines the effects of task complexity in spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF) and the relationship between students' perception of the task complexity and students' spoken/oral performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF). 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.

In sum, the previous studies about manipulating task complexity have not analyzed all aspects in resource-directing and resource-depleting optimally. Therefore, this research investigates the effects of task complexity in spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF) and the relationship between students' perception of the task complexity and students' spoken/oral performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) by manipulating the six variables of the resource directing and the resource depleting dimensions through dialogic tasks as the material.

1.2 Problems of The Research

As the concerns of this research, there are main problems of the research formulated as follows:

1. What are the effects of task complexity on students' spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF)?
2. Is there any relationship between students' perception of the task complexity and students' spoken/oral performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF)?

1.3 Objectives of The Research

The objectives of the research formulated as follows:

1. To find out the effects of task complexity on students' spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF).

2. To find out whether there is a relationship between students' perception of the task complexity and students' spoken/oral performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF).

1.4 Uses of The Research

This research is useful both practically and theoretically,

1. Practically

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

a. Teachers

Through this research, the teachers know what to do in designing the task and task complexity can be beneficial to develop students' on spoken performance.

b. Students

Task-based language teaching facilitates and enriches students with various types of tasks that provide communicative activities without ignoring the grammatical rules. Besides that, it will make them realize that manipulating of task complexity can enhance their speaking in learning English.

c. Schools

The result of this research can be used as a consideration for schools, whether certain manipulating of task complexity will always be applied to develop students on spoken performance.

2. Theoretically

The result of this research enriches the previous theories about manipulating task complexity.

1.5 Scope of The Research

This research will be conducted at SMPN 21 Bandar Lampung. The population of this research was eighth grade students of SMPN 21 Bandar Lampung. There was only one class that was taken as the sample of this research. The researcher distributed two types of tasks, which had been manipulated along with resource-directing and resource-depleting dimensions. In this research, the researcher had tried to find out the effects of task complexity on students' spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) and to find out whether there was a relationship between students' perception of the task complexity and students' spoken/oral performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF). Thus, the data collected were in the form of students' utterances that were transcribed and analyzed in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF).

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 according to Long in Madarsara &Harimiy (2015:247) is considered as an approach to language teaching that attempts 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.

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, 2001b:29).

3. Spoken performance

Speaking performance is defined as actual instances of producing oral language in real time (McNamara, 1996: 54 in Liando & Lumettu 2017:22).

4. Perception

Mcdonald (2011: 15) who state that perception is an individual's view making it a powerful driving force for action. Processing sensory information and relating to past experiences enables one to create a lens in which to view the world through a filter of sociocultural influences.

5. Two cognitive dimensions

Resource-depleting variables: related to performative and procedural demands (e.g. +/-planning time, +/-single task, or +/-prior knowledge of task or topic).

Increasing these variables makes great demands on learners' intentional and memory resources and, consequently, disperses them.

Resource-directing variables: related to cognitive and conceptual demands (e.g. +/-few elements, +/-here and now, +/-reasoning demands). It draws learners' attention to vocabulary and syntax encoding (Robinson in Crespo 2011:3).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

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

2.1 Speaking Performance

In this case, speaking is defined as an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving and processing information. Its form and meaning are dependent on the context in which it occurs, the participants, and the purposes of speaking (Burns & Joyce, 1997 in Torky, 2006). This idea shows that speaking comprises of three main processes in which the speaker will produce message, then hearer will receive and process it in his mind to respond to the message. The definition also relates to task-based approach in which language is used to convey meaning and the forms of the language will appear based on the context.

In addition, according to Nunan in (Febriyanti 2006:2), speaking requires that learners not only know how to produce specific points of language such as grammar, pronunciation, or vocabulary ("linguistic competence"), but also they understand when, why, and in what ways to produce language ("sociolinguistic competence"). Based on this definition, in the process of speaking, someone needs

not only produce utterances but also understand what he talks about, to whom he talks, and how to use the utterances for certain circumstances.

In line to Nunan (1999), Kayi in Febriyanti (2006:2) states that speaking refers to the gap between linguistic expertise and teaching methodology. Linguistic expertise concerns with language structure and language content. Teaching speaking is not like listening, reading, and writing. It needs habit formation because it is a real communication and speaking is a productive skill so it needs practicing as often as possible. Therefore, to be able to speak, students need more repetition to make them get accustomed to using the language.

