THE USE OF TASK COMPLEXITY IN SPOKEN PERFORMANCE BY THE 10TH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMAN 2 PADANG CERMIN

(A Thesis)

By
Vivian Agustina

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

ABSTRACT

THE USE OF TASK COMPLEXITY IN SPOKEN PERFORMANCE BY THE 10TH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMAN 2 PADANG CERMIN

Vivian Agustina
vivian02@gmail.com
Magister of English Education
Lampung University

Speaking is a crucial part of second and foreign language learning and teaching. Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has become popular in the field of foreign language teaching and learning. In TBLT, task complexity should be the sole basis for making prospective sequencing decisions since it can be anticipated in advance of implementation of syllabus. The current research aimed to investigate the effect of four types of task complexity manipulated along with the number of elements and prior knowledge on students' spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) and to eleborate the students' perceptions of the four types of task complexity. This research used quantitative method. The istruments were four types of monolog tasks and questionnairres. The data took the forms of a students' utterences and students' perception. The subjects were 33 of the tenth grade students of SMAN 2 Padang Cermin. The result showed that the tasks which are made simple or complex in resource-directing (number of elements) generated more fluent utterences on the students' spoken performance since they were simple in resource-depleting (prior knowledge). This finding partly supports the cognition hypothesis. With respect to the students' perceptions, the current research found out that prior knowledge became the major reason for the students to do the task easily, successfully, and confidently. It also arises the students' interest, motivation, and learning opportunity. The finding suggests that task complexity which is manipulated along with the number of elements and prior knowledge facilitates students to improve the speaking performance.

Key words: *Speaking, TBLT, task complexity, CAF, students' perceptions.*

THE USE OF TASK COMPLEXITY IN SPOKEN PERFORMANCE BY THE 10TH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMAN 2 PADANG CERMIN

By:
VIVIAN AGUSTINA

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

Research Title	:	**THE USE OF TASK COMPLEXITY IN SPOKEN PERFORMANCE BY THE 10TH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMAN 2 PADANG CERMIN**
Student's Name	:	Vivian Agustina
Student's Number	:	**1423042069**
Study Program	:	**Master in English Language Teaching**
Department	:	**Language and Arts Education**
Faculty	:	**Teacher Training and Education**

APPROVED BY

Advisory Committee

Advisor

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

Co-Advisor

Dr. Ari Nurweni, M.A.
NIP 19630302 198703 2 001

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

Secretary : **Dr. Ari Nurweni, M.A.** .....

Examiners : I. **Prof. Dr. Cucu Sutarsyah, M.A.** .....

II. **Dr. Flora, M.Pd.** .....

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 30th, 2017**

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN

Dengan ini saya menyatakan dengan sebenarnya bahwa:

1. Tesis dengan judul "The Use of Task Complexity in Spoken Performance by the 10th Grade Students of SMAN 2 Padang Cermin" 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, 30 Oktober 2017

Yang membuat pernyataan,

Vivian Agustina

NPM 1423042069

CURRICULUM VITAE

The researcher's complete name is Vivian Agustina. She was born in Sidomulyo, August 6th, 1984. She is the second daughter of a lovely couple Suprapto and Sri Bunga. She has two sisters; Weni Metaria, A.Md. and Anggun Paramita. She also has one brother named Yulian Nursasongko.

She began formal education institution for the first time in Elementary school at SDN 2 Wates Pesawaran at 1991 and graduated in 1996. Then she pursued her study at SMPN 2 Padang Cermin Pesawaran in 1996 and graduated in 1999. Then in 1999 she continued at SMA Persada Bandar Lampung and graduated in 2002. At the same year, in 2002 she was registered as an S-1 college student of Teknokrat College at English Literature and graduated in 2006. In 2014, she was registered as Post-Graduate student at MPBI of Lampung University and graduated in 2017.

The researcher was an English teacher of SMKN Padang Cermin at 2006 until 2008. Besides, in 2006 also she worked in SMPN 2 Padang Cermin as an English teacher until 2010. Then the researcher is an English teacher in SMAN 2 Padang Cermin from 2008 until now. She had followed SEMNASTA national seminar at Lampung University.

DEDICATION

By offering my praise and gratitude to Allah SWT for some blessings to me, I would proudly dedicate this thesis to:

- My beloved parents, Suprapto and Sri Bunga.
- My beloved husband, Sartono, S.E.
- My beloved daughters, Shafira Almaputri (Alma) and Sakiza Ashil Nuruputri (Sisil).
- My beloved brother and sisters, Weni Metaria, A.Md, Yulian Nursasongko, and Anggun Paramita.
- All my teachers and lectures of English Department.
- My lovely comrades English Literature of Teknokrat college'02, and the second batch of MPBI Unila.
- My beloved Almamater, Lampung University.

MOTTO

"Learn from yesterday,
live from today, and
hope for tomorrow".

(Albert Eistein)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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 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 the best figure of the universe.

The researcher would like to address her great respect and sincere gratitude to Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D., her first advisor, for his criticism, assistance, motivation, and encouragement to the researcher to think more scientifically and critically. Her gratitude is also addressed to Dr. Ari Nurweni, M.A., her second advisor for her suggestions, motivation, assistance, unlimited patience, to the researcher during the completion of this thesis. Her thankfulness is also dedicated to Prof. Dr. Cucu Sutarsyah, M.A., as the first examiner and Dr. Flora, M.Pd., as the second examiner for patiently giving much support, input, and correction to improve this thesis better.

The appreciation is also given to Tamzir Zamka, S.Pd., the headmaster of SMAN 2 Padang Cermin for giving the researcher permit to conduct the research. The researcher's appreciation is also given to the students for their participation as the subject of this research.

Her great indebtedness is dedicated to her beloved husband Sartono, S.E. for his unlimited patience and support. Her beloved daughters; Shafira Almaputri (Alma) and Sakiza Ashil Nuruputri (Sisil) who have been the source of inspiration, support, prayer, motivation, and encouragement for the researcher to finish her study.

The greatest honor and thankfulness would be dedicated to her beloved father, Suprapto, and her mother, Sri Bunga. It is truly undoubted that loves, cares, support, timeless prayers during days and nights, are everything for her. Apreciation is also extended to her beloved brother and sisters; Weni Metaria, A.Md., Widi Nuridin, Yulian Nursasongko, Weni Aprilia, A.Md.Keb., and Anggun Paramita for supporting during this thesis writing.

The unforgettable thanks are also given to the researcher's second batch fraternity in MPBI; Fitri Agustin, Fitri Susmiati, Titis Arsiwi, Tri

Lastri, Arifah, Rizki, Mutia, Uswatun, Mr. Iswahyudi, Iqbal, Harits, and other friends who cannot be mentioned one by one, thanks for the beauty of togetherness. Special thanks to Dwi Ratih, M.Pd (the first batch of MPBI) for her support and sharing. Many thanks are also addressed to the researcher's partner in teaching, Arina Sulistyaningsih, S.Pd and Sigit Joko Purnomo, S.Pd for the motivation and sharing in teaching students.

The researcher hopes this research would give a beneficial contribution to educational development, and to the readers.

Bandar Lampung, 30 Oktober 2017

The Researcher,

Vivian Agustina

CONTENTS

TABLES

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is concerned with backgrounds of the research, problems of the research, objectives of the research, uses of the research, and scope of the research. It also provides the definition of terms.

1.1 Backgrounds of the Research

Speaking is a crucial part of second language learning and teaching (Kayi, 2006: 1). In spite of the importance of skill in English teaching program as a foreign language in some public schools, it still stresses reading (reading comprehension on the text) and writing (which focus on vocabulary and grammar) than the expense of speaking. English language teaching and learning particulary pay more attention on traditional grammar translation method in all grades. The focus of English teaching and learning is explaining grammatical rules, memorizing vocabulary and dialog, reading and translating the text. In this case, students are not motivated to master the speaking skill. Because of the description, it has become natural to know students' inability when they express their performance orally. Deng (2005) in Azizi et al., (2012: 22) suggests that the cognetive complexity of a particular influences the nature of learner oral production. Therefore, the students' spoken performance was analyzed in this research.

One alternate approach, which needs to be implemented for enhancing the students' speaking skill by English teachers, is task-based approaches. A task-based approach to focus on form is quite feasible for the EFL situation (Fotos, 1998:306). 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). Task-based approaches to second language teaching focus on the ability of a learner to perform target-like tasks without any explicit teaching of grammatical rules (Rahimpour, 2008 in Mehrang & Rahimpour: 3678). It is expected that the implementation of this approach in speaking class would change the condition happened in the class where some students dominate the opportunity of talking over the other ones.

The development of theoretically motivated, empirically substantiable, and pedagogically feasible sequencing criteria has long been acknowledged as a major goal of research aimed at operationalizing task-based approaches to syllabus design (Robinson, 2001b: 27). Syllabus design is based essentially on a decision about the units of classroom activity, and the sequence in which they are to be performed, and these two decisions have consequences for the role of the learner in assimilating the language encountered in classrooms (Robinson, 2001a: 288).

Theoretically, empirical research into task-based language learning has been prompted by proposals for task based language teaching, (Robinson, 2011: 1). In Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), Robinson (2001b: 30) proposed the Triadic Componential Framework composed of three aspects, those are; task

complexity (cognitive factors), task conditions (interactive factors), and task difficulty (learner factors). Robinson (2001a: 287), distinguishes task complexity (the task dependent and proactively manipulable cognetive demands of tasks) from task difficulty (dependent on learner factors such as aptitude, confidence, motivation, etc) and task conditions (the interactive demands of tasks), arguing that these influences on task performance and learning are different in kind, and have not been sufficiently distinguished in previous approaches to conceptualizing the options in, and consuquences of, sequencing tasks from the syllabus designer's perspective. In addition, he (Robinson, 2001a: 287) argues that task complexity should be the sole basis for making prospective sequencing decisions since most learner factors implicated in decisions about task difficulty can only diagnosed in situ and in process, so cannot be anticipated in advance of implementation of syllabus and therefore can be of no use to prospective materials and syllabus designer.

As stated by Robinson (2001a: 294; 2001b: 30) in Triadic Componential Framework, the task complexity (cognitive factors) are divided into two dimensions; those are resource-directing and resource-depleting/dispersing dimension. The resource-directing includes three variables, that is, +/- here and now, +/- few elements, +/- reasoning demands. Whereas, the resource-depleting consists of +/- planning, +/- single task, and +/- prior knowledge variables. Based on the TCF (Robinson, 2001b: 30) describes task complexity as consisting of a number of dimensions which can be manipulated during task design. The dimensions are represented by +/- component which may be present or absent (though they may also be thought of as continua, along which there is relatively

more, versus relatively less of a component such as planning time, or prior knowledge, etc). Therefore, the current study focused on the use of task complexity (cognitive factors).

In addition, Robinson (2001b: 31) assumes that increasing task complexity along resource-directing dimensions (e.g. by requiring reasoning, in addition to simple information transmission) makes greater resource demands which can be met by using specific features of the language code. In contrast, complex tasks along resource-depleting dimensions make greater demands on attention and working memory, but do not direct resources to features of language code that can be used in completing the task.

