DESIGNING TASK COMPLEXITY ON THE QUANTITY OF INTERACTION AND NEGOTIATION OF MEANING

(A Thesis)

By
NUR ARIFAH HANAFIAH

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

DESIGNING TASK COMPLEXITY ON THE QUANTITY OF INTERACTION AND NEGOTIATION OF MEANING

By:
NUR ARIFAH HANAFIAH

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

DESIGNING TASK COMPLEXITY ON THE QUANTITY OF INTERACTION AND NEGOTIATION OF MEANING

By

NUR ARIFAH HANAFIAH

The purpose of this study is to find out whether or not different types of task complexity produce quantity of interaction and to find out whether or not different types of task complexity produce negotiation of meaning. One group repeated measures design was carried out in this research. The subjects of the research were 30 students of IAIN Raden Intan Lampung. The result of analisis shows that there is a statistically significant differences between types of task complexity and the quantity of interaction. The significant differences were analyzed in terms of students' interaction quantity; they are length time, turns taken and the number of c- unit. Furthermore, the task which was specifically designed on the basis of prior knowledge and planning triggered the students to produce the most negotiation of meaning. This suggests that English teachers need to provide their students with types of task complexity designed along with prior knowledge and planning time.

Keywords: Task Complexity, Quantity of Interaction, Negotiation of Meaning

Research Title	:	**DESIGNING TASK COMPLEXITY ON THE QUANTITY OF INTERACTION AND NEGOTIATION OF MEANING**
Student's Name	:	Nur Arifah Hanafiah
Student's Number	:	**1423042062**
Study Program	:	**Master in English Language Teaching**
Department	:	**Language and Arts Education**
Faculty	:	**Teacher Training and Education**

APPROVED BY

Advisory Committee

Advisor

Hery Yufrizal, M.A., Ph.D.
NIP 19600719 198511 1 001

Co-Advisor

Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D.
NIP 19650706 199403 1 002

The Chairperson of Department of Language and Arts Education

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

The Chairperson of Master in English Language Teaching

Dr. Flora, M.Pd.
NIP 19600713 198603 2 001

ADMITTED BY

1. Examination Committee

Chairperson : **Hery Yufrizal, M.A., Ph.D.** .....

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

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

II. **Dr. Tuntun Sinaga, M.Hum.** .....

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 : **November 13th, 2017**

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN

Dengan ini saya menyatakan dengan sebenarnya bahwa:

1. Tesis dengan judul "Designing Task Complexity on The Quantity of Interaction and Negotiation of Meaning" 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,

Nur Arifah Hanafiah
NPM 1423042062

CURRICULUM VITAE

The researcher's complete name is Nur Arifah Hanafiah, but her friends call her Arifah or Ipeh. She was born in Baradatu, October 03rd 1992. She is the first daughters of lovely couple from Bapak Imam Abu Hanifah, S.Pd, MM.Pd. and Ibu Anaritwana Ningsih, S.Pd. She has one brother namely M. Arifin Hanafi, She also has two sisters; Wuri Astuti Hanafi and Nur Aisyah Hanafiah.

She started her study from Kindergarten at TK Dharma wanita Baradatu in 1997 and graduated in 1999. In the same year, she joined Elementary school at SD Negeri 2 Tiuh Balak Pasar Baradatu and graduated in 2005. She pursued her study at SMP and SMA Al-Kautsar Bandar Lampung and graduated in 2010. 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 2014 she graduated from S1 English Education of IAIN Raden Intan Lampung. In December 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; Imam Abu Hanifah, S.Pd, MM.Pd. and Anaritwana Ningsih, S.Pd
- My best brother and sisters; M.Arifin Hanafi, Wuri Astuti Hanafi and Nur Aisyah Hanafiah
- My precious grandmother
- My beloved best friends
- My fabulous friends of the 2nd batch of Master of English Education
- My almamater University of Lampung

MOTTO

"Learn from the past, live for the today, and plan for tomorrow".

(Unknown)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Alhamdulillahirabbil'alamin, praise to Allah SWT, the Almighty and Merciful God, for blessing the writer with faith, health, and opportunity to finish this thesis entitled "Designing Task Complexity on The Quantity of Interaction and Negotiation of Meaning" It is submitted as a compulsory fulfillment of the requirements for Master's Degree of English Language Teaching Study Program in Language and Arts Education Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty at Lampung University.

Gratitude and honor are addressed to all persons who have helped and supported the writer until completing this thesis, since it is necessary to be known that it will never have come into its existence without any supports, encouragements, and assistances by several outstanding people and institutions. Therefore, the writer would like to acknowledge his respect and sincere gratitude to:

1. Hery Yufrizal, M.A., Ph.D. as the first advisor, for his advice, carefulness, criticism, and cooperation in encouraging the writer to think more critically and simply.
2. Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D. as the second advisor, for hir assistance, ideas, advice, and cooperation in triggering the writer's spirit for conducting seminars and final examination and also as the Head of English Education Study Program of Lampung University, for her help and full support.
3. Prof. Ag. Bambang Setiyadi, Ph.D. as the 1st examiner, for his advice, ideas, and carefulness in reviewing this thesis.
4. 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.
5. Dr. Tuntun Sinaga, M.Hum. as the 2nd examiner, for his contribution, ideas, and support.
6. All beloved students of S1 in the second semester, academic year 2016 - 2017, for their participation as the subject of the research.
7. Her beloved parents, Imam Abu Hanifah, S.Pd., MM.Pd. and Anaritwana Ningsih, S.Pd. who have always prayed and supported the writer.
8. Her brother and sister, M. Arifin Hanafi, Wuri Astuti Hanafi and Nur Aisyah Hanafiah for her prayer.