Meanwhile, performance is considered to be the physical representation, usually in utterances of any type, of the human competence (Chomsky, 1965 in James 2006). Similarly, Fromkin & Rodman (1993) in Wahyuni (2014:84) differentiate competence and performance as follows, “it is a difference between what you know, which is your linguistic competence and how you use this language in actual speech production and comprehension, which is your linguistic performance”. Chomsky considered performance as a faulty representation of competence because of psychological "restrictions such as memory lapses and limitations, distractions, changes of directions halfway through sentence, hesitation and so on”. Performance, in a way, accounts for the failures language users have when transposing their competence into actual linguistic production.

Based on the theories about speaking and performance, it can be summarized that speaking performance is the way how people produce language to communication not only know how to produce specific points of language such as grammar,

pronunciation, or vocabulary (linguistic competence), but also they understand when, why, and in what ways to produce language (sociolinguistic competence).

In this study, the students performed a dialogic containing simple task complexity that was manipulated along two dimensions of resource-directing and resource-depleting. A dialogic task was used since dialogic tasks learners are expected to be actively involved in sharing ideas as the information flows in two-ways (Mahpul 2014:35).

2.2 Concept of Perception

There are several assumptions about perception. One of them is mentioned by Otara (2011: 22), argues that perception is our sensory experiences of the world around us and involves both the recognition of environmental stimuli and actions in response to these stimuli. Through the perceptual process, we again information about properties and elements of the environment that are critical to our survival.

From the description above, it can be stated that perception is an attempt to interpret the information in order to represent the state of an environment. This information is the result of physical stimulation of the sense organs. The definition is supported by Otara (2011: 22) who state that perception is sensory stimulation and the perception process is the organization of that stimulus in your brain; i.e., forming a positive or negative cerebral response to the stimulus. This is a process in which we strive to organize things in such a way that they make sense to us.

From previous definition and explanation above, it can be concluded that perception is a process to interpret the information related to his/her experience as the result of physical stimulation of the sense organs. It includes a specific idea, concept and impression. It means that, when someone gives a response on something he/she will get knowledge and understand something. The understanding and knowledge that was obtained is called someone's perception.

Here, the researcher asserts that perception is the recognition of things by using the sense especially the senses of seeing and hearing. It is about perception of what he/she experienced, which gives an impression to him/her.

2.3 Concept of Task-Based Language Teaching

Task-Based Language Teaching is a meaning-centered methodology; it develops learners' communicative competence by focusing on the meaning (Shabani & Ghasemi 2014:1719). 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) is considered as an approach to language teaching that attempts 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, Koosha (2012) pointed 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.

2.4 Concept 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 (2014:11) characterized 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 cherub, 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) in Nunan (2004:2) 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 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 endeavor 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 work plans 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 work plan that requires learners to process language pragmatically in order to achieve an outcome that can be evaluated in terms of whether the correct or appropriate 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, middle and an end.

Based on the ideas explained above, the tasks that will be 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.

2.5 Concept of Task Complexity

In the Cognition Hypothesis proposed by Robinson & Gilabert (2007:162), it is claimed that pedagogic task should be designed and sequenced on the basis of task complexity, specifically in terms of the manipulation of cognitive 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	**Task Conditions**	**Task Difficulty**
(Cognitive Factors)	(Interactive Factors)	(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		on-line decision
About task unit		about pairs and groups.

Therefore, this research will focus on the task complexity since the task complexity 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 will be better if the task complexity becomes the main consideration.

According to Robinson (2001b:29), task complexity is defined as the result of the attention, 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 characteristics, 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' intentional 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.

Based on the explanation above, this research will design the tasks which only manipulate the task complexity in term of resource-directing dimension and resource-depleting because it refers to cognitive/conceptual demands requiring attention and working memory that directs learners to focus on linguistic form and encourage faster and more automatic L2 access and use the language.