As previously described above the resource-directing dimension of task includes three components: the number of elements, reasoning demand, and here and now/there and then. Among these three components, the manipulation of a number of elements is regarded to be more inclusive than the other two components (reasoning demand), and (here and now/there and then). This is because tasks which are manipulated according to the number of are expected to involve the other two components of the resource-directing dimension, namely, giving reasons and using present or past references (Mahpul, 2014: 32). Therefore, the number of elements (+/- few elements) became one of variables manipulated.

The number of elements (+/- few elements) was manipulated with prior knowledge (+/- prior knowledge). Robinson (2001a: 312) states that +/- prior knowledge receives considerable support from previous research both within and

out-side (see for example, Anderson, 1981; Britten & Tresser, 1982; Joseph & Dwyer, 1984) the field of SLA. There is evidence that prior knowledge of formal and content schemata both facilitate L2 reading (e.g., Carrel, 1987), and that prior knowledge of the role of the listener makes speaking tasks easier (G. Brown, 1995; G. Brown et al., 1984; Yule & MacDonald, 1990), as does prior knowledge of., and familiarity with, the content domain of the speaking task (Salinker & Douglas, 1985).

As indicated, in TBLT research complexity, accuracy, and fluency are regarded as the manifestations of learners' language performance (Mahpul, 2014: 39). With regard to task effects on language production, the outcome measures are often classified in terms of accuracy, fluency, and complexity of learner language (Robinson, 2001a: 306). Research on fluency, accuracy, and complexity in second (L2) and foreign language learners' production has a long tradition in the SLA field since it is assumed that their measures can reveal the level of learner's proficiency in target language. Their indicators are usually used for observing differences in learners' written and oral discourse over time, which permits to evaluate language development in terms of each of the above mentioned language aspects. Within this wide field we are especially interested in the assessment of progress in complexity of FL oral performances (Evnitskaya, 2008: 2). Therefore, the current research used CAF as the measure.

Many studies have concerned with the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching especially in task complexity in terms of complexity accuracy, and complexity. Most of them focused on trying out the Cognition Hypothesis

proposed by Robinson. For example: Gilabert, (2007a) did the simultaneous manipulation of task complexity along planning time and +/- here-and-now: effects on L2 oral production.. Besides, some other researchers (for examples: Gilabert, 2007b; Kuiken & Vedder, 2007; Crespo, 2011; Salimi, Dadaspour, & Asadollahfam, 2011; Shahreza, Dabaghi, & Kassaian, 2011; Soleimani & Rezazadeh, 2014; and Cho, 2015 have manipulated task on resouce-directing. In contrast, Mehrang & Rahimpour (2010) just focused on manipulating task complexity in resource depleting dimension.

Robinson (2005: 14) emphasized his second study (2001b) on task complexity and interactive production along the ± reference to many elements and ±prior knowledge dimensions. The study purposed to examine the effects of tasks made complex on two dimensions simultaneously, operationalized task complexity using a direction giving map task. In the simpler condition, a small map of an area known to the Japanese L1 participants (their own college campus) was used. In the complex condition, an authentic street map of a much larger area likely to be unknown to the participants (the downtown area of Nihombashi in central Tokyo) was used. The study also also examined the effects of increasingtaskcomplexity onlearner perceptions of task difficulty, using a procedure whereby learners complete Likert scale responses (on a scale from 1 to 9) to questions immediately following task performance. These questions assess learners' overall perceptions of task difficulty, (e.g., this task was easy/this task was hard) the extent to which they found the task stressful (e.g., I felt relaxed doing this task/I felt frustrated doing this task), their confidence in their ability to successfully complete the task (e.g., I did the task well/I did not do this task well), and the interest in (e.g., this

task was not interesting/this task was interesting), and motivation to complete similar tasks (e.g., I don't want to do more tasks like this/ I want to do more tasks like this). The results have been extremely consistent. These findings show, then, that the dimensions of complexity manipulated during task design in this framework also correspond well with learners' perceptions of the difficulty of the task, and so therefore indicate that learners are to a large extent construing tasks demands in a way consistent with the task designer's intentions (see Schwartz 1996 and Stanovitch 1999, for extensive treatment of the issue of task construal, i.e., whether subjects frame a problem or task in a different way than that intended by the task designer or researcher).

Mahpul (2014: 8) had also conducted a research on task complexity. It aimed to investigate dialogic (that is, two way, interactive) task difficulty manipulated simultaneously within planning time (+/-planning time) and the number of elements (+/- few elements). That was undertaken with Indonesian learners of English. In addition, the participant's perceptions on task difficulty were explored in-depth. The findings of this study suggest that the manipulation of task complexity (cognitive factors) within the resource depleting dimensions (e.g., prior knowledge) may enable participants to perform tasks more easily (p: 110). In addition, familiarity with the task or the effect of repeating similar tasks led the participants to perform tasks more easily (p: 152). The results suggest that they need to be provided with tasks or activities of the same type or content on a regular basis that encourage them to practice the language in a meaningful situation or context activities in the way language is used as a means of communication as reflected in real-life activities. Therefore, tasks or learning

activities can be “manipulated" in such a way that learners are actively involved in undertaking familiar and meaningful activities (p: 152).

Motivated by the previous studies above, the current research had two purposes that might be gaps. . The first objective was manipulating +/- few elements (few and many elements) and +/- prior knowledge (prior knowledge and no prior knowledge) on task complexity, which was designed into four types of task, resulted different spoken performance statistically in term of CAF. The second objective was eleborating the students’ perception of the four types of task complexity in spoken performance. The four types were designed in monologic form. Robinson (2001b: 35) states that to make predictions about the effects of task complexity on these aspects of task production it is necessary to distinguish between monologic, non interactive tasks such as narratives and interactive tasks such as discussion or information transfer. Monologue is a personal and participatory speech act, even though only one person may be speaking (Davis, 2007: 179). Hence, it would be easier to analyze since there was only one person who was speaking without being disturbed by other people’s voice. The material in this spoken performance was procedure text. It was done since procedure text was taken from KTSP curriculum for the tenth grade students of Senior High School.

1.2 Problems of the Research

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

1.2.1 What are the effects of four types of task complexity manipulated along with the number of elements (+/- few elements) and prior knowledge (+/- prior knowledge) statistically in spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF)?

1.2.2 What are the students' perceptions of the four types of task complexity in terms of CAF in spoken performance?

1.3 Objectives of the Research

The objectives of the research were as follows:

1.3.1 To investigate the effects of four types of task complexity manipulated with the number of elements (+/- few elements) and prior knowledge (+/- prior knowledge) statistically in spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF).

1.3.2 To eleborate the students' perception of the four types of task complecity in terms of CAF in spoken performance.

1.4 Uses of the Research in terms of CAF

This research was useful both practically and theoretically,

1.4.1 Practically

I hope that this research would be useful for English teachers, students, and schools.

a. Teachers

Through this research, teachers would know what to do in designing the task for their students' speaking performance in monolog. Besides, they also would know what type of task complexity that could be beneficial to increase the students' spoken performance. Additionalally, the students' perception about those tasks became the consideration for them in order to get the best task design on students' spoken performance.

b. Students

Hopefully, students would be able to practice speaking or spoken performance fluently. It not only focused on grammatical structure but also in a meaningful context. Besides, Background knowledge was also very important and useful for them to enhance the spoken performance. Additionallly, they would be able to express their perception after doing the spoken performance.

c. School

Hopefuly, the result of this research could be used as the consideration for schools, whether a certain task will always be applied to increase the students' spoken performance and whether number of elements and prior knowledge explain the criteria on the spoken performance or not. Besides, the students' perception could be the consideration in designing the tasks.

1.4.2 Theoretically

Hopefully, the results of this research support the previous findings and develop the theories concerning the manipulation on task complexity.

1.5 Scope of the Research

This research was conducted at SMAN 2 Padang Cermin Pesawaran. The sample of the research was the tenth grade students of Senior High School. There were six classes for the tenth grade in this school but the sample taken was one class (X1). There were 33 students in this class so there were 33 samples in this research. The researcher distributed four kinds of tasks that had been manipulated between resource-directing (number of elements) and resource-depleting dimension (prior knowledge), as followed:

1. +Few elements, +prior knowledge (Few elements with prior knowledge)
2. +Few elements, -prior knowledge (Few elements with no prior knowledge)
3. -Few elements, + prior knowledge (Many elements with prior knowledge)
4. -Few elements, -prior knowledge (Many elements with no prior knowledge)

In designing the task complexity, procedure text was used as the material. The form of task design in spoken performance was monolog. The current research was to investigate the effects of four types of task complexity manipulated with number of elements and prior knowledge statistically in spoken performance in terms of CAF and to eleborate, the students' perception of the four types of task complexity manipulated with number of elements and prior knowledge in spoken performance. The data was taken from the students' utterences. The data were transcribed and analyzed in order to find out the CAF. The questionnaire also used to answer the second question.

1.6 Definition of Terms

Definition of terms was very useful in order to help understanding of the terms and limit the width of the research.

1. Task Based Language Teaching

   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. (Nunan, 2003 in Yousefi, Mohammadi, & Koosha, 2012: 1436).

2. Task Complexity

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

3. Complexity

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

4. 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).

5. Fluency

   Fluency is the rapid, smooth, accurate, lucid, and efficient translation of thought or communicative intention into language under the temporal constraints of on-line processing (Lennon, 2000 in Mahpul, 2014: 45).

6. Spoken Performance

   Spoken performance is the students' capability in expressing the ideas orally in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluently.

7. Perception

   Perception is the way we all interpret our experience (Otara, 2011: 21).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The second chapter delineates theories, which are relevant to the research as guidance. The discussion of the chapter concerns with concepts of Task-Based Language Teaching, concepts of tasks in language teaching, concept of task complexity, manipulating task complexity, complexity-accuracy-fluency (CAF), previous studies on task complexity, spoken performance, concepts of perception on task complexity, theoritical assumtion, and hypothesis.

2.1 Concepts of Task-Based Language Teaching

The field of research lies within the area of second language acquisition (SLA), and particularly the interectionist paradigm, and is based on theories which suggest the naturalistic exposure to and use of language is a prerequisite for language dvelopments (Skehan, 2003 in Mahpul, 2014: 4). Task-based approaches to second language teaching focus on the ability of a learner to perform target-like tasks without any explicit teaching of grammatical rules (Rahimpour, 2008 in Mehrang & Rahimpour, 2010: 3678) and include procedural syllabuses, process syllabus and task-based language teaching (TBLT) (Long and Crookes, 1992 in Mehrang & Rahimpour, 2010: 3678). According Rahimpour (2007, 2008 in Mehrang & Rahimpour, 2010: 3678) task-based language teaching is a response to a better understanding of a language learning process.