9. The unforgettable thanks are also given to the researcher's 2nd batch fraternity in MPBI; Harits, Ferayani, Lutfan, Meutia, Bu Titis, Bu Vivian, Bu Fitri Sus, Iqbal and other friends who cannot be mentioned one by one, thanks for the beauty of togetherness.
10. Her best friends, Endah Dwi Rahmawati, M.Pd., Uswatun Khoiriyah, M.Pd., Rizqi Fitria Mulyadi M.Pd., Sulastri, M.Pd., Solihin. S.Pd., Yunita M, S.Pd., and Elly M, S.Pd. for their unconditional help, support and motivation.

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. After all, 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, 5 December.2017
The writer,

Nur Arifah Hanafiah

TABLE OF CONTENT

		Page
ABSTRACT		**i**
ADMISION		**ii**
LEMBAR PERNYATAAN		**iv**
CURRICULUM VITAE		**v**
DEDICATION		**vi**
MOTTO		**vii**
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		**viii**
TABLE OF CONTENT		**x**
TABLE		**xii**
I.	**INTRODUCTION**	
1.1	Background of the Research	1
1.2	Problem of the Research	6
1.3	Objectives of the Research	6
1.4	Uses of the Research	6
1.5	Scope of the Research	7
1.6	Definition of Terms	7
II.	**LITERATURE REVIEW**	
2.1	Concept of Task Based Language Teaching	9
2.2	Concept of Task in Language Teaching	10
2.3	Concept of Task Complexity	13
2.4	Manipulating Task Complexity	15
2.5	Concept of negotiation of meaning	16
2.6	Negotiation in the classroom	21
2.7	Concept of Quantity of Interaction	22
2.8	Concept of Interaction	24
2.9	Previous Studies	25
2.10	Theoretical Assumption	27
2.11	The Hypotheses	28

III. RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 Research Design 29
3.2 Setting of the Research 30
3.3 Research Procedure 30
3.4 Data collecting technique 33
3.5 Validity and Reliability 33
3.6 Data Analysis 35

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Quantity of Interaction according to four types of task 37
4.2 Task Complexity in Negotiation of Meaning 47
4.3 Discussion 56

V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Conclusions 61
5.2 Suggestions 62

REFERENCES

APPENDIXES

TABLES

Tables Page

1.1 The descriptive statistics of time 38
1.2 The paired samples test of time 39
1.3 The descriptive statistics of turn taken 41
1.4 The paired samples test of turn taken 42
1.5 The descriptive statistics of c-unit 44
1.6 The paired samples test of c-unit 45
1.7 Descriptive statistics of negotiation of meaning 53
1.8 The paired samples test in negotiation of meaning 54

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is concerned with background of the research, problems of the research, objectives of the research, uses of the research, scope of the research, and definition of terms clarified like in the following.

1.1. Background of The Research

The aim of studying Language is to interact with other. One of the ways to obtain the aim is through speaking. English teaching should focus on promoting oral skill to accommodate the students' need for an effective communication in their second or foreign language. It is line with what has been suggested by Hatch (1987:63) in Mackey and Polio (2009:2) that second language learning is developed from "learning how to carry on the conversation and learning how to communicate". Those two learning activities can be found in an interactional conversation activity. Broadly speaking, language is best learned and taught through oral interaction.

Therefore, to acquire foreign language, learner need such ideal activities or task 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 Saedi, Zaferanieh & Shatery (2012:72), both focus on foms and focus

on meaning instructions are valuable, and should complement rather than exclude each other. Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is a second language (L2) teaching approach that has developed with increasing popularity of communicative approaches to L2 teaching and learning since the 1980s, where communication is seen as the primary means and end of language development. Task based instruction or known as Task Based Language Teaching (TBL) 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 (Prabu, 1987; Larsen & Freeman, 2000 in Mahpul, 2014:11)

There have been many investigations concerning the usage about Task-Based Language Teaching. Most of them are focused on trying out the Cognition Hypothesis proposed by Robinson. In the hypothesis, Robinson (2015:5) suggests that tasks be sequenced from simple to complex for learners. He then describes a model for steps to follow in sequencing increasingly complex versions of pedagogic tasks and the complementary Triadic Componential Framework of task characteristics which makes distinctions between task complexity, task conditions, and task difficulty. Those three factors are also called Triadic Componential Framework (TCF). The TCF differentiates three main categories of task demands: (1) task condition, which refers to interactional demands; (2) task complexity, which is concerned with cognitive factors that are intrinsic to the task (i.e. reasoning demands); and (3) task difficulty, which deals with individual

differences in learners' factors that make the same task more or less difficult for different subjects (i.e. affective factors and working memory capacity).

In the SLA field, a number of definitions of tasks have been provided by different authors and from multiple perspectives. Although in this study tasks are used for research purposes to collect information from L2 speakers, in this section pedagogic tasks as used by teaching practitioners and tasks from a psychological perspective will also be analyzed. Tasks can also be manipulated for different empirical purposes and to test different theoretical constructs in both classroom and experimental settings. In this way, researchers usually propose a series of operationalizations that may affect either their internal structure, their interactional design, or the conditions under which they are performed in order to test and measure their effects on learners' comprehension, production, or learning.

However, Robinson (2003: 57) suggests that task complexity also makes a distinction between two categories of the dimension of task complexity, *resource directing* and *resource dispersing* dimensions. According to Robinson, the cognitive factors can be manipulated to increase or lessen learners' cognitive engagement when learners are performing a task. Robinson argues that the 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 (2007:164), 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. From this definition and from other studies on task complexity, two

important assumptions that would lead to the basic grounds of the study to be carried out can be inferred. The first one is that tasks differ in their degree of complexity, which in turn affect L2 production. The second is that 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.