2.6 Manipulating Task Complexity

As it is explained above that this research will manipulate the resource directing and resource depleting dimensions, so in manipulating the task complexity there are six variables of the dimensions, that is, number of elements, here-now/there-then, reasoning demand, planning time, single task and prior knowledge will be combined and sequenced in simple and complex task. In other words, in manipulating the tasks, the researcher will increase and decrease the task complexity of all variables in the resource-directing and resource-depleting simultaneously. The example of task manipulation design will be as follows:

Table 1: Manipulation of Task Complexity

Task	Resource-directing dimensions	Resource-depleting dimensions
Task 1	+ few elements	+ planning time
	+ here and now	+ single task
	+ no reasoning demand	+ prior knowledge
Task 2	-Few elements	-No planning time
	-Here and now	-Single task
	-Reasoning demand	-Prior knowledge

Note:

- : complex task
+ : simple task

Many Elements	: Contain more elements
Few Elements	: Contain fewer elements
There & Then	: Use past tense
Here & Now	: Use present tense
Reasoning Demand	: Need to state the reason
No Reasoning Demand	: Do not need to state the reason
Planning time	: Has planning time
No planning time	: Has no planning time
Single task	: Single task
Dual task	: Dual task
Prior knowledge	: Has background knowledge/schemata
Prior knowledge	: Has no background knowledge/schemata.

2.7 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 (2009:3), 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 gives the students a space to use the language for communication without any burden.

Besides, according to Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005) in Mahpul (2014:41), 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, Foster, Tonkyn, and Wigglesworth (2000) in Mahpul (2014:41) support the use of an As-unit to measure syntactic complexity. 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, 2000:365).

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

2. 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.

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. Furthermore, two measures with respect to self-repairs were included: the ratio of self-repairs in relation to the number of errors as well as the percentage of self-repairs related to the total number of words. These repair measures were chosen because repair behavior is thought to reflect the speaker's self-monitoring and therefore is an indication of learners' attention to form (Michel et. al, 2007:8).

3. Fluency

Fluency is the rapid, smooth, accurate, lucid, and efficient translation of thought or communicative intention into language under the temp speaking constraints of on-line processing (Lennon in Kormos 2010:7). Hence, the fluency focuses on the smoothness of conveying the message while communicating.

With respect to fluency, Yuan and Ellis in Michel et al (2007:8) offered 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 2008:25). For that reason, this research will use Speech Rate B since it ignores the repetitions, reformulations, false starts, and comments in the L1, so the researcher will only focus on the students' performance in L2.

2.8 Theoretical Assumption

Speaking is so much a part of daily life that people tend to take it for granted. However, learning speaking whether as a first or second language, involves developing a subtle and detailed knowledge about why, how and when to communicate and to produce complex skills for managing interaction, such as asking a question or taking a turn.

Nunan (1989) in Zhao (2011:43) argues that a task is a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focus on meaning rather than form. The task should have a sense of completeness, being able to stand alone as a communicative act in its own right. Thus, this approach is a structured plan for the provision of opportunities for the refinement of knowledge and capabilities entailed in a new language and its use during communication (Breen, 1987 in Zhao 2011:43). A number of definitions of task have been suggested (Bygate, Skehan, & Swain, 2001; Nunan 1989; Prabhu, 1987; Willis, 1996 in Nunan 2004:3). However, this study draws on the definition of task by Willis (1996:23) in Nunan (2004:3): a task is "an activity where the target language is used by the learner for a communicative purpose (goal) in order to achieve an outcome". Here the notion of meaning is subsumed in 'outcome'. Language in a communicative task is seen as bringing about an outcome through the exchange of meaning. This definition suggests the idea that tasks can bring learners to the meaningful use of a foreign language because language use is more important than language practice. 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 (2001).

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. Additionally, Robinson assumes that task made more complex will increase the students' speaking. Thus, the researcher

tries to manipulate task complexity by combining the six variables of resource-directing dimension and resource-depleting dimension.

Based on the frame of theories above, the researcher assumes that task complexity can be used to encourage students to speak English in their class because they are not enjoyable in their speaking class. It can be used to stimulate them to pay more attention and more active in teaching and learning speaking process. It means that task complexity can be used to improve students to speak English in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF).

2.9 Hypotheses

Based on the statement above, the researcher states her hypothesis as follows:

Ho: There is no significant effect of task complexity on students' performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF).

Hi: There is a significant effect of task complexity on students' spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF).

Ho: There is no relationship between students' perception of the task complexity and students' spoken/oral performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency.