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

According to Tavakoli and Foster (2008) in Mehrang and Rahimpour (2010: 3679), there are three reasons why task-based research has been the hottest trend in the field of empirical research for more than 20 years. First of all, research sheds light on the proposition that task performance in itself drives interlanguage change by causing learners to attend to and retain information about the target language as they use it. Second, since research identifies various features of tasks that influences learner's language processing, it provides empirical principles for classroom materials design. Finally, research serves to explore the claim that task design and processing conditions can be chosen deliberately by a teacher to guide a learner's focus of attention to particular aspects of the language being learned.

For the above reasons, the current study also purposes at conducting research in the area of task-based language teaching to investigate the effects of four types of task complexity manipulated with number of elements and prior knowledge statistically in spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency and to eleborate the students’ perception of the four types of task complecity.

2.2 Concepts of Tasks in Language Teaching

There were many researchers defined the concept of task in language teaching. Long (1985) in Nunan (2004: 2) argues that a target task is a piece of work undertaken for oneself or for others, freely or for some reward. Thus examples of task 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.

In another term, tasks become pedagogical in nature when the target tasks are transformed from the real world to the class room. 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). Forexample, 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 varieties 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.

Based on the definition, it can be seen clearly that the tasks are the instruction form, which are created by the teacher for the students in the classroom. 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.

Skehan (1998) in Nunan (2004: 3) draws on a number of other writers, puts forward five key characteristics of a task: meaning is a primary, learners are not given other people's meaning to regurgitate, there is some sort of relationship to comparable real-world activities, task completion has some priority, and the assesment of the task is in term of outcome. Nunan (2004: 4) states that a pedagogical task is a piece of classroom work that involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is focused on mobilizing their grammatical knowledge in order to express meaning, and in which the intention is to convey meaning rather than to manipulate form. The task should also have a sense of completeness, being able to stand alone as a communicative act in its own right with a beginning, a middle and an end.

While these definitions vary somewhat, they all emphasize the fact that pedagogical tasks involve communicative language use in which the user's

attention is focused on meaning rather than grammatical form. This does not mean that form is not important. Pedagogical task refers to the deployment of grammatical knowledge to express meaning, high lightening the fact that meaning and form are highly interrelated, and that grammar exist to enable the language user to express different communicative meaning (Nunan, 2004: 4).

Based on the definition described above, the tasks that was applied in the current research included the pedagogical tasks since they were applied in the classroom context during the learning process. The task should facilitate the students to use communicative language by conveying the meaning without ignoring their grammatical knowledge.

2.3 Concept of Task Complexity/Cognitive Factors

One of the key constructs of the Cognition Hypothesis is cognitive task complexity, it refers to the amount of cognitive processing that is needed to perform a task (Michael et.,al, 2007: 2). According to Ellis (2003), as cited by Mohammadi, Yousefi, & Afghari (2012: 2593), complexity is 'the extent to which learners produce in performing a task is elaborate and varied'. As stated by Robinson (2001b: 30) task complexity as consisting of a number of dimensions which can be manipulated during task design. Therefore, the complexity of the task is effective on task performance. Robinson (2001b: 29) says that: "task complexity is the result of attention, memory, and other information processing demands imposed by the structure of the task on the language learner ". Robinson believes that task complexity is based on the cognitive demands of each task in the phase of conceptualization. The cognetive factors or task complexity

contributing to complexity are consequence of the structure of the task which imposes resource demands satisfying those demands in order to succesfully complete the task is dependent on the extent of the resources a learnier brings to the task (Robinson, 2001b: 31)

Robinson (2001b: 30, 2003: 56) shows interactions between complexity, condition, and difficulty are bound to occur during task performance in the components of Robinson's Triadic Componential Framework (TCF) below:

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 groups		on-line decision about pairs and

TCF describes task complexity as consisting of a number of dimensions which can be manipulated during task design. The dimensions are represented by +/- component which may be present or absent (though they may also be thought of as continua, along which there is relatively more, versus relatively less of a component such as planning time, or prior knowledge, etc). These are divided into two categories, resource-directing and resource-depleting.

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

The two categories identify an importance difference in the way these dimensions affect resource a llocation during task performance. Robinson (2001b: 31) assumes that increasing task complexity along resource-directing dimensions (e.g. by requiring reasoning, in addition to simple information transmission) makes greater resource demands which can be met by using specific features of the language code. In contrast, complex tasks along resource-depleting dimensions make greater demands on attention and working memory, but do not direct resources to features of language code that can be used in completing the task.

In Robinson's view (2001a: 287), task complexity should be the sole basis for making prospective sequencing decisions since most learner factors implicated in decisions since most learner factors implicated in decisions about task difficulty can only diagnosed in situ and in process, so cannot be anticipated in advance of implementation of syllabus and therefore can be of no use to prospective materials and syllabus designer. In his view, task performance conditions are determined by a needs analysis. Information about the effects of task complexity on production should help syllabus designers to organize pedagogic tasks from simple to

complex so that they progressively approximate real world target tasks. Robinson (2001a: 301) claims that schedulling tasks for language learners in terms of their increasing the cognitive complexity of tasks will facilitate the 'means' of language learning, and therefore lead to a transition in the learner's knowledge states.

Based on the previous explanation above, the current research was designed the tasks manipulated two dimensions: resource-directing dimension (+/-few element) and resource-depleting dimension (+/-prior knowledge) because it refers to cognitive/conceptual demands requiring attention and working memory that directs learners to focus on linguistic form, and also for increasing these variables makes great demands on learners' attentional and memory resources and, consequently, disperses them.

2.4 Manipulating Task Complexity

Concerning the resource-directing (+/- few elements) and resource depleting (+/- prior knowledge), Robinson (2005: 14) emphasized his second study (2001b) on task complexity and interactive production along the ± reference to many elements and ±prior knowledge dimensions. The study purposed to examine the effects of tasks made complex on two dimensions simultaneously, operationalized task complexity using a direction giving map task. In the simpler condition, a small map of an area known to the Japanese L1 participants (their own college campus) was used. In the complex condition, an authentic street map of a much larger area likely to be unknown to the participants (the downtown area of Nihombashi in central Tokyo) was used. One participant was instructed to give

directions from point A to point B, both of which were marked on their maps, to a partner who had only point A marked on their map. This was therefore a one-way (since the information giver was instructing the partner on how to get to point B) closed (since there was a definite correct solution) interactive task (since the partner was able to ask questions about the directions they were given). As in Robinson (1995a) this was again a repeated-measure design, in which half the participants performed the task in the sequence simple-complex, and half in the reverse sequence. As in the previously described study, results showed task complexity significantly ($p<.05$) affected the lexical variety (lower token type ratios, and hence more lexical complexity on the complex version) and additionally significantly affected fluency of speaker production (more words per clausal, or C-unit on the simple version). Also supporting the predictions made above, and as in the following study to be reported, results showed significantly greater interaction, with significantly higher number of hearer comprehension checks ($p<.05$) on the complex version, and also a trend to more clarification requests in the same direction.

Related to the study above (2001b) which is recited in Robinson (2005: 15) also reported the effects of increasing task complexity on learner perceptions of task difficulty, using a procedure where by learners complete Likert scale responses (on a scale from 1 to 9) to questions immediately following task performance. These questions assess learners' overall perceptions of task difficulty, (e.g., this task was easy/this task was hard) the extent to which they found the task stressful (e.g., I felt relaxed doing this task/I felt frustrated doing this task), their confidence in their ability to successfully complete the task (e.g., I did the task

well/I did not do this task well), and the interest in (e.g., this task was not interesting/this task was interesting), and motivation to complete similar tasks (e.g., I don't want to do more tasks like this/ I want to do more tasks like this). The results have been extremely consistent. These findings show, then, that the dimensions of complexity manipulated during task design in this framework also correspond well with learners' perceptions of the difficulty of the task, and so therefore indicate that learners are to a large extent construing tasks demands in a way consistent with the task designer's intentions. In other words, the result of the previous study showed that the complex task resulted in significantly less fluent oral production, but higher lexical complexity than the simple task. However, the complex task did not affect either accuracy or syntactic complexity.

In the previous study that mentioned above, Robinson only designed two types of task, as followed:

1. + few elements, + prior knowledge (simple task)
2. – few elements, - prior knowledge (complex task)

Since Robinson (2001b: 30) assumes that the effects of complexity differentials should be revealed by the fact that the cognitively simpler, less resource-demanding task will involve a lower error rate, and/or be completed faster, and be less susceptible to interference from competing tasks than the more complex task. it is true that variance in task performance should also result from repeating the same task, whether simple or complex, since task practice and automatization recude resource demands. Therefore, the current research was designed tasks into four type's tasks, as followed:

Task 1: + Few Elements, + Prior Knowledge (Simple task with prior knowledge).

Task 2: + Few Elements, - Prior Knowledge (Simple task with no prior knowledge).

Task 3: - Few Elements, + Prior Knowledge (Complex task with prior knowledge).

Task 4: - Few Elements, - Prior Knowledge (Complex task with no prior knowledge.

Note:

- : complex task
+ : simple task

+ Few Elements= has few elements
- Few Elements= has many elements
+ Prior Knowledge= has background knowledge/schemata
- Prior Knowl edge= has no background knowledge/schemata

There have been other many studies about the variables of the dimension. They are as follows:

2.4.1 Few Elements vs. Many Elements

As previously described, the resource-directing dimension of task includes three components: +/–few elements, +/– reasoning demand, and +/–here and now. Among these three components , the manipulation of a number of elements is regarded to be more inclusive than the other two components (+/– reasoning demand), and (+/–here and now). This is because tasks which are manipulated

according to number of elements (+/–few elements) are expected to involve the other two components of the resource-directing dimension, namely, giving reasons (+/– reasoning demands) and using present or past references (+/–here and now) (Mahpul, 2014: 32).

The Cognition Hypothesis states that identifying few easily distinguished elements within a task is simpler than identifying many similar elements (+/- few elements). It can be claimed that relatively few researches have investigated the +/- few elements of The Cognition Hypothesis. In determining the difference between + few elements (few elements) and – few elements (many elements), some previous researches can be considered. Robinson (2001b) manipulated the factor +/- few elements in an oral interactive task. He used two map tasks in his research; simple and complex. He describes the tasks detail (p. 41), one map task (the simpler version) required the speaker to give directions from A to B using a map convering a small area. While the complex version required them to give directions from A to B using a map of a larger area. From the research, it is revealed that the task containing few elements will increase fluency, but decrease accuracy and complexity. Meanwhile task containing many elements will increase accuracy and complexity, but decrease fluency.

Mahpul (2014: 59) describes four tasks manipulated the number of elements (+/- few elements and planning time (+/- planning time). In this part, the current study focused on the description of the number of elements. Mahpul comprised two many elements tasks; the first task consisted of pictures of six different types of Blackberries, each with different features (e.g., prices, colors, weight) for the

participants to discuss. The second task of many elements consisted of six different houses for rent. six types of houses and the participants were only provided with instructions of how to perform the task (e.g., specifications, price, facilities, location, etc.). While for few elements (+ few elements) tasks: first, he comprised two different pictures of Blackberry mobile phone devices; second, he design the few elements task by giving two different pictures of houses were provided for the participants to describe and then. It was chosen as a familiar. The written instructions about performing the task included telling the participants to provide their partners with information about the houses (e.g., price, location, facilities).