In these many elements of task, negotiation of meaning occurs during the interaction. Negotiation of meaning is defined as side sequences to the main flow of communication aimed at signaling and solving problems in message comprehensibility that is aimed at restoring mutual understanding, (Van Den Branden, 1997 in Yufrizal 2007:19). Meanwhile Pica (1988) in Yufrizal (2001:14) defines negotiation of meaning as a series of exchanges conducted by addressor to addressee to help them understand and be understood by their interlocutor.

Recently, some researcher (Marije et, all) conducted a research on an oral interactive task entitle “Task Complexity and interaction: (combined) effects on task based performance in Dutch as a second language”. Besides that, Madarsara & Rahimy (2015:252) entitled examining the effect of task complexity and sequence on speaking ability of Iranian EFL learners. Furthermore, Azizi, Asoudeh & Ali (2012:1) entitled “The Role of Task Complexity on EFL Learners’ Oral Production in English Language Institutions”.

There are problems of task complexity on the quantity of interaction and negotiation of meaning. This might be gap that wants to be filled through this research. Thus, this reseach intends to focus on prior knowledge and planing that refer to performative or procedural demands. Task complexity is the result of the

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

This research will examine Designing Task Complexity on The Quantity of Interaction and Negotiation of Meaning. It is done because many researchers and language practitioners believe that increasing cognitive task complexity may lead to more interaction since more clarification and negotiation work are needed. As both task complexity and interaction guide their attention towards language form, L2-learner's performance on complex interactive task may become even more accurate than on simple interactive task. The quantity of interaction and negotiation of meaning have been used both as performance descriptors for the interaction assessment of language learners and as indicators of learners' proficiency underlying their performance. They have also been used for measuring progress in language learning.

After combining the variables of prior knowledge and planning, there were four types of tasks that had been assessed to the students in the form of dialogic. It was used since according to Nirmawati (2015:10), dialogues involve two or more speakers and can be subdivided into those exchanges that promote social relationships (interpersonal) and those for whose purpose is to convey propositional or factual information (transactional). In each case, participants may have a good deal of shared knowledge (background information, schemata). Therefore, the familiarity of the interlocutors will produce conversations with more assumptions, implications, and other meanings hidden between the lines.

In sum, the previous studies of Designing Task Complexity on the Quantity of Interaction and Negotiation of Meaning have not analyzed all aspects in research performative factors optimally. Thus, it was done in this research. From the research, Designing Task Complexity on the Quantity of Interaction and Negotiation of Meaning, the effects of four types of task manipulated along with prior knowledge and planning on the students' interaction was known.

1.2. Problem of The Research

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

1. Do different types of task complexity produce quantity of interaction?
2. Do different types of task complexity produce negotiation of meaning?

1.3. Objectives of The Research

1. To find out whether or not different types of task complexity produce quantity of interaction.
2. To find out whether or not different types of task complexity produce negotiation of meaning.

1.4. Uses of The Research

The uses of the research are:

Practically

1. The finding of this research can be made as input for teachers to make students enthusiastic in interaction. For the students, they can practice to interaction freely and bravely.

2. This research can be a source of information and knowledge for English teachers in designing task complexity.

Theoretically

1. The result of this research is expected to give an input and reference in designing task complexity on quantity of interaction and negotiation of meaning.
2. This result is also expected to give an input and references in analazing the the types of task complexity in students' interaction.

1.5. Scope of The research

This research was conducted at IAIN Raden Intan Lampung. The population of the research was first semester students. There was only one class that has been chosen as sample of this research. The purposes of this study was to find out whether or not different types of task complexity produce quantity of interaction and to investigate how the negotiation of meaning was affected by different types of task complexity.Thus, the collected data were in the form of students' utterances that had been trascribed and analyzed.

1.6. Definition of Terms

Definition of terms will be useful in order to avoid misunderstanding in the terms and width limitation of the research.

1. Interaction

Interaction is the effective way in language learning by rendering underlying meaning of a message, comprehend cultural reference, use strategies to keep communication.

2. Task Based Language Teaching

TBLT is a model of second language learning conceptualized in terms of holistic activities, meaning based approaches, and learner driven activities.

3. Task complexity

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

4. Negotiation of meaning

Negotiation of meaning is a series of exchanges conducted by addressor to addressee to help them understand and be understood by their interlocutor (Pica (1988) in Yufrizal (2007:14).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter includes related literature, previous studies, and theoritical assumtion. They are elaborated as follows:

2.1. Concepts of Task Based Language Teaching

Task-based language teaching is one of the more modern approaches to language teaching. Since then increasing amounts of teachers and scholars have adopted this method in their work to understand the meaning of task based learning we must first define what a ‘task’. Crookes (1986) in Ellis (2003: 4) a task is a piece of work or an activity, usually with a specified objective, undertaken as part of an educational course, at work, or used to elicit data for research. While Nunan (2004) states that a pedagogical task is a piece of classroom work that involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language. Nunan goes on to say that tasks should also have a sense of completeness and should be able to stand on their own as a form of communication and learning.