Hi: There is relationship between students' perception of the task complexity and students' spoken/oral performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

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

3.1 Research Design

One group repeated measures design was carried out in this research. The research intended to investigate the effect of the use of task complexity on students' spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF) and the relationship between students' perception of the task complexity and students' spoken/oral performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF). In this way, the researcher designed the two tasks which were carried out in this research. The tasks were administered to all of students, they did the task in pairs, and there were two types of task complexity which were distributed to the students. The tasks described as in this below:

Task 1: + few elements, + here and now, + reasoning demand, + planning time, + single task, + prior knowledge.

Task 2: - few elements, - here and now, - reasoning demand, - planning time, - single task, - prior knowledge.

Each student's spoken performance was analyzed in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. Those four aspects were measured based on certain formula. Then, the result was found out by the means of statistic calculation in SPSS.

3.2 Setting of the Research

The setting included the time and the place of the research. This research was conducted in the academic year of 2016/2017, on February, 8^{th} – 10^{th} 2017. It was held at SMPN 21 Bandar Lampung, especially in VIII K.

3.3 Population and Sample

The researcher chose eighth grade students of SMPN 21 Bandar Lampung as the population of this research. The sample had been chosen randomly based on the consideration that they had similar speaking ability. It was known from their scores of speaking. Therefore, VIII K which consisted of 30 students was taken as sample of this research.

3.4 Research Procedures

In doing this research, there were some procedures which had been done in order to get the data. They were as follows:

1. Preparing the task

There were two types of task which were given to the students. 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) and

three variables of resource-depleting dimension (planning, single task, and prior knowledge). In this case task represented by "+" in resource-directing refer to few elements, simple present tense, and no reasoning demands while simple task along resource-depleting coded as "+" refer to planning time, single task and prior knowledge. Meanwhile, task represented by "-" in resource-directing refer to many elements, simple past tense, and reasoning demands besides complex task along resource-depleting coded as "-" refer to no planning time, dual task, and no prior knowledge.

Table 2: Manipulating of Task Complexity

Task	Resource-directing dimensions	Resource-depleting dimensions
Task 1	+ few elements	+ planning time
	+ here and now	+ single task
	+ no reasoning demand	+ prior knowledge
Task 2	-Few elements	-No planning time
	-Here and now	-Single task
	-Reasoning demand	-Prior knowledge

First of all the researcher tried out the task to another group of students before administering the tasks to the sample which would be chosen. It was done in order to know whether the tasks were valid and reliable or not.

2. Determining the sample

In determining the sample, the researcher chose randomly based on the consideration that they had similar speaking ability. It was VII K class as the sample of this research which consisted of 30 students.

3. Conducting the task

The researcher gave two types of task complexity to each student. Then, the students were asked to perform in front of the class with their pairs. For the task number one, the researcher asked to the students to choose the type of exercise which was included into the task. Then, the researcher divided the students into pairs. In one pair, there were 2 students who choose 2 different type of exercise. They were given fifteen minutes to discuss with their friend about the instruction of the task and also to find out the vocabularies in their dictionary. They were also given a chance to ask about the instructions which they did not understand. Beside that, the researcher used Indonesian Language to make the students comprehend the task. After that, the researcher collected the task from the students.

On the other hand, for the task number two, the researcher asked the students to discuss about the task in pairs. The researcher did not give the students time to prepare the task; they directly did the spoken performance based on the task. 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 led 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. Then, the researcher recorded students' utterances by using cellular phone in order to obtain the data.

4. Giving the Questionnaire

The researcher distributed questionnaire to the students after the treatments. The researcher adopted Robinson's questionnaire which consisted of 5 questions asking the students difficulty, stress, confidence, interest, and motivation of task complexity. The students were asked to indicate their preferences by giving score 1 for strongly disagree (*Sangat tidak setuju),* 2 for disagree (*Tidak setuju),* 3 for Doubt (*Ragu),* 4 for agree (*Setuju),* and 5 for strongly agree (*Sangat setuju).* Robinson (2001b:41) classified student's perception of task complexity. The following table is the item number of questionnaire specification.

Table 3: The category of students' perceptions.

The Questions of questionnaire	**The Categorize of questionnaire**
I thought the task was easy	Difficulty
I felt relaxed doing this task	Stress
I did well on this task	Confidence
The task was interesting	Interest
I want to do the task like this	Motivation

5. Data analysis

After conducting some procedures, the researcher analyzed the data. Related to this case, the researcher used SPSS to see whether or not the effects of the use of task complexity on students' spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF) and to find out the relationship between students' perception of task complexity and students' spoken/oral performance in terms of CAF.