2.4.2 Prior Knowledge

Schema theory is an explanation of how readers use prior knowledge to comprehend and learn from text (Rumelhart, 1980 in An, 2013: 130). Robinson (2001b: 36) states that the facilitating effect of +prior knowledge on task performance receives support from research outside the field of SLA (e.g. Anderson 1981; Britten and Tresser 1982; Joseph and Dwyer 1984) as well as from within it for its effect on L2 reading and listening comprehension (e.g. Barry and Lazarte 1998; Carrel and Wise 1998; Urwin 1999). Good and Butterworth (1980) found prior knowledge (of familiar route) resulted in significantly more fluent first language (L1) speech production on a route description task than no prior knowledge (describing an unfamiliar route).

Similary, Chang (1999) Robinson (2001b: 36) in a small-scale study of six Taiwanese learners of English on a monologic one-way task found topic

familiarity led to significantly greater fluency (words per error free T-unit, and words per minute), but had no effect on accuracy (error rate per T -unit). There is some evidence, however that prior knowledge may interact with proficiency level in facilitating task performance. Chalpham (1996) in Robinson (2001b: 36) found prior knowledge of a domain did not facilitate performance for subjects taking reading tests who were at a low level of proficiency, but increasingly facilitated performance for subjects at higher levels of proficiency. Robinson (2001b: 47) argues that it is also possibly the result of the differentials in assumed shared prior knowledge, since less complex and explicit noun phrase could be used as referring expressions on the simple version where such knowledge was available.

Mahpul (2014: 110) suggests that the manipulation of task complexity (cognitive factors) within the resource depleting dimensions (e.g., prior knowledge) may enable participants to perform tasks more easily. In addition, familiarity with the task or the effect of repeating similar tasks led the participants to perform tasks more easily (p: 152). Therefore, prior knowledge became one of variable used in the current research.

2.4.3 Number of Elements and Prior Knowledge

To examine the effects of tasks made complex on two dimensions simultaneously, Robinson (2001b) in Robinson (2005: 15), operationalized task complexity using a direction giving map task. In the simpler condition, a small map of an area known to the Japanese L1 participants (their own college campus) was used. In the complex condition, an authentic street map of a much larger area likely to be unknown to the participants (the downtown area of Nihombashi in central Tokyo) wasused. One participant was instructed to give directions from point A to point

B, both of which were marked on their maps, to a partner who had only point A marked on their map. This was therefore one-way (since information giver was instructing the partner on how to get to point B) closed (since there was a definite correct solution) interactive task (since the partner was able toask questions about the directions they were given). This research used a repeated-measure design, in which half the participants performed the task in the sequence simple-complex, and half in the reverse sequence.

2.5 Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF)

Research on fluency, accuracy, and complexity in second (L2) and foreign language learners' production has a long tradition in the SLA field since it is assumed that their measures can reveal the level of learner's proficiency in target language. Their indicators are usually used for observing differences in learners' written and oral discourse over time, which permits to evaluate language development in terms of each of the above mentioned language aspects. Within this wide field we are especially interested in the assessment of progress in complexity of FL oral performances (Evnitskaya, 2008: 2).

CAF emerge as principal phenomena of the psycholinguistic mechanisms and process underlying the acquisition, representation and processing L2 knowledge Housen and Kuiken (2009: 3). As indicated, in TBLT research complexity, accuracy, and fluency are regarded as the manifestations of learners' language performance (Mahpul, 2014: 39). Skehan (1996) in Mahpul (2014: 23) predicts that tasks which are made more difficult (more cognetively engaging), will decrease learners' L2 performance in terms of CAF because their attentional

resources are forced to primarly focus on meaning rather than on form. Therefore, the speaking performance of this research was 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).

Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) in Inoue (2010: 3) argues that complexity is 'the extent to which learners produce elaborated language' and is often concerned with syntactic and lexical aspects of narrative performance. This research also analyzed complexity in terms of syntactic and lexical complexity. Some researchers use T-unit for analysis, however, Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) in Inoue (2010: 3) recommend using C-units or AS-units because they can take sub-clausal units into account. In addition, Foster, et.,al. (2000: 365) defined 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. They also pointed in Inoue (2010: 3) that AS-Unit are more appropriate for analyzing spoken language than the other two units, C units or T-Units. This is because AS-units can clearly distinguish among false starts, repetitions, and self-corrections. Aditionally, Mahpul (2014: 43) argues that AS-Units are more appropriate to analyze oral production data than C-Units or T-Units. Therefore, this research

employed AS-units since that unit is necessary in the measures (the number of words per AS-unit). Despite complexity having been measured in different way, there are two common features, 1) syntactical or structural complexity, and, 2) lexical complexity. In the current research, syntactic complexity was measured by means of the total number of clauses per AS-Units and by a subordination index: the ratio of subordinate clauses per total number of clauses. While lexical complexity was measured by calculating the ratio of lexical words to total number of words (Mahpul, 2014: 41).

2. Accuracy

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). Regarding accuracy, it was calculated by means of the total number of errors per AS-Units (Michel, Kuiken & Vedder 2007: 8), and the number of lexical errors as well as the total number of omissions (of articles, verbs, and subjects), both in relation to the number of AS units. In adition, Mahpul (2014: 69) argues Accuracy, also calculated manually by determining percentage of Error-Free Clauses.

3. Fluency

Fluency is the rapid, smooth, accurate, lucid, and efficient translation of thought or communicative intention into language under the temporal constraints of on-line processing (Lennon, 2000 in Mahpul, 2014: 45)**.** In measuring fluency, Yuan and Ellis (2003 in Levkina, 2008: 25) chose two measures: Rate A, as the number

of syllables within each narrative, divided by the total number of seconds used to complete the task and multiplied by 60; Rate B, the same calculation as for Rate B, but repetitions, reformulations, false starts, and comments in the L1 were excluded from the calculation. The advantage of both measures is that they take into account the amount of speech (the number of syllables) and the length of pauses (the total number of seconds), Rate B being more precise since it excludes elements such as repetitions or reformulations and through which learners sometimes try to gain time. Similary, Mahpul (2014: 70) argues that to calculate Speech Rate A, the number of syllables2 used per minute was determined, with the following rules applied.

1. Ing forms such as, doing, saying, etc., counted as two syllables.
2. The constructions such as, isn" t, doesn" t, didn" t, were calculated as two syllables.
3. Syllables in Indonesian words were counted (Speech Rate A).
4. Epenthesis (insertion of sounds in the middle of words) does not count as a syllable, e.g., speak /səpi:k/, instead of /spi:k/.
5. Past /ed/ form was not regarded as a syllable (e.g., looked). But past /ed/ was calculated as a syllable for the verbs ending with t or d (e.g., “wanted”, “landed”), each counted as two syllables.

Speech Rate B was also calculated in a similar way to Speech Rate A, but syllables which appeared as repetitions, self-corrections, false starts, and in Indonesian or local words were excluded. Therefore, the current research focuses on Rate B.

2.6 Previous Studies on Task Complexity

There were many researches conducted concerning the manipulation of task complexicty in the term of CAF. Robinson (1995: 100) examined difference in production of oral narative discourse by 12 adult second language learners of English on narative tasks that simulated the ability to describe events in Here-and-Now versus There-and-Then. A MANOVA showed sifnificant differences between the two conditions. The more complex There-and-Then condition elicited greater accuracy and a higher ratio of lexical to grammatical words. There was also a trend suggesting greater utterence lenght for narrative performed under the simpler Here-and Now condition. These results support the claim that somplex tasks elicit less fluent, but more accurate and complex production than do simpler tasks.

Ortega (1999) in Salimi & Dadaspour (2012: 730) studied whether planning time results in an increased focus on form. She found that planning for the claim that planning before doing an L2 task can promote an increased focus on form since learners allocate conscious attention during pre-task planning to formal aspects of the language needed to perform a task. Ortega believes that the Planning time before the task has two facilitative impacts. First, planning time removes some of the cognitive load and communicative pressure of a given task. The second effect of planning is that it gives the learner devoted to formal properties of the language.

Foster & Skehan (1999) in Salimi & Dadaspour (2012: 730) studied the impact of source of planning and focus of planning on task-based performance. Results of

the study indicated that the teacher-led condition made significant effects on accuracy whereas the solitary planning condition led to more complexity, fluency and turn length. Group-based planning did not lead to performance significantly different from the control group. Finally, there was little effect on performance as a result of the language vs. content planning condition.

Iwashita, et al. (2001) in Salimi & Dadaspour (2012: 730) tried to answer this question: Are different task characteristics and performance conditions (involving assumed different levels of cognitive demand) associated with different levels of fluency, complexity, or accuracy in test candidate responses? They were required to produce oral narratives from picture strips that had been designed to differ in their cognitive demands. These four dimensions of task were considered: adequacy (whether the set of pictures was complete or incomplete); immediacy (here-and-now task or there-andthen task); perspective (whether the participant was speaking as if the story had happened to him / her or not) and planning time (as either 3.5 minutes or 0.5 minute). No significant eff ect for any of the measures (accuracy, fluency and complexity) was found, with the single exception of an effect for accuracy in the immediacy dimension.

Ishikawa (2006) in Salimi & Dadaspour (2012: 731) examined the effect of task complexity and language proficiency on task-based writing performance. Task complexity was manipulated along here-and-now / there-and-then dimension. The results showed that increasing task complexity for high-proficient learners had positive effects on accuracy, structural complexity and fluency, though; it had negative effects on lexical complexity. The results of increasing task complexity

for low-proficient learners, however, showed the positive effects on accuracy, fluency, lexical and structural complexity.

Gilabert (2007a: 215) studied the effects of manipulating the cognitive complexity of L2 oral tasks on language production. It specifically focuses on self-repairs, which are taken as a measure of accuracy since they denote both attention to form And an attempt at neing accurate. By means of a repeated meaures design, 42 lower-intermediate students were asked to perform three different tasks types (anarrative, and instruction-giving task, and adecision-making task) for which two degrees of cognitive complexity were established. The narrative task was manipulated along +/− Here-and-Now, an instruction-giving task manipulated along +/−elements, and the decision-making task which is manipulated along +/−reasoning demands. Repeated measures ANOVA sareused for the calculation of differences between degrees of complexity and among task types. One-way ANOVA are used to detect potential differences between low proficiency and high-proficiency participants. Results show an overall effect of Task Complexity on self-repairs behavior across task types, with different behaviors existing among the three task types. No differences are found between the self-repair behavior between low and high proficiency groups.