Others define ‘task’ in their own way, such as Prabhu (1987) in Ellis (2003: 4) who defines a task is an activity which required learners to arrive at an outcome from given information through some process of thought, and which allowed teachers to control and regulate that process. Bygate, Skehan & Swain (2001) in Ellis (2003: 5) states that a task is an activity which requires learners to use language, with emphasis on meaning, to attain an objective. While Willis (1996)

in Willis and Leaver (2004: 15) states that a task is a goal-oriented activity in which learners use language to achieve a real outcome. Willis (1996) in Murad (2009: 37) asserted that task is a goal oriented activity with real outcome; this implies that a task is a goal oriented activity which learners use language to achieve a real outcome. In other words, learners use whatever target language resources they have in order to solve a problem, do a puzzle, play a game or share and compare experiences. Skehan (1996a) in Ellis (2003:4) defines a tasks is an activity in which: meaning is primary; there is some short of relationship to the real world; task completion has some priority; and the assessment of task performance is in terms of task outcome. Task success is evaluated in terms of achievement of an outcome and tasks generally bear some resemblance to real-life language use. A task is defined as a method of learning that is focused on the use of language and on the learner making use of the new language in as close to a real-life setting as is possible. Task-based learning forces learners to apply the language in a realistic way that is similar to how one would use language in daily-life.

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 (2014:11) 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 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) 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 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.

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.

2.3. Concept of Task Complexity

The Cognition Hypothes is rationale differs in some aspects from another model of task demands. Skehan's limited attention capacity model Ellis (2010) and his Trade-off Hypothesis (2009) in Crespo (2011:3) suggest that it is not task complexity but particular combinations of task characteristics and conditions that predict correlations between different dimensions of performance. Due to attentional and memory limitations competition for attention exists and it leads to trade-off effects, typically between complexity and accuracy. When task conditions are simplified, mainly by giving planning-time to students, this competition is diminished.

According to Robinson (2001a:33), suggest that it is differences in task complexity which are the logical basis for prospective decision making about task based syllabus design and the sequencing of pedagogic task. Robinson distinguishes between the term task complexity (cognitive factors) and task difficulty (learner factors), which were previously used interchangeably 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

To begin with, 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." (Robinson, 2001a:29).

From this definition and from other studies on task complexity, two important assumptions can be inferred that would lead to the basic grounds of the study to be carried out. The first one is that tasks differ in their degree of complexity, which in turn affects L2 production. The second is that 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-dispersing variables*: related to performative and procedural demands (e.g. less planning time or familiarity 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, reasoning demands). It draws learners' attention to vocabulary and syntax encoding.

Resource-dispersing 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 manipulate the task complexity in term of priorknowledge and planning time.

2.4. Manipulating Task Complexity

In manipulating the task complexity the two variables of the dimension, that is, prior knowledge and planning was combined and sequenced from simple to complex task. The example of task manipulation design are as follows:

1. Task 1 : + prior knowledge, + planning
2. Task 2 : + Prior knowledge, - no planning
3. Task 3 : – no prior knowledge, + planning
4. Task 4 : – no prior knowledge, - no planning

Note:

- : complex task
+ : simple task

Prior knowledge : Students has background knowledge/schemata concerning to the topic.

No prior knowledge	: Students has no background knowledge/schemata concerning to the topic.
Planning	: Students has planning time to express their ideas
No planning	: Students has no planning time (limit time) to express their ideas.

2.5. Concept of Negotiation of meaning

Negotiation of meaning is defined as the instances in which interlocutors in a conversation face a problem in understanding and they engage in a reciprocal work to solve the comprehension problem or to stop the flow of the conversation to check whether their interlocutor is following the flow of the conversation through interactional modification including comprehension checks, clarification requests, confirmation checks and recast (Ellis, 2003; Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005; Ellis, 1994; Oliver, 2002; Oliver, 1998; Pica, Young, & Doughty, 1987; Gass & Polio, 1998;) in Mohammadi (2015:96). In this case, when native speakers and non native speakers are involved in an interaction, both interlocutors work together to solve any potential misunderstanding or non understanding that occurs, by checking each others' comprehension, requesting clarification and confirmation and by repairing and adjusting speech.

According to Pica et al (1989) and Pica et al (1991) in Yufrizal (2007:71) there are four components in negotiation of meaning:

1. Trigger

Trigger is the utterance that contains elements that create communication breakdown. It can also be defined as prime of negotiation of meaning which invokes or stimulate incomplete understanding on the part of the hearer. e.g.:

Student A: and I need a very energetic person that uh…can what it can…..

Student B: can attract.

2. Signals.

This component refers to an indicator from a listener that understanding is not complete. This indication is triggered by a speaker's previous utterance. In many studies of negotiation of meaning signals have been closely linked to two concepts: confirmation checks and clarification of requests.

Signals are divided into confirmation check and clarification request. The detail explanation is discussed below.

a. Confirmation check.

It is defined as listener's inquiry as to whether or not their expressed understanding of the speaker's previous is correct. It could occur in three ways:

a) The interlocutor repeats all of parts of the speaker utterance. It is called confirmation check through repetition, e.g.:

Student A: café it's too in South Street

Student B: South Street?

b) The interlocutor corrects or complete what the previous speaker has said, e.g.:

Student A: Uh the story it tell about the man who wants to…..

Student B: To trap?

c) The interlocutor elaborates or modifies what the speaker has said in order to confirm whether his/her understanding of what speaker has said is correct, e.g.:

Student A: he see a frog the frog is on the water…,yeah, it seems it's on uh…what is it kind of leafs on the water and then just

...she just smile the girl is stand on the left side of the picture.

Student B: do you mean that she's watching the frog?

b. Clarification request.

A clarification request is a request for further information from an interlocutor about a previous utterance. Unlike confirmation checks where the listener listened to the speaker's utterance with some degree of non understanding clarification request refers to an indicator that shows the listener has totally not understood what the speaker has said.

3. Response

It refers to a speaker's attempt to clear up what the listener has said (unaccepted input). In many studies of negotiation of meaning responses were related to the discussion of the repair, that is, corrections made by non-native speaker as a response to a modification of input action by native speaker.