3.5 Data Collecting Technique

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

1. Determining the instruments

The researcher used speaking test and also questionnaire as the instruments of this research. The speaking test contained of task complexity which had been distributed to the students. The researcher used recorder to obtain the data. Questionnaire was also the instrument which was used in this research. The researcher adopted Robinson's questionnaire, as mentioned in the first step of research procedure.

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 pairs who performed the task, there were 30 dialogues recorded in the cellular phones.

3. Transcribing the students' utterances

The students' utterances need transcribing. It means that 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 Instruments

To get a valid and reliable data, this research should fulfill the validity and reliability.

1. **Validity**

   In this research, to measure whether the test has good validity or not, the researcher analyzed its content and construct validity.

   a. Content Validity

   Content validity is intended to know whether or not the test items are good reflection of what will be covered. It means that the items of the test should present the material being discussed. Then, the test is determined according to the materials that have been taught to the students. To fulfill the content validity, the material for the speaking task was taken based on KTSP curriculum (Curriculum 2006). Due to the reason, the descriptive texts in the form of dialogue were chosen for the students' tasks.

   b. 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 this research was included into TBLT research, thus the speaking performances were measured in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

   Additionally, the tasks made based on the theories of task complexity by Robinson, resource-directing dimension (number of elements, here-now/there-then, and reasoning demand) and resource-depleting dimension (planning time,

single/dual task, and prior knowledge). Therefore, the tasks consisted of the six variables that had been manipulated.

2. Reliability

This research is focused on the students' spoken performance, which belongs to subjective test. Thus, the researcher used inter-rater to obtain more reliable data. The raters were Post-Graduate students of English Department in Lampung University. Before doing the calculation, firstly, the two raters had discussion 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 the task was examined by using statistical measurement of reliability in SPSS.

In order to find out whether or not there is a significant effect of task complexity on students' spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF) on the first rater with second rater, the researcher also made the statistical correlation by using SPSS computation. The result of statistical correlation is as follows:

Table 4: The table of correlations

		Rater1	Rater2
Rater1	Pearson Correlation	1	.993**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	30	30
Rater2	Pearson Correlation	.993**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	30	30

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The statistical computation shows that there is a significant correlation among students' speaking result based on the first rater with the second rater (r= 0.993; p<0.001). So, it means that students' speaking quality based on the first rater is equivalent with the students' speaking from the second rater. It also can be said that the students' speaking score in terms of CAF based on the first rater and second rater is reliable.

3.7 Data Analysis

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

1. **Complexity**

This researcher analyzed the complexity in terms of syntactic and lexical complexity, because according to Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005) in Koizumi (2005:4), complexity is often concerned with syntactic and lexical aspects. Syntactical

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, the syntactic complexity was measured by means of the total number of clauses per As-unit, like the previous study done by Michel, Kuiken, & Vedder (2007:8). 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, 2000:365). While, lexical complexity was measured by calculating the percentage of lexical words to total number of words (Mahpul, 2014: 68).

Syntactical Complexity

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

Coding and calculating the syntactic complexity can be as follows:

> Hello.‖ what sport do you like? (C).‖ I like swimming (C). ‖ My favorite player is Elfiza roza (C), and you? ‖ Who is your favorite player? (C).‖ What day do you usually exercise? (C).‖ I exercise everyday Wednesday and Saturday (C).‖ (21")

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 seven AS-units and six clauses, so the syntactic complexity can be calculated, as follows:

$$\frac{6}{7} = 0.86$$

Meanwhile, 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 5: Calculation of Lexical Words

No.	Lexical Words	Example
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 type	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:

Hello Lucia. How are you?. I'm very well thanks. I like sports swimming, and you?. I see. When you like the sports?. If I like the sports from

watching champion in television. I playing the sports in the swimming pool. What do you wish athlete?. Okay. Nice to meet you.

In accordance with the transcription above, the underlined words are the lexical words, so it is known that there are 25 lexical words contained, and the total number of words is 50. 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:

$$\frac{25}{50} x\ 100\% = 0.50$$

2. Accuracy

Regarding to accuracy, it is 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.