Kuiken & Vedder (2007) in Salimi & Dadaspour (2012: 731) investigated the effects of cognitive task complexity on written production for accuracy and lexical variation by using specific measures of writing proficiency regarding the type of errors made by the students and the frequency band of the words they used. task complexity was manipulated along two The results showed that both

students of Italian and French produced fewer lexical errors in the complex task. However, the students of French made significantly more Appropriateness and Other errors in complex tasks than in simple tasks. In addition, the students of Italian used more high frequent words in complex task whereas the students of French used more infrequent words in complex task.

Michel, et al. (2007: 1) concerned the influence of complexity in monologic versus dialogic task in Dutch L2. The study puts the Robinson Cognition Hypothesis to the test with respect to its predictions of the effects or changes in task complexity (+/- few elements) and task condition (+/- monologic) on L2 performance. The performance of the L2 learners was analysed with regard to linguistic complexity, accuracy and fluency. As predicted by the Cognition Hypothesis, the complex task generated more accurate though less fluent speech. Linguistic complexity, however, was only marginally affected. Dialogic tasks triggered more accurate and fluent output though it was structurally less complex. The interaction of task complexity and task condition showed effects on measures of accuracy only: in the monologic but not in the dialogic condition task complexity did promote accuracy.

Robinson (2007: 193) studied task complexity, theory of mind, and intentional reasoning: Effects on L2 speech production, interaction, uptake and perceptions of task difficulty. Three interactive tasks, increasing in the complexity of resource-directing reasoning demands on speaker/storyteller attribution of and linguistic reference to, the thoughts and intentions of characters in narrative stimuli were performed by Japanese Li speakers of English. Largely consistent with the claims

of the Cognition Hypothesis, results of the present study show; (i) task complexity led to more complex speech assessed using specific measures motivated by the conceptual/linguistic demands of the tasks but did not, however, affect accuracy, fluency and complexity assessed using general measures; (ii) tasks requiring complex reasoning about characters' intentional states led to significantly more interaction, and uptake of pre modified input than simpler versions; and (iii) output processing anxiety showed a linearly progressive, negative relationship to use of complex speech as tasks increased in complexity. The role of specific versus general measures of production is discussed, as is the importance of examining interactions of production, interaction and uptake with measures of individual differences when researching the influence of L2 task demands on learning and performance.

Ishikawa (2008) in Salimi & Dadaspour (2012: 731) investigated the impacts of manipulating task demands of intentional reasoning on L2 speech performance. Three types of tasks were used: simple reasoning task, complex reasoning task, and no reasoning task. The results showed that intentional reasoning had positive effects on syntactic as well as lexical complexity and accuracy, but it had a negative effect on fluency.

Kuiken & Vedder (2008) in Salimi & Dadaspour (2012: 731) studied the effect of cognitive task complexity on written output in Italian and French as a foreign language. The participants transacted on two writing tasks with prompts of differing cognitive complexity. In their study cognitively more demanding task produced more accurate but it had no effect on the written output in terms of

syntactic complexity and lexical variations. Gilabert. et.al (2009) in Salimi & Dadaspour (2012: 732) studied the effects of manipulating cognitive complexity across task types and its impact on learners" interaction during oral performance. The result of the study concerning decision-making tasks proved no significant differences between accuracy of the learners' performance on the two tasks. Gilabert and his colleagues attributed the result to the open nature of the decision-making task types.

Mehrang & Rahimpour (2010: 3678) The present study aims at investigating the impact of planning conditions on the oral performance of the EFL learners while performing structured vs. unstructured tasks. Sixty four intermediate learners of English were randomly selected and divided into two groups of with pre-task planning time and without pre-task planning time. Cartoon scripts were employed for data collection. Results indicated that planning time had no effect on the accuracy and fluency of the learners' performances, but led to more complex performances when participants performed the unstructured task. Meanwhile, task structure did not affect the accuracy and complexity while promoting the fluency under the planned condition.

Hosseini & Rahimpour (2010) in Salimi & Dadaspour (2012: 732) investigated the effects of task complexity on L2 learners' written performance on narrative pictorial tasks of here-and- now and there-and- then. The results of the study demonstrated that cognitively more demanding task (there-and- then) were more fluent, but no significant effects on written narratives were observed on measures of accuracy and complexity.

Ong & Zhang (2010) in Salimi & Dadaspour (2012: 732) based on Robinson's (2001, 2003) cognition hypothesis and Sheehan's (1998) Limited Attention Capacity Model, this study explored the effects of task complexity on fluency and lexical complexity of 108 EFL students argumentative writing. Task complexity was manipulated using three factors of planning time, provision of ideas and macro-structure, and the availability of drafts. The results of the study showed that: 1.increasing task complexity with respect to planning time continuum produced significantly greater fluency.2.increasing task complexity through the provision of ideas & macro-structure produced significantly greater lexical complexity but no effects on fluency.3.increasing task complexity through the availability of draft produced no significant differences in fluency, and lexical complexity.

Ahmadian & Tavakoli (2011) in Salimi & Dadaspour (2012: 732) studied the effects of simultaneous use of careful online planning and task repetition on L2 learners' oral performance in terms of three linguistic domains of accuracy, fluency, and complexity. It was shown that participants in careful online planning groups spent more task completion than those in pressured online planning (control) groups did, and the differences proved to be statistically significant. The findings of this study provides further evidence in support of the limited and selective nature of attention capacity in that L2 learners who have used more time for task completion have produced more accurate language than those who have performed the task under time restriction. Furthermore, it lends support to Skehan's (1988) dual-model system proposal. Skehan argued that "rule-based system is likely to be parsimoniously and elegantly organized, with rules being

compactly structured (p: 89)". The findings of the study also indicated a high level of positive impact upon complexity in EFL oral production. The finding of this study is in line with Yuan & Ellis's (2003) findings.

Besides the studies above, Crespo (2011) in his thesis entitled " The Effects Of Task Complexity On L2 Speaking Production As Mediated By Differences In Working Memory Capacity" analyzed the effects of increasing task complexity along reasoning demands on L2 speaking performance, factoring in individual differences in working memory capacity (WMC) and affective factors. Related to task complexity, Crespo just focused on manipulating task complexity in resource directing, that is, reasoning demand. The result of the research confirmed that the task, which is made much more complex, in which more reasons are demanded, would decrease fluency, but increase accuracy. Additionally, there is no significant effect on complexity.

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

made simpler by combining those two dimensions results the lowest accuracy, fluency, and syntactic complexity. Meanwhile, combining complex task and simple task from both domains results the highest syntactic complexity.

Saeedi, Ketabi, Kazerooni (2012: 1057) also conducted the impact of manipulating the cognitive complexity of tasks on EFL learners' narrative task performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency of their production. To this aim, by drawing upon Robinson's (2001) Triadic Componential Framework (TCF), four levels of task complexity were operationalized. Sixty- five Iranian students studying English as a foreign language at the intermediate level participated in this research. The obtained results revealed that manipulating different dimensions of task complexity exerts differential effects on complexity, accuracy, and fluency of learners' narrative task performance. Additionally, it was shown that keeping tasks simple along the resource-dispersing dimension, while making them more demanding along the resource-directing dimension results in a simultaneous increase in complexity and accuracy, a finding which conforms to predictions based on Robinson's Cognetive Hypothesis.

Mahpul (2014) had also conducted a research on task complexity by combining resource-directing and resource-depleting. He combined number of elements and planning variables. Nevertheless, the research did not see the effects of the task complexity in monologic task like the other previous studies, but in dialogic task. Additionally, the perception of the students towards the task complexity also became his concern. There are four tasks in his research those are; the planned simple task (task 1), the unplanned simple task (task 2), the planned complex task

(task 3) and the unplanned complex task (task 4). The result was described that there is a complex interrelationship between the conditions of complexity (+/- number of elements) and planning. Since he manipulated number of elements and planning variables, he found that familiarity of doing the previous tasks is considered to be one of the aspects underlying the paerticipants' feeling of ease in performing the task.

Cho (2015: 107) conducted the research on task complexity. The research was manipulated by +/–reasoning demands and +/–few elements. A set of 110 argumentative essays were analyzed on 6 global measures of CAF and 2 task-specific measures. The results showed that task complexity affected the fluency of the argumentative writings, in that the complex task group produced more fluent writings than the simple group. However, task complexity did not affect accuracy or syntactic complexity of the argumentative writings. In the task-specific measures, task complexity affected neither frequency nor target-like use of conjunctions. These results have pedagogical implications for task design to help learners develop their L2 proficiency.

The similar research on task complexity with the current research was from Robinson (2001b) who conducted a study using monologic tasks where he simultaneously combined prior knowledge and the number of elements. The aim of the study was to test his Cognition Hypothesis (2001a), namely, that a task made complex will decrease learner fluency, but generate more accurate and complex language production. In the study one task the learners performed was simple and included a map of an area with which the learners were already

familiar (+ prior knowledge) and contained only few elements (+few elements). On the other, the complex task, also a map task, but included many elements (-few elements) of an area with which the students were not familiar (-prior knowledge). Students were asked to give directions to another student who had to draw a route on an empty map. The result showed that the complex task resulted in significantly less fluent oral production n, but higher lexical complexity than the simple task. However, the complex task did not affect either accuracy or syntactic complexity.

Based on the previous studies above, the researcher conducted a slightly similar research. The dimensions and aspects that were manipulated in line to Robinson's study (2001b). That was, the number of elements (+/- few elements) and prior knowledge (+/- prior knowledge) but there were different developments. The differences of previous research (Robinson, 2001b) and the current research can be seen at the table below:

Table 2.1 Robinson' Finding

No	Differences	Robinson (2001b)	The Current Research
1	Task Design	1. + few elements, + prior knowledge 2. – few elements, - prior knowledge	1. + few elements, + prior knowledge 2. + few elements, - prior knowledge 3. – few elements, + prior knowledge 4. – few elements, - prior knowledge
2	Instruction	Giving direction (map of area)	Asking how to make food (fried tofu, fried banana, fried tempeh)., how to measure the blood pressure, how to play (scrabble, basket ball or volley ball)., how to fly plane) (procedure text)

Besides, the current research determined the aspect of task complexity (the number of elements or prior knowledge) that contributes positive effect on spoken performance based on the students' responses. Those differences might be the gaps and novelty that revealed through this research. It was done since the cognitive factors (consisting of resource-directing and resource-depleting dimension) have an important role in students' learning activities. Additionally, Robinson assumes that resource-directing dimension will specifically lead students to the linguistic aspect. On the other hand, the resource-depleting just influences the students' psychological condition.

2.7 Spoken Performance

Speaking is a crucial part of second language learning and teaching (Kayi, 2006: 1). Speaking is "the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbol, in a variety of contexts" (Channey, 1998 in Kayi, 2006: 1). Speaking is not just 'any skill'- it is arguably the most important, and therefore should take priority in any language test Ur (1996: 134). According to Nunan (1999) 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 these 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.

Based on the types of speaking performance elaborated above, the researcher preferred to use monologue task. According to Davis (2007: 179) monologue is a personal and participatory speech act, even though only one person may be speaking. Hence, it would be easier to analyze since there was only one person who was speaking without being disturbed by other people's voice. Therefore, the spoken performance in monologic task had been analyzed in this research in term of Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency.