There are five categories of response. They are self –repetition response, other – repetition response, self modification, other-modification response, and confirm or negate response.

a. Self –repetition response

It refers to a response produced by a speaker in the form of part or all an utterance produced in the trigger. e.g.:

Student A: now I in pub

Student B: what….pub?

Student A: pub

b. Other –repetition response

In this category, the speaker repeats what the listener says in the signal. Therefore, it is called other-repetition. In the speaker's response to the signal, we can see that the speaker has changed his output based on the input from the listener. Since the listener's signal is triggered by inability to interpret the speaker's utterance, the signal always modifies the trigger toward the listener's assumed interpretation. Therefore, the speaker in this case has produced modified output e.g.:

Student A: I think like a suit, us, usual

Student B: like usual suit

Student A: yes, usual suit

c. Self modification

In this category, the speaker modifies the trigger as a response to the listener's signal of negotiation of meaning. The modification made by the speaker can be at the level of phonology, morphology, or syntax, or at the semantic level. e.g.:

Student A: and then uh…..I think this picture tell tell us about ironic ironic picture

Student B: can you spell it

Student A: ironic ironic ironic in Indonesia ironi

d. Other-modification response

Other-modification response is a modification by the speaker to reflect the signal given by the listener, e.g.:

Student A: hu….hu….what they

Student B: what she done

Student A: what she done to the frog

e. Confirm or negate response

It refers to a response in form of confirmation or negation. A ‘yes’ confirmation response is usually short e.g.:

Student A: yes I see…..what about his hair?

Student B: his hair…..

Student A: yes

4. Follow-up

It refers to information about whether the communication modifications have been successful or not. In a long negotiation of meaning, interlocutors usually repeat the signal-response exchange until an agreement is achieved, e.g.:

Student A: on the top of cooker

Student B: pardon?

Student A: on the top of the cooker.

Student B: yes, on the top of the cooker

Bellow is the working scheme of negotiation of meaning adapted from Varonis and Gass (1985, cited in Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005) in Mohammadi (2015:96):

1. Trigger (i.e., the utterance that causes the communication problem).
2. Indicator (i.e., the utterance that demonstrates a communicative problem has occurred)
3. Response (i.e., the utterance that attempts to address the communication problem identified in the indicator)
4. Reaction (i.e., the utterance that indicates a speaker’s uptake to the response)

2.6. Negotiation in the Classroom

Comprehension precedes production. (Real language acquisition develops slowly and speaking skills emerge after listening skills, even satiation is perfect. The best way is to provide "comprehensible input" in low anxiety context and students produce when they are ready. Teacher can use different co-operative learning strategies such as small group discussions in the classroom. The increased opportunities to speak can help students to speak. These are some suggestions to work in the classroom:

1) Divide students into groups. Change the groups by different activities.
2) Provide opportunities to practice with more proficient speakers.
3) Keep groups small, four students in the group is sufficient. It provides more chance to speak and practice.
4) Explain and emphasize the value of collaboration.
5) Visit the groups regularly to supervise.
6) Explain the groups the concept of agreement and disagreement. "You may have some similar or different opinion so you should use especial words and expressions.
7) Try to connect prior knowledge of students".
8) Model pronunciation and syntax and ask students to repeat.
9) Pay attention to student's errors and provide indirect feedback by modeling the correct form. Don't interrupt learners by correcting directly.

2.7. Concept of Quantity of Interaction

The quatity of interaction is mesured by three elements, namely the length of speaking time, the number of turns taken, and the number of c-units.

a. The length of speaking time

When the students like to do their speaking task, they will have opportunity to decide when they should start the conversation, and of course it will be based on their own readiness. They also have chance to stop the conversation if they think they have fulfill their speaking task. In completing different task may require different lengths of time. Consequently, it also affects the opportunities for production of other components of other interaction.

b. The number of turns taken

Turn-taking is one of the basic facts of conversation: speakers and listeners change their roles in order to begin their speech (Coulthard 1985: 59). There is a set of rules that govern the turn taking system, which is independent of various social contexts (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974: 704): (a) when the current speaker selects the next speaker, the next speaker has the right and, at the same time, is obliged to take the next turn; (b) if the current speaker does not select the next speaker, any one of the participants has the right to become the next speaker. This could be regarded as self-selection; and (c) if neither the current speaker selects the next speaker nor any of the participants become the next speaker, the current speaker may resume his/her turn.

In this research the number of turns taken will be calculated based on the amount of turns a speaker produced when the student interacts with another student. A turn will be begun when a student starts an utterance and it will be ended when the

other student produces another utterance. In a kind of conversation it will be possible if the turn by a speaker overlaps with the turn of the next speaker. The turn of the first speaker will be calculated from the beginning of the relevant utterance until the speaker stopped speaking and the turn of the interlocutor will be also calculated from the start of speaking even though the first speaker hasn't stopped yet.

c. The number of c- units

A c- unit is defined as an independent utterance that provides referential or pragmatic meaning, that is, c- units are utterances produced by any individual which are meaningful though not necessarily complete (Crook, 1990 in Yufrizal 2007:69).

The *c-unit* (communication unit: Loban 1966 in Crookes 1990: 184) is closely related to the T-unit, but it has the advantage that isolated phrases not accompanied by a verb, but which have a communicative value, can be coded. Such phrases typically appear in answer to a question:

Question : Where's my hat?
Answer : On the table.

In this case, the answer is not a T-unit, and could not appear in an analysis using T-units, but it is a c-unit. If we see from the answer there is no main clause which is the characteristic of T- unit, but it has communication value as meant that showing the position of the hat.