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

The example of calculating accuracy is as follows:

‖Hi.‖ What ~~do~~ you like sport?.‖ I'~~m~~ like football.‖ I'~~m~~ play football with my friend,‖ and who you ~~play~~ badminton (will) with you?.‖ Where and when ~~you~~ usually play badminton?.‖ I'~~m~~ play football Saturday afternoon (ain) in field.‖

Having analyzed every sentence in the transcription above, there is one AS-unit which is error free. Thus, the accuracy is:

$$\frac{1}{7} x\ 100\% = 0.143$$

3. Fluency

To measure fluency, this research will implement Speech Rate B in which the number of syllables generated from task performance, measured by the number of syllables, divided by the total number of seconds and multiple by 60 (Gillabert, 2007a:21). For Speech Rate B, repetitions, reformulations, false starts, and comments in the L1 are excluded from the calculation. Thus, the researcher just focuses 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,

> Hi (1). I (1) like (1) badminton,(3) and (1) you (1)?. ohh.. Who (1) is (1) your (1) player (2)?. My (1) favorite (3) player (2) is (1) Tantowi (3) ahmad (2). I (1) exercise (3) every (2) Saturday (3) and (1) Sunday (2), and (1) you (1)? (17")

The transcription above contains 39 syllables, so the fluency is,

$$\frac{39}{17} x60 = 137.65$$

Having got the result of students' speaking performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency, an analysis using SPSS will be run in order to investigate the statistical significance of mean differences. It is done to find out the effect of task complexity developed on the basic of two cognitive dimensions on students' spoken performance.

3.7.2 Questionnaire

To analyze the data of questionnaire, the result of questionnaire-based data and the result of spoken performance task in terms of Complexity, Accuracy and fluency (CAF) were used in order to find out the coefficient correlation between them. The data was correlated by using Pearson Product Moment Correlation (SPSS) in order to investigate whether there was any correlation or not. After that the researcher described the taken data by considering the result of the correlation. Setiyadi (2006:167) states that coefficient correlation is always between -1 up to +1. To find out whether there was any correlation between students' perception of task complexity and students' spoken performance in terms of CAF, the criteria of coefficient correlation were used:

0.00 – 0.20 = Very low

0.20 – 0.40 = Low

0.40 – 0.60 = Average

0.60 – 0.80 = High

0.80 – 1.00 = Very high

(Setiyadi 2006:167).

3.8 Hypothesis Testing

The hypotheses of the research are formulated as follows:

Ho: There is no significant effect of task complexity on students' performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF).

Hi: There is a significant effect of task complexity on students' spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF).

Ho: There is no relationship between students' perception of the task complexity and students' spoken/oral performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency.

Hi: There is relationship between students' perception of the task complexity and students' spoken/oral performance in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This part describes the conclusions of the research and also the suggestions of the research.

5.1 Conclusions

Considering all the data gathered after finishing the research which was conducted in SMPN 21 Bandar Lampung, some conclusions were taken as follows:

1. The simple task complexity with manipulating task complexity along with two dimensions resource-directing (+few elements, +here and now, +no reasoning demands) and resource-depleting (+planning time, +single task, +prior knowledge) can be used to increase the students' complexity (syntactic and lexical complexity) and fluency on students' spoken performance. Besides, the complex task complexity with manipulating task complexity along two dimensions resource-directing (-few elements, -here and now, -reasoning demands) and resource-depleting (-planning time, -single task, -prior knowledge) can be used to increase the students' accuracy and complexity but decreased the fluency on students' spoken performance.

2. The students had problems in performing the task not only because of the level of task complexity (cognitive factors), but also because of the other factors such as task difficulty (learner factors).

5.2 Suggestions

In accordance with the conclusions above, this below are the suggestions for English teachers and further research:

For English the teachers who want their students have a high level of syntactic complexity, lexical complexity and fluency in their oral production, the speaking task should be manipulated by increasing two dimensions of resource-directing and resource-depleting simultaneously in complex and simple task.

For the further researcher it's better for them not only to design the simple or complex task of task complexity by manipulating resource-directing and resource-depleting dimensions but also they have to combine the task with complex and simple task.

Furthermore, the further researcher can combine between simple task and complex task along with two dimensions of task complexity as well as find the students' problems when performing the task through interview because through interview, the problems that students face can be revealed more detailed.