2.8 Concept of Perception on Task Complexity

Beside isvestigating the effects of four types of task complexity, this research also elaborating the students' perception on the four types of task complexity in spoken performance. First of all, this part describes the definition of perception. According to Otara (2011: 21), perception is our sensory experience of the world around us and involves both the recognition of environmental stimuli and actions in response to these stimuly. Shortly, he (p: 21) says that the way we all interpret our experience.

Many researchers conducted the students' perceptions on task difficulty/task complexicity (for examples: Robinson, 2001b; Tavakoli, 2009 in Mahpul, 2014; and Mahpul, 2014). Robinson (2001b: 27) assumes that cognetive complexity also significantly affects learner perceptions of task difficulty (e.g. a complex version is rated significantly more stressful than a simple version). It was one of the aim of the current research. Aditionally, he (2001b: 33) suggests it is difference in task complexity which are the logical basis for prospective decision making about task-based syllabus design and the sequencing of pedagogic tasks. It is also

possible that stable relationships may exist between increases in task complexity (the cognetive demands of tasks) and learner perceptions of difficulty, assessed via effective variables, with more complex tasks also being judged to be more difficult. Tavakoli (2009) in Mahpul (20014: 38) suggests that learners' perceptions of task difficulty is necessary "to broaden the current understanding of task difficulty.

Mahpul (2014: 102) investigated the Indonesians' perception of task complexity. He reports on the findings of the participants" views about the complexity of the four tasks. It includes participants" responses and how they perceive the four versions of the tasks that had been simultaneously manipulated according to planning time and the number of elements. A thematic analysis of the data led to these learners" perceptions being grouped into seven categories. The seven categories of perceptions to emarge from the data include: difficulty, stress, confidence, interest, motivation, learning opportunity, and diologic nature of the tasks. As described in his study, the responses for each category included the participants' contradictory opinions for each category which for coding purposes were symbolized as (+) and (-). The former (+) refers to learners' agreement about an issue regarding the task, while the latter (-) indicates their disagreement about the task.

In categorizing the students' perception, the current research was considered from two previous studies mentioned above; Robinson (2001b: 41) states that responses to these five items assessing overall perception of task difficulty, rating of stress, perceived ability to complete the task, interest in task content, and motivation to

complete these and other tasks like them, were used to assess learner perception of task difficulty. It means that he specifies five categories: level of difficulty, stress, confidence, interest, and motivation. While Mahpul (2014: 102) used seven categories of perceptions to emerge from the data include: difficulty, stress, confidence, interest, motivation, learning opportunity, and dialogic nature of the tasks. Therefore, this research elaborated the students perception on four types of complexity. Based on the categories of students' perceptions above, this research focused on the six categories: difficulty, stress, confidence, interest, motivation, and learning opportunity.

2.9 Theoretical Assumption

According to some theories, speaking is considered as one of the central elements of communication in EFL teaching. Teachers need to provide their students to practice speaking performance in the classroom. However, speaking not only focuses on the grammatical structures but also on meaning. 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. That is why this research will focus on manipulating the task complexity by combining resource-directing dimension (+/- few elements) and resource-depleting dimension (+/- prior knowledge). This might be the gap that wants to be filled through this research. Thus, this research intends to focus on two variables these are +/- few elements in resource dssirecting dimension and +/- prior knowledge in resourch-depleting. Additionally, Robinson assumes that task made more complex will increase accuracy and complexity but decrease fluency in the students' speaking performance.

From this research, it was assumed that increasing task complexity of the two variables (few elements in resource-directing dimension and prior knowledge in resource-depleting dimension) simultaneously would increase complexity and accuracy but decrease fluency.

2.9 Hypotheses

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

Ho The use of task complexity manipulated along with number of elements and prior knowledge has no significant effect in spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

H_1 The use of task complexity manipulated along with number of elements and prior knowledge has significant effect in spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

Ho The use of task complexity manipulated along with number of elements and prior knowledge has no good perceptions from the students in spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

H2 The use of task complexity manipulated along with number of elements and prior knowledge has good perceptions from the students in spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

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

3.1 Design of the Research

This researh used a quantitative approach since this current study was to investigate the result of different types of task complexity in statistically different spoken performance in terms of Complexity, Accuracy and Fluency (CAF) and to eleborate the students' perception of four types of task complecity manipulated along with number of elements (+/- few elements) and prior knowledge (+/- prior knowledge) in spoken performance. This research carried one group repeated measure design, which the researcher administered the tasks to one group of students in four meetings. There were three dependent variables: Complexity, (2) Accuracy, and (3) Fluency. There were four kinds of tasks administered to the students that related to the independent variables, as followed:

Condition 1: + Few Elements, + Prior Knowledge (few elements with prior knowledge)

Condition 2: + Few Elements, - Prior Knowledge (few elements with no prior knowledge)

Condition 3: - Few Elements, + Prior Knowledge (many elements with prior knowledge)

Condition 4: - Few Elements, - Prior Knowledge (many elements with no prior knowledge)

Each student's speaking performance has been analyzed based on the terms of Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency. Those three aspects were measured based on the certain formula. In the end, the result and level of significance were found out by means of ANOVA.

This current research also explored students' perceptions of the complexity of the four levels of tasks (taken from the questionnaire). The students' perception included the students' responses and how they perceived the four versions of the task that had been simultaneously manipulated according to few elements and prior knowledge. A thematic analysis of the data led to these students' perceptions are grouped into six categories (difficulty, stress, confidence, interest, motivation, and learning opportunity).

3.2 Setting of the Research

The time and the place were including of the setting in this research. This research was conducted on January 9th 2017 in the academic year of 2016/2017. It was held at SMAN 2 Padang Cermin Pesawaran, exclusively with the tenth grade.

3.3 Population and Sample

There were six classes of the tenth grade students in SMA N 2 Padang Cermin. From those six classes in the tenth, one class was randomly selected as sample for

this research that was X 1. It was taken through purposive sampling technique, based on the consideration that all of classes have the same ability in speaking ability. The sample consisted of 33 students.

Related to the number of samples, there is a criterion of the sample number in statistical analysis as stated by Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007) in Mahpul (2014: 58), the number of participants in statistical analysis should be more than 30 participants. Thus, there were 33 samples in this research, which consist of 10 boys and 23 girls.

3.4 Procedures of the Research

The procedures which were done in this reseach were as followed:

3.4.1 Preparing the Tasks

Task 1- Simple Task with Prior Knowledge

Task 1 (+ Few Elements, + Prior Knowledge) comprised three different pictures of food (fried tofu, fried banana, and fried fermented soybean). The three pictures apply in this task were including of the simple food which consist of few elements (simple ingredients and simple way) and the students were assumed that they have prior knowledge. In this task, the participants were asked to be a cheef and choose only one picture which they were familiar most. The three options of the food pictures were provided to facilitate the participants in doing the task so that they could produce the best result in speaking task. The participants were also provided with instructions to perform the task about procedure text, including mentioning the ingredients needed for the kind of food that they choose and explaining the way of how to make that kind of food. According to the Cognition Hypothesis,

Task 1 would be predicted to be the easiest task for the students to perform because the task is provided with prior knowledge and it consists of few elements (simple foods).

Task 2- Simple Task without Prior Knowledge

Task 2 (+ Few Elements, - Prior Knowledge) comprised one picture about a nurse and her patient who were still measuring the blood pressure. In this task, the researcher assumed that the students do not have prior knowledge about that. Besides, the task is including of a simple task (few elements) because it only used one device and simple tehhnique). Here, the participants were asked to tell how to examine the patient by measuring the blood pressure of the patient.how to explain the way to give the information to the patient about her blood pressure. So that other people could practise it. Based on the Cognition Hypothesis, because of the lack of prior knowledge, it was predicted that Task 2 would be more difficult than Task 1.

Task 3- Complex task with prior knowledge

Task 3 (- Elements, + Prior Knowledge) comprised three differents kinds of game, those are; scrabble, basket ball, and volley ball. The researcher assumed that the students have prior knowledge with those games. Eventhoug, those games are complex which consist of many elements but the researcher assumed that the participants could speak fluently in this task, the participant were capable in playing various games (scrabble, basket ball, and volly ball). They had to choose one of the games under the instructions that they feel most familiar with. Then the researcher instructed them to explain the procedures of including; the rule of the

game (number of players, timing and the other rules), the way how to play (the terms in the games) and the system of scoring. Based on the Cognition Hypothesis, Task 3 should be more cognitively demanding than either Task 1 or 2. It is more complex within the resource-directing dimension (– few elements), but simultaneously simpler within the resource-dispersing dimension (+ prior knowledge).

Task 4- Complex Task without Prior Knowledge

Task 1 (- Few Elements, - Prior Knowledge) comprised one picture of pilot who is still flying the plane. The researcher justified this task as a complex task bacause the students did not have prior knowledge about the job. Moreover, it consisted of many elements.The students were asked to be a pilot who would fly the plane; then the researcher instructed the participants to explain the tasks of pilot in detail such as the planning of flight before departure (what thing you prepare or check in order to make departure will run well), when the plane take off, the way how to fly the plane, and when the plane landing. According to the Cognition Hypothesis, Task 4 would be the most difficult task for the participants to perform among the four levels of tasks, as it is complex within both dimensions, that is, resource-directing and resource-dispersing.

Before the researcher administered the tasks to the sample choosen, firstly the students were given tried out. The students who were given the tried out were considered as had same speaking ability. It was done since the tasks design were not valid and reliable yet. During the try out, it seemed that the students could understand with the instructions but they got difficulty in speaking. One of the

problems for them was because they lacked of vocabulary. In solving the problem, the researcher decided to give time for them to open dictionary to find out the difficult words around ten minutes.

3.4.2 Subjects of the Research

In determining sample of this research, the researcher used 33 students from X1 class as the sample of this research. It has been chosen randomly by using sampling technique.

3.4.3 Conducting the tasks

In this research, the tasks were given to the students during four meetings. as the table in this below:

The time for one meeting was 90 minutes. The researcher divided the time into three parts for each meeting. Firstly, 5 minutes for learning the instruction and the technique of the spoken performance test. In that activity, the researcher gave the chance to the students to give questions that related to the instructions and then they were allowed to open dictionary for finding the vocabs that they needed. Secondly, 40 minutes for doing the task. The last 45 minutes part was for answering the questionare. Hence, managing the time effectively was necessary in order to get the best result of spoken performance.

Before doing the spoken performance task, the researcher asked the students to leave the room except one student whose name was at the first one in the absence. They were allowed to enter the classroom when they performed their spoken test only. The students were called based on their name as alphabetically. Meanwhile,

the other students were waiting for their turned outside of the room. That made the process of recording run well since there was no disturbance from other students. It was done to avoid the other students cheating or asking for information from the previous one.