In this research, the researcher used C- unit to analyze the students' utterance because it permits all meaningful utterances to be included rather than only the major clause that form the basis of t- unit. So it means that the researcher only

analyzed the student's utterance based on the independent clause or independent modifier which has communicative value.

2.8. Concept of interaction

Interaction in language learning refers to the condition in which students achieve facility in using language, when their attention is focused on conveying and receiving authentic message, that is, messages which contain information of interest to speaker and listener in a situation of importance to both (Rivers: 1987) in Paiva (1989:359). In addition, Rivers (1987) in Choudhury (2005:1) states through interaction students can increase their language store as they listen to read authentic linguistics material or even the output of the fellow students in discussion, joint problem solving tasks, or dialogues journals.

In other hand, according Savignon (1997) in Moss (2003:1) interaction can also be defined as the ability to interpret the underlying meaning of a message, understand cultural references, use strategies to keep communication from breaking down, and apply the rules of grammar-develops in a second language . Here, it talks about how language is learned and the factors that influence the process.

From the explanation above, it can be concluded that interaction is the effective way in learning language by rendering underlying meaning of a message, comprehend cultural references, use strategies to keep communication. Interaction is important both in learning language and second language acquisition. It cannot be separated from the communication.

2.9. Previous Studies on Task Complexity and negotiation of meaning

There have been many studies conducted concerning task complexity on the quantity of interaction and negotiation of meaning in spoken performance and writing performance. However, the researcher will only review the following studies which focus on interaction, since this study is just going to be conducted in that domain.

First of all Marije et, all. conducted a research on an oral interactive task entitle "Task Complexity and interaction: (combined) effects on task based performance in Dutch as a second language". He manipulated the factor ± elements and manipulation of the interactive factor ± monologic ±dialogic. From this research, it is revealed that the task containing few elements and interactive factor will increase fluency, accuracy and complexity.

In line to Madarsara & Rahimy (2015:252) They manipulated task complexity by adapting a map task and a car task. The finding of the study also revealed that the participants in the experimental group, who practiced task sequence and complexity, far outweighed the control group in complexity and fluency than the other area of the speaking test.

In contrast to Azizi, Asoudeh & Ali (2012:1) entitled "The Role of Task Complexity on EFL Learners' Oral Production in English Language Institutions", examine 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. This study is specifically concerned with the design features of oral task which contributes to their different degrees of accuracy and fluency.

The last Shumei Zhang (2009:91) entitle “The Role of Input, Interaction and Output in the Development of Oral Fluency”. He used the instument tests of oral fluency and face to face interviews. The findings of this research non-native oral fluency could be obtained through efficient and effective input, interaction and output in EFL while on the other hand most chinese English learners failed to speak English fluently, namely lacking effective input and output having no real need for interaction, attaching too much importance to language forms and written test.

Based on the previous studies above, the researcher tries to conduct a slightly similar research but there is one variables of dimension. To the researcher’s knowledge, the existing studies mostly concerned about resource-depleting on the quantity of interaction and negotiation of meaning and other studies just discussed about task manipulation in a particular dimension in interaction using quantity of interaction and negotiation of meaning. Thus, this research will just focus on task complexity by combining planning and prior knowledge on the quantity of interaction and netiation of meaning. This might be the novelty that wants to be revealed through this research.

2.10. Theoretical Assumption

According to some theories, 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 will only focus 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 tries to manipulate task complexity by combining the three variables of resource-directing dimension.

In negotiation of meaning, we learn two or more learners work together to overcome miscommunication which can be identified on four interrelated moves developed. Negotiation of meaning is define as side sequences to the main flow of communication aimed at signaling and solving problems message comprehensibility that is aimed at restoring mutual understanding. While Yufrizal (2007:14) defines negotiation of meaning as a series of exchanges conducted by addressor to addressee to help them understand and be understood by their interlocutor.

2.11. The Hypotheses

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

H_i : The different types of task complexity produce quantity of interaction and negotiation of meaning.

H_o : The different types of task complexity do not produce quantity of interaction and negotiation of meaning.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter includes research design, setting of research, population and sample, research procedure, and data collecting technique.

3.1. Research Design

In this research the researcher used one group repeated measures design because the research was intended to find out task complexity on the quantity of interaction and negotiation of meaning and in this way the researcher designed the task that has been carried out in this research. This kind of design was used since the tasks has been administered to one group of students, but there were four times for them to perform the tasks. The research's design has been formulated as follow:

T1 T2 T3 T4

Where is:

T1 : Task 1 (+) prior knowledge, (+) planning

T2 : Task 2 (+) prior knowledge, (-) no planning

T3 : Task 3 (+) no prior kowledge, (+) planning

T4 : Task 4 (-) no prior knowledge, (-) no planning

The variables in this research are as follows :

1. Independent variable is task complexity (X) there are four kinds of task that will be administered. There are as follows :
    1) Task 1 : (+) prior knowledge, (+) planning
    2) Task 2 : (+) prior knowledge, (-) no planning
    3) Task 3 : (+) no prior kowledge, (+) planning
    4) Task 4 : (-) no prior knowledge, (-) no planning

2. Dependent variable are quantity of interaction (Y1) and negotiation of meaning (Y2).

3.2. Setting of The Research

This research was conducted in the academic year of 2015/2016, and it was held at IAIN Raden Intan Lampung.

3.3. Research Procedure

In doing the research, there were some procedures which have been done. They were as follows:

1. Preparing the tasks

There were four kinds of tasks which were given to the students. All tasks were made by combining and manipulating the two variables of prior knowledge and planning time. The first task containing (+) prior knowledge (+) planning. The second tasks cotaining (+) prior knowledge, (-) No Planning. The third tasks containing (-) no prior knowledge, (+) planning. The fourth consist (-) no prior knowledge, (-) no planning.