REFERENCES

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

Bates, N. 2007. *Real Time.* Erlangga: Jakarta.

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.

Febriyanti, E. R. 2006. Teaching Speaking of English as a Foreign Language: Problems and Solutions. Banjarmasin: Universitas Lambung Mangkurat.

Foster, P., Tonkyn, A., & Wigglesworth, G. 2000. A unit for all Reasons: Measuring Spoken Language. *Applied Linguistics*, *21* (3), 354-375.

Gilabert, R. 2007a. The Simultaneous Manipulation of Task Complexity along Planning Time and +/- Here-and-Now: Effects on L2 Oral Production. Barcelona: Universitat Ramon Llull.

Harmer, J. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Essex, England: Longman.

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

Ismaili, M. 2012. The Effectiveness of the Task-Based Learning in Developing Students' Speaking Skills in Academic Settings on the EFL Classroom-A Study Conducted at South East European University (SEEU). *1st Albania International Conference on Education (AICE)*. 291-297.

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

Koizumi, R. 2005. Speaking Performance Measures of Fluency, Syntactic Complexity, and Lexical Complexity. *JABAET (Japan-Britain Association for English Teaching) Journal,* 9, 5-33.

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

Liando, N. V. & Lumettu, R. 2017. Students' Personal Initiative towards Their Speaking Performance. *International Education Studies,* 10 (8), 21-28.

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

Mahpul. 2014. *Task Complexity in Dialogic Oral Production by EFL Indonesian Learners*. Unpublished Thesis.

Masrom,U. K., Alwi, N. A., & Daud, N. S. 2015. The Role of Task Complexity and Task Motivation in Language Production. *Gema Online Journal of Language Studies*, 15 (2), 33-49.

Mcdonald, S. M. 2011. Perception: A Concept Analysis. *Script*. Texas: The University of Texas at Tyler.

Michel, M. & Kuiken, F. & Vedder. 2007. The Influence of Complexity in Monologic Versus Dialogic Tasks in Dutch L2. *IRAL*. 45 (2), 241–259.

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

Nunnally, J. C. 1978. Psychometric theory (2nd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Otara, A. 2011. Perception: A Guide for Managers and Leaders. Journal of Management and Strategy, 2 (3), 21-24.

Prefontaine, Y., & Kormos, J. 2010. The Relationship between Task Difficulty and Second Language Fluency in French: A Mixed Methods Approach. USA: United Kingdom.

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*, 45, 193–214.

Robinson, P. 2001a. 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.

Robinson, P. 2001b. "Task Complexity, Task difficulty, and Task production: Exploring Interactions in a Componential Framework." Applied Linguistics, 22 (1), 27-57.

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

Robinson, P. & Gilabert, R. 2007. Task Complexity, the Cognition Hypothesis and Second Language Learning and Performance. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching,* 45 (7), 161-176.

Saeidi, M., Ketabi, S., & Kazerooni, S. 2012. The Impacts of Manipulating Task Complexity on EFL Learners. *Gema Online Journal of Language Studies*, 12 (4), 1057-1075.

Saeidi, M., Zaferanieh, E., & Shatery, H. 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,* 5 (10), 72-79.

Setiayadi, Ag. B. 2006. *Metode Penelitian untuk Pengajaran Bahasa Asing*. Graha Ilmu: Yogyakarta.

Shabani, M. B., & Ghaseni, A. 2014. The Effect of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT) on the Iranian Intermediate ESP Learners' Reading Comprehension. *Social and Behavioral Sciences.* 98 (3), 1713-1721.

Torky, S. 2006. *The Effectiveness of a Task-Based Instruction Program in Developing the English Language Speaking Skills of Secondary Stage Students.* Unpublished PhD. Dissertation. Women's College, Ain Shams University.

Ur, P. 1996. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wahyuni, d., Ihsan, D., & Hayati, R. 2014. Linguistic Competence and Speaking Performance of English Education Study Program Students of Sriwijaya University. Journal of English Literacy Education, 1 (2), 83-90.

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

Zhao, H. 2011. How Far Do the Theories of Task-Based Learning Succeed in Combining Communicative and from-Focused Approaches to L2 Research. *Journal of Cambridge Studies,* 6 (1), 41-56.