3.5 Data Collecting Technique

To answer the first research question, the collected data were in the form of students' utterences. The students' utterences were transcribed, coded, analyzed, and calculated. To answer the second research questions, the collected data were in the form of questionnaire of students' perceptions. There were some steps which have been done by the researcher, they were as followed;

3.5.1 Determining the instrument

The instruments, which were used in this research were four monolog tasks, and questionnaires. First instrument was four tasks. There were four different types of monologic tasks with different level of task complexity. Those tasks were designed in such a way that the factors of the number of few elements (+/- few elements) and the prior knowledge (+/- prior knowledge) are manipulated simultaneously. The number of elements were chosen since the tasks, which were manipulated according to the number of elements (+/- few elements), were expected to be more comprehensive in the sense that learners might inevitably include the other two factors of resource-directing dimensions viz.giving reasons (+/- no reasoning demands) and using present or past activities (+/- here and now) while performing the tasks. Moreover, studies investigating the manipulation of numbers of elements suggest that these aspects have enabled learners to improve

their language performance in term of Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency CAF (Gilabert, 2005 in Mahpul, 2014: 59).

The students' utterences in spoken performance were recorded by using application in the cell-phone. To avoid the trouble that might come, the researcher prepared two recorder applications in the cell phone. The last instrument was questionnairee. The questionnaire was used in this research to answer the second research question. There were four questionnaires in this research. The questions related to task 1, task 2, task 3, and task 4. It purposed to determine which aspect of task complexity (the number of element or prior knowledge) that contributed positive effect on students' spoken performance based on the students' response. Students also gave the reasons of their answers on the questionnairee given. It was conducted to make sure that the answers were effective for exploring the students' perceptions of the tasks and their difficulty. The questions of questionnairee were classyfied on the six characters (difficulty, stress, confidence, interest, motivation, and learning opportunity). The questionnaire can be seen in appendix II.

3.5.2 Recording the students' monolog

To obtain the data, the researcher recorded the students' utterences by using recorder application in the cell phone. Since there were 33 students who performed the four types of tasks in spoken test, so it can be concluded that there were 132 monologues recordedd in the cellular phones.

3.5.3 Distributing the Questionnairee

To answer the second research question, the data was obtained from the questionnairee that were classyfied on the six categories (difficulty, stress,

confidence, interest, motivation, and learning opportunity). There were six questions following the reasons of each tasks. Since there were six students' answers and six students' perceptions for each four tasks, so that there were 792 students' answers coded in this data. Besides that, there were 792 reasons or perceptions were analyzed from this data.

3.5.4 Transcribing and coding the students' monolog

The students' utterences need transcribing. It means that the spoken form must be transferred into the written form. After transcribing the data, the written utterences were coded by certain symbols. They were coded into the number of syllabes and length of time for fluency, clauses, AS-unit, lexical words for complexity, and function words for complexity, and number of errors for accuracy. These two processes which were done in this research were carried out by the researcher in an inter-rater.

3.5.5 Coding and Classifying the Students' Questionnairee

This part addreeesed the second research question and reports on the findings of students' perceptions about the complexity of the four tasks. It included students' responses and how they perceived the four versions of the task that had been simultanoustly manipulated according to few elements and prior knowledge. A thematic analysis of the data led to these students' perceptions being grouped into six categories. The six categories of perceptions to emerge from the data include: difficulty, stress, confidence, interest, motivation, and learning opportunity.

3.6 Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

To get validity and reliability of the data, the instruments used in this research should fulfill the validity and reliability criteria. Regarding validity, the instrument should at least fulfill content validity and construct validity.

3.6.1 Content Validity

To fulfill the content validity, the material for the speaking task was taken based on KTSP curriculum (Curriculum 2006). Due to the reason, procedure text in the form of monologue was chosen for the students' tasks. Based on the material, one of the students' competence they must be able to tell the ingredients or material and how to make or to do something in monolog task. Based on the syllabus, it is clear that procedure text is one of material that must be mastered by the students of Senior High School in practicing their speaking or spoken performance.

3.6.2 Construct Validity

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

Additionally, the tasks made should also be based on the theories of task complexity, especially the resource-directing dimension (few elements) and

resource-depleting (prior knowledge). Due to the reason, each task consists of the two variables that have been manipulated.

3.6.3 Reliability

One of focus on this research was to see the effect of task complexity on the students' spoken performance, which belongs to subjective test, thus, the researcher used inter-rater in order to obtain the data more reliable.The inter-rater was one of the Post-Graduate students of English Department in Lampung University. There were two raters in calculating the students' utterences in this research. The first rater was the researcher self and the second rater was Arina Sulistyaningsih, S.Pd, an English teacher in SMAN 2 Padang Cermin, Pesawaran who teaches the tenth grade. Before calculating the data, firstly, two raters attemped to have similar perception towards some terms related to complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

In doing the process of scoring students' spoken performance in term of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. There was discussion between the two raters when there were some significant differences found in the final scores. After the two scorings had been done, it was necessary for the researcher to make sure that both results were reliable statistically. Reliability of each task was examined by using statistical measurements of reliability in SPSS.

3.7 Data Analysis

The data analysis of this research elaborated the two analyses. The first analysis was about students' utterances in term of complexity, accuracy, and fluency

(CAF) and the second analysis was about the students' perception of four types of task complecity manipulated along with number of elements and prior knowledge in spoken performance. The analysis of this research was conducted in the manner as described below;

3.7.1 Analysis of Students' Spoken Performance in Term of CAF

The students' spoken performance or utterances were analyzed in term of CAF. In doing this analysis, the students' utterances were transcribed, and coded for CAF measures. These CAF measures were adapted from those used in the study by Michel, Kuiken, & Vedder (2007: 8). It entailed the use of multiple aspects of CAF, including:

3.7.1.1 Complexity

Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) in Inoue (2010: 3) argues that complexity is 'the extent to which learners produce elaborated language' and is often concerned with syntactic and lexical aspects of narrative performance. This research also analyzed complexity in terms of syntactic and lexical complexity. Some researchers use T-unit for analysis, however, Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) in Inoue (2010: 3) recommend using C-units or AS-units because they can take sub-clausal units into account. In addition, Foster, et.,al. (2000: 365) defined 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. They also pointed in Inoue (2010: 3) that AS-Unit are more appropriate for analyzing spoken language than the other two units, C units or T-Units. This is because AS-units can clearly distinguish among false starts, repetitions, and self-corrections. Aditionally, Mahpul (2014: 43) argues that AS-Units are more appropriate to

analyze oral production data than C-Units or T-Units. Therefore, this research employed AS-units since that unit is necessary in the measures (the number of words per AS-unit). Despite complexity having been measured in different way, there are two common features, 1) syntactical or structural complexity, and, 2) lexical complexity.

Thus, this research analyzed complexity (both syntactic and lexical complexity were calculated). 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, this research just measured syntactic complexity by means of calculating the ratio of clauses to AS unit, like the previous study done by Michel, Kuiken, & Vedder (2007: 8).

Syntactic Complexity

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

The Example of Coding and calculating the syntactic complexity can be as follows:

> |I'm going to tell you (C) how to make fried banana.(C)| |The ingrediants are flour, salt, sugar, banana, and water.(C)| |Step: mix all ingredients|....|except banana and add some water.(C)| |Second, ..*ma masukan* banana and fry them. (C)| |That's all.(C)| (00.32')

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 are in Indonesia are not counted in, and group of words without verbs cannot be categorized as a clause. For that reason, the example of students' voice

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

$$\frac{7}{6} = 1.17$$

While, lexical complexity was measured by calculating the percentage of lexical words to total number of words.

Lexical Complexity

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

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

Table 3.2. Calculation of Lexical Words (Mahpul, 2014: 69)

No	Lexical Words	Examples
1	Full verbs, nouns, adjective, adverbs ending in *ly*	Buy,houses, good, carefully
2	The verbs *have*, *do*, *be* except when use as auxiliaries	I *have* much money
3	Wrongly conjugated verbs	Buyed
4	Words that have with number	Man, men
5	Interjection	Hi, hello, goodbye
6	Hyphenated words and contractions	I'm, I'd
7	Conjugated forms of verbs count as different types	Do and did
8	Phrasel verbs	To get up
9	In preposition verbs	Interested in

Coding and calculating the lecical complexity can be as followed:

> I'm going to tell you how to makefriedbanana. The ingrediants are flour, salt, sugar, banana, and water. Stepmixallingredients....exceptbanana and add some water. Second, {..*ma masukan*}banana and fry them. That'sall. (00.32')

In accordance with the transcription above, the underlined words are the lexical words, so it is known that there are 23 lexical words contained, and the total

number of word is 36. In determining the total words, false starts, repetition, and words in mother tongue are exluded. Finally, the calculation of lexical complexity is as follows:

$$\frac{23}{36} \text{ X } 100\% = 63.89$$

3.7.1.2 Accuracy

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

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

The example of calculating accuracy is as follows:

> |I'm going to tell you how to make fried banana.| |The ingrediants are flour, salt, sugar, banana, and water.| |Step: mix all ingredients..| |except banana and add some water.||Second, ..*ma masukan* banana and fry them.||That's all.| (00.32')

Having analyzed the six AS-unit in the transcription above, there is five AS-unit which are error free. Thus, the calculation of accuracy is as follows:

$$\frac{5}{6} \text{ X } 100\% = 83.33$$

Having analyzed every sentence in the transcription above, the result of accuracy was 83.33.

3.7.1.3 Fluency

With respect to fluency, Yuan and Ellis (2003) & Gilabert (2005) in Mahpul (2014: 70) states that fluency was again calculated manually, ascertaining the Unpruned Speech Rate A and Prunch Speech Rate B. This research implemented Speech Rate B in which For Speech Rate B, repetitions, reformulations, false starts, and comments in the L1 are excluded from the calculation. To measure fluency by using Speech Rate B, 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, was also calculated in similar way to Speech Rate A, but syllables which appeared repetitions, self corrections, false starts, and in Indonesian or local words were excluded in the calculation.

Mahpul (2014: 71) argues that in determining the number of syllables calculation, the following rules applied.

1. *Ing* form such as, doing, saying, etc., counted as two syllables.
2. The constructions such as, isn't, doesn't, didn't, were calculated as two syllables.
3. Epenthesis (insertion of sounds in the middle of words) does not count as a syllable, e.g., speak /s...../, instead of /spi;k/
4. Past /ed/ form was not regarded as a syllable (e.g., "wanted", "landed"), each counted as two syllables.

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

(Gilabert, 2005 in Mahpul, 2014: 71)

The calculation for fluency in this research is as follows,

> I'm (1) going (2) to (1) tell (1) you (1) how (1) to (1) make (1) fried (1) banana (3). The (1) ingredients (3) are (1) flour (2), salt (1), sugar (2), banana (3), and (1) water (2). Step (1): mix (1) all (1) ingredients (3)....except (2) banana (3) and (1) add (1) some (1) water (2). Second (2), ..*ma masukan* banana (3) and (1) fry (1) them. (1) That's (1) all. (1) (00.32')

The transcription consists of 55 syllables, so the formula of fluency is,

$$\frac{55}{32} \text{ X } 60 = 103.12$$

After getting the result of students speaking performance (complexity, accuracy, and fluency), the researcher ran SPSS to investigate the difference of the four tasks.

3.7.2 Analysis of Students' Post Task Questionaree

In undertaking the analysis of this data, first it was read and rewritten then organized in prepararion for analysis. Next, all the data was coded in detail. From this categorizes or themes emerge, which were then interprated for presentation in the findings. A thematic analysis of the data led to these students' perceptions being grouped into six categories. The six categories of perceptions to emerge from the data include: difficulty, stress, confidence, interest, motivation, and learning opportunity. The responses for each category included the students' contradictory opinions for each category which for coding purposes were symbolized as (+) and (-). The former (+) refers to students' agreement about an issue regarding the task, while the letter (-) indicates their disagreement about the task.

To undertake the coding a binary system was used in which the students who had apposite responses for each categoty were designated either (+) or (-). Both plus (+) and minus (-) codes were then accompanied by a number referring to the order of the questions in the questionnairee. For example, the Plus (+) code was generated from question 1 and was coded by "1+". A minus (-) response generated from question 1 would be then coded by "1-", etc. (see Appendix VIII)

The students written responses were coded manually with reference to descriptive and In-Vivo Codes (Saldana, 2009 in Mahpul, 2014: 72). According to Sadana (2009) in Mahpul (2014: 72) the first term refers to the summary of the primary topic of the excerpt, while the letter means a direct quotation taken from what the participant says (pp. 72). Drawing on these procedures, the coding process of this research was dealt with as shown in the example below.

> "Mudah, karena saya sudah pernah membuat *pisang goreng* sebelumnya jadi saya sudah tau bahan-bahan yang dibutuhkan
> dan cara membuatnya'.
> ("it was easy because I have ever made fried banana so I have known the ingredients needed an the way to make it)"

The word "mudah" is coded (1+) and the following responses to 1+, "karena saya sudah pernah membuat *pisang goreng* sebelumnya jadi saya sudah tau bahan-bahan yang dibutuhkan dan cara membuatnya'. It means that she has understood with what she did. It means that the students has prior knowledge on making fried banana. (Task 1). It was summarized by a Descriptive Code as a 'simple task' (ST).

The same procedures were applied to minus (-) responses. As shown in the example below:

> "Sulit, karena saya tidak bisa dan tidak mengerti bagaimana mengukur tekanan darah pasien" (Task 2).
> ("it was difficult, because I can not and I do not understand how to measure the blood of patient)"

The word "sulit" is coded by (1-), while the response following the minus (1+) code, karena saya tidak bisa dan tidak mengerti bagaimana mengukur tekanan darah pasien". It means that the student showed that he had no prior knowledge about the task. It can be concluded that Few Element did not give effect to the student. It was coded as a complex task. (CT).

These data were tabulated as a percentage agreement summary of all the students' perceptions of task complexity, which were presented in the results. This was done to answer the second research question.

3.7 Hypothesis Testing

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

H0 The use of task complexity manipulated along with number of elements and prior knowledge has no significant effect in spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

H_1. The use of task complexity manipulated along with number of elements and prior knowledge has significant effect in spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

Ho The use of task complexity manipulated along with number of elements and prior knowledge has no good perceptions from the students in spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

H2 The use of task complexity manipulated along with number of elements and prior knowledge has good perceptions from the students in spoken performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

In testing the hypotheses, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run. It was used to find out the statistical significance of mean differences (complexity, accuracy, and fluency). Then, in the table of ANOVA, the comparison among the means could be clearly seen.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter describes the conclusions of the research and also the suggestions for other researchers and English teachers who want to give spoken performance for the students task by designing task complexity and ask students' perceptions related to the task. They are elaborates as follow;

5.1 Conclusion

With reference to the results and discussions of the current research, the use of task complexity simultaneously manipulated by increasing and decreasing resource-directing (-/+ number of elements) and resource-depleting (-/+ prior knowledge) in spoken performance in terms of complexity (lexical and syntactic complexity), accuracy, and fluency by the tenth grade students of SMAN 2 Padang Cermin was partly in line with Cognition Hypothesis. The task form which was used was monolog.

The result of two complexities (syntactics complexity and lexical complexity) of this research were different. The students' syntactics complexity increased if the tasks were complex (many elements). In this case, -/+ prior knowledge did not give contribution. While students' lexical complexity increased if the task designed from prior knowledge (-/+ few elements with prior knowledge). In

accuracy, the number of elements became the factor in increasing students' accuracy if the tasks were only few elements.

Furthermore, prior knowledge became the first factor that support students' fluency in spoken performance. As long as the students have prior knowledge, they were fluent in doing the tasks whether it was few elements or many elements task. Therefore, prior knowledge gave the big influence in increasing the students fluency in spoken performance.

Meanwhile, the students perceptions of the four types of tasks complexity were taken based on the six character (difficulty, stress, confidence, interest, motivation, and learning opportunity). This results showed that familiarity or background knowledge became the main reason for the students to do the task easily, successful, and confident. Additionaly, prior knowledge or familiarity gave good effect for students' interest, motivation and learning opportunity.

5.2 Suggestions

The current research suggests to English teachers who want to design task complexity on students' spoken performance. In getting the better result for the students' spoken performance, the task that can make the students produce accurate spoken performance should contain few elements to discuss and simple instruction by giving the pictures related to the tasks. In producing more fluent spoken performance of the students, the tasks had better design on prior knowledge by supporting the familiarity aspect of the task. Additionally, it will be better to develop the familiarity in all cognetive familiarity. Besides, the

familiarity with the topic, other types of familiarity can be considered for the next research in detail.

Meanwhile, the futher research or English teacher with respect to task complexity needs to design or to develop task by using other variable in resource-directing (e.,g. Planning time) and resource-depleting (e.,g; prior knowledge) as long as in the current research those variables gave good effect for the students' fluency in doing spoken performance.

Students' perceptions are useful in order to see the reason or problem, which is related to the task complexity in spoken performance. In this case, teacher or the further researcher should pay more attention to understand all aspect that can increase or decrease students' spoken performance. The questionnaire used can be specified on the characters (difficulty, stress, confidence, interest, motivation, and learning opportunity). It is better to add the category to be asked for example asking the opinion to the students about the use of monolog task in spoken performance. Additionally, further research can focus on other materials besides procedure text.

REFERENCES

An, S. 2013. Schema theory in reading. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 3 (1), 130-134.

Azizi, M. Asoudeh, F., and Azar, A.S. 2012. The role of task complexity on EFL learners' oral production in English language institutions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistic Studies*, Vol. 1 (1), 22-27.

Cho, H. 2015. Effect of task complexity on English argumentative writing. *Journal English Teaching*, Vol. 70 (2), 107-131.

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.

Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan. 2006. Petunjuk teknis pengembangan silabus dan contoh/model silabus SMA/MA. Jakarta: Depdikbud.

Davis, J. 2007. Dialogue, monologue, and soliloquy in the large lecture class. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, Vol. 19 (2), 178-182.

Evnitkaya, N. 2008. Analyzing complexity in foreign language monologic oral production in CLIL context. Master' Thesis. Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona.

Febriyanti, E. R. 2006. Teaching speaking of English as a foreign language: Problems and Solutions. Banjarmasin: Universitas Lambung Mangkurat.

Foster, P., Tonkyn, A., and Wigglesworth, G. 2000. A unit for all reasons: measuring spoken language. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 21 (3), 354-375.

Fotos, S. (1998). Shifting the focus from forms to form in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal*, Vol. 52 (4), 301-307.

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.

Gilabert, R. 2007b. Effects of manipulating task complexity on self-repairs during L2 oral production. *IRAL*, Vol. 45, 215-240.

Housen, A., and F., Kuiken. 2009. Complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 30 (4), 461–473.

Inoue, C. 2010. Investigating the sensitivity of the measures of fluency, accuracy, complexity and idea units with a narrative task. *Papers from the Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics & Language Teaching*, Vol. 4, 1-24.

Kayi, H. 2006. Teaching speaking: activities to promote speaking in a second language. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. XII, (11), 1-5.

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.

Madarsara, M. A., and Rahimy, R. 2015. Examining the effect of task complexity and sequence on speaking ability of iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, Vol. 4 (1), 247-254.

Mahpul. 2014. Task difficulty in dialogic oral production by EFL Indonesian learners. Dissertation. Curtin University.

Mehrang, F., and Rahimpour, M. 2010. The impact of task structure and planning conditions on oral performance of EFL learners. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 2, 3678–3686.

Michel, M, F. Kuiken, S.C. and Vedder. 2007. The influence of complexity in monologic versus dialogic tasks in Dutch L2. *IRA*L, Vol. 45, 241-259.

Mohammadi, E,G., Youse fi, M, H., and Afghari, A. 2012. Task-based learning research and the cognition hypothesis: the case of task complexity. *Theory and practice in language study*, Vol. 2 (12), 2593-2602.

Nunan, D. 2004. *Task-based language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Otara, A. 2011. Perception: A guide for managers and leaders. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, Vol. 2 (3), 21-24.

Robinson, P. 1995. Task complexity and second language narrative discourse. *Language Learning*, Vol. 45 (1), 99-140.

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 (287-318). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, P.2001b. Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring Interactions in a componential framework. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 22, (1), 27-57.

Robinson, P. 2003. The Cognition hypothesis, task design, and adult task- based language learning. *Second Language Studies*, Vol. 21 (2), 45-105.

Robinson, P. 2005. Cognitive complexity and task sequencing: studies in a componential framework for second language task design. *IRAL*, Vol. 43, 1–32.

Robinson, P. 2007. Task complexity, theory of mind, and intentional reasoning: effect on L2 speech production, interaction, uptake and perceptions of task difficulty . *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 45, 193-214.

Robinson, P. 2011. Task-based language learning: a review of issues. *A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, Vol. 61 (1), 1-36.

Saeidi, M., Ketabi, S., and Kazerooni, S. 2012. The impacts of manipulating task complexity on EFL learners. *Gema Online Journal of Language Studies*, Vol. 12 (4), 1057-1075.

Salimi, A., and Dadaspour, S. 2012. Task complexity and SL development: does task complexity matter. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 46, 726 – 735.

Salimi, A., Dadaspour, S., and Asadollahfam, H. 2011. The effect of task complexity on EFL learners' written performance. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 29, 1390-1399.

Shahreza, M. A., Dabaghi, A., and Kassaian, Z. 2012. The effects of manipulating task complexityon the occurrence of language-related episodes during learner-learner interaction. *Article in Porta Linguarum*, 173-188.

Soleimani, H., and Rezazad eh, M. 2014. The effect of increase in task cognitive complexity on Iranian EFL learners' accuracy and linguistic complexity: a test of Robinson's cognition hypothesis. *Applied Research on English Language,* 3