Before administering the tasks to the sample chosen, firstly they have been tried out to another group of students who were supposed to be randomly. This was done since the tasks designed were not valid and reliable.It was expected that the valid and reliable tasks would be obtained.

During the tried out, firstly the students had difficulties in finding the English for some words. Thus, the teacher 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 teacher 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. In concerning prior knowledge, almost all students did not state their knowledge of doing each step. They ignored the instruction which they thought hard to understand. Hence, in the real research, the researcher decide to let the students ask some question if they were unable to comprehend the instructions. Moreover, the researcher used partly Indonesian to make students understand what to do.

2. Determining the sample

In determining the sample, the researcher chose second semester which consisted of 30 students, due to the assumption that the class was homogeneous.

3. Conducting the tasks

Before conducting the tasks, the researcher gave four tasks to each students, however, in conducting the tasks, the researcher did them in four meetings. 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. 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 students interaction.

After that the teacher collected the task from the students. Then, the 30 students were divided into fifteen groups consisted of two students per group. This was done in order to make the activity run effectively.

While conducting the tasks, one pair had to perform tasks 1 (prior knowledge and planning), this made the process of recording ran well since there was no disturbance from other students' voices. When the students had finished doing the tasks, he/she must return with other group. In performing the tasks the students make dialogue with their partner and performed it in the class. then, in the second meeting, they did tasks 2 (prior knowledge and no planning) for the second meeting the students make dialogue with their pair and performed in front of the class. for the third meeting the students did tasks 3 (no prior knowledge and planning) and the fourth meeting the students did tasks 4 (no prior knowledge and no planning), it was done like the previous meetings. The time allocated for each meeting was 100 minutes. For the first ten minutes, the teacher gave explanation the tasks, then the students were given 90 minutes to do the tasks. In performing the tasks the students did it with their pairs.

4. Data analysis

After conducting some procedures the researcher analized the data. Related to this, the researcher used SPSS to see whether task complexity on the quantity of interaction and negotiation of meaning in students' interaction.

3.4 Data collecting Technique

The researcher used instruments to collect the data. The instruments were described as follow:

1. Recording the students' utterances

To obtain the data, the researcher recorded the students' utterances by using recorder application in the cell phone. In fact, the students recorded the utterances produced with their own cell phones.

2. Transcribing and coding the students' utterances

The students' utterances needed transcribing. It means the spoken form must be transferred into the written form. Having done it, the written utterances were coded by certain symbols. These two processes were carried out by the researcher and an inter-rater.

3.5 Validity and Reliability of The Instruments

In order to get a data which is valid and also reliable then the instrument of 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 analized its content and construct validity.

a. Content validity

Conten validity means that the test is good reflection of what has been taught and the knowledge which the teacher wants the students to know. 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. In order words, the test is based on the materials in the English curriculum, so that it can be said that the test has content validity since the test is good representation of material which will be studied in the classroom. Due to the reason, the text of this research was in the form of dialogue which was chosen for the students' tasks.

b. Construct validity

In this research the researcher asked the students to do interaction. The researcher observed the interaction based on the quantity of interaction and negotiation of meaning. In order to fulfill construct validity the researcher used Yufrizal's theory of interaction in observing students quantity of interaction and negotiation of meaning.

2. Reliability

Before the tasks were administered to the sample of the research, they have been tried out first to another group of students who were supposed to have similar students' interaction to the sample. Inter-rater reliability was also used to make the instrument more reliable.

In scoring the students' interaction in term quantity of interaction and negotiation of meaning 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. Then in order to find out whether there is a significant correlation between students' speaking result in quality based on the first rater

with second rater the researcher also made the statistical correlation by using SPSS computation then she got the result of statistical correlation as below:

Table. Correlation

		rater1	rater2
rater1	Pearson Correlation	1	,884**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	30	30
rater2	Pearson Correlation	,884**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	30	30

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

From the statistical computation shows that there is a significant correlation between students' interaction result based on the first rater with the second rater ($r= 0.884$; $p<0.001$). So it means that students' interaction based on the first rater is equivalent with the students' interaction from the second rater. It also can be said that the students' interaction based on the first rater and second rater is reliable.

3.6 Data Analysis

After the data needed were collected, then they were codes and counted in negotiation of meaning and the quantity of interaction in terms of the length of speaking time, the numbers of turns taken, and the numbers of c-unit. The explanation was as follows :

1. **The quantity of interaction**
   a. The length of speaking time

The length of speaking time or interaction time was calculated in minutes and seconds from the time at which both participants had clearly understood the items and content of the task and began the recordings.

b. The number of turns taken

The number of turns taken was calculated on the basis of the number of turns a speaker produced when the participant was interacting with another participant. A turn begins when a participant starts an utterance and it was ended when the other participant produces another utterance.

c. The number of c-units

The number of c-units was calculated based on the number of meaningful utterances. The mean number of c-units produced by the participants across the four task given.

2. Negotiation of meaning

The researcher used certain symbol to measured negotiation of meaning in students interaction, they are:

a. Trigger is the utterance that contains elements that create communication breakdown.
b. Signal is an indicator from a listener that understanding is not complete.
c. Response is correcting made by NNSs as a response to a modification of input action by NSs.
d. Follow up moves contain information about whether the communication modifications have been successful or not.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter is concerned with conclusions of the research. It includes some suggestions for the English teachers and further research .

5.1. Conclusions

With reference to the findings of the current study, the research draws conclusions as follows:

- There is statistically difference of tasks complexity on the quantity of interaction. The statistically difference can be seen in every term of students' interaction quantity. They are length time, turn-taking, and the number of c- unit. Furthermore, students learn more easily and get better understanding when they are taught by using tasks.
- There is a statistically difference of task complexity on the negotiation of meaning. The students did not employ in negotiation of meaning. Even so, all types of components for negotiation have been applied in their interaction.

5.2.Suggestions

In accordance with the conclusions above, some suggestions are given for both English teachers and further research.

5.2.1 Suggestions for English Teacher

Based on the results of the research, there are several suggestions which can be addressed to the English teachers. Firstly, as described in Chapter 4, the majority of the students did not do negotiation of meaning when the students were provided with prior knowledge of Task 1 as shown in the class. They were provided with planning time before they performed. Therefore, it is suggested that English teachers need the task without planning time, so the task might be more effective.

Secondly, when the students did Task 2, the researcher found that there was no follow up in their conversation. It is because the limitation of topic in Task 2. Therefore, it is suggested that English teacher s give their students fully-comprehendible messages about the topic before doing Task 2. The teacher also suggests Task 2 is made with general topic, so the students are easier in doing the Task 2.

Thirdly, the students got difficulty in doing Task 3 and Task 4. It was because there was no prior knowledge in Task 3 and Task 4, and then the students did not have guide line when they did Task 3 and Task 4. Therefore, it is suggested that English teachers change Task 3 and Task 4 with no prior knowledge into Task 3 and Task 4 with prior knowledge. Prior knowledge is important to give a guide line for the students about the topic which will be undertaken by them in Task 3 and Task 4.

5.2.2 Suggestion for Further Research

There are also several points necessary for further study to concern. Firstly in doing this research, the researcher found that most of the students had the same results in their conversation (cheating). Therefore, it is suggested that further research gives the topic randomly in order to avoid the students cheat with their friends.

Secondly further researchers with respect to task complexity and negotiation of meaning need to take a number of factors into account. It is better for them to design the task by manipulating not only resource directing dimension but also resource depleting dimension. There will be such a complex combination between all variables of resource directing and resource depleting in one task. Some researchers who concern to the task complexity and negotiation of meaning just focus on interaction. Therefore, for the next researchers, they should develop task complexity and negotiation of meaning in other skills such as listening, reading, or writing.

REFERENCES

Alemi, Minoo & Saman Ebadi.(2010). *The effects of pre-reading activities on ESP reading comprehension*. Finlandia: JLTR academy publisher. Vol. 1, No. 5

Azizir, Mehdi, & Fatemeh Asou Deh. (2012). *The role of task complexity on EFL learners' oral Production in English language institutions.* Maragher-Branch: Scienceline Publication. Vol. 1 Issue 1.

Choudhury, Shaheena. (2005). *Interaction in second language classrooms.* Bangladesh: BAC University Journal. Vol. II, No. 1

Crespo, Mary Recio. (2011). *The effects of task complexity on L2 oral production as mediated by differences in working memory capacity*. Barcelona: University Barcelona

Crookes, Graham. (1990). *The utterance, and other basic units for second language discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, Rod. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. New York: Oxford

Madarsara, Masoumeh Alipour & Rahim Rahimy. (2015). *Examining the effect of task complexity and sequence and speaking ability of Iranian EFL learners.* Iran: International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature Vol. 4 No.1: Januari 2015.

Mahpul. (2014). *Task difficulty in dialogic oral production by Indonesian EFL learners*. Curtin University.

Michele. C, Marije, Folkert Kuiken & Ineke Vedder. *Task complexity and interaction: (combained) effect on task-based performance in dutch as a second language*. University of Mannheim, University of Amsterdam.

Murad, Tareq Mitib. (2009). *The effect of task based language teaching on developing speaking skills among the Palestinian secondary EFL students in Israel and their attitudes towards English*. Yarmouk University.

Mohammadi, Zohre. (2015). *Negotiation of meaning in required and optional information exchange tasks: discourse issues*. Iran : International journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature Vol. 4 No.1

Moss, Donna. (2003). *Second language acquisition in adults: from research to practice*. Georgetown University.

Nirmawati, Lia Amalia. (2015). *Improving students' speaking skills through speaking board games of grade VIII of SMPN 13 Yogyakarta in the academic year of 2013/2014*. Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta States University.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. New York: Cambridge.

Paiva, Ricardo M. (2001). *Linguistics, language and the real world: discourse and beyond*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Rahayu. Desi. (2016). *Negotiation of meaning by the second year students with extrovert and introvert personalities at SMA Al-Kautsar Bandar Lampung*. Bandar Lampung : Lampung University.

Robinson, P. (2001a). *Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: exploring interaction in a componential framework.* Applied Linguistics. *Applied linguistics,* Vol. 22 (1).

Robinson, P. (2001b). *cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, P. (2003). *The cognition hypothesis, task design and adult task based language learning*.

Robinson, P & Roger Gilabert. (2007). *Task complexity, the cognition hypothesis and second language learning and performance*. IRAL.

Robinson, P. (2015). *The cognition hypothesis second language task demands and the SSAC model of pedagogic task sequencing.*

Troike, Muriel Savile. (2006). *Introducing second language acquisition*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Willis, Jane E & Betty Lou Leaver. (2004). *Task based instruction in foreign language education*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Yufrizal, Hery.(2007). *Negotiation of meaning by Indonesia EFL learners*. Pustaka Reka Cipta.

Zhang, Shumei. (2009). *The role of input, interaction and output in the development of oral fluency*. China: Foreign Language Department, Dongguan University of Tech.

Zhao, Xiaoguang & Lei Zhu. (2012). *Schemata theory and college English reading teaching*. China : Canadian center of science and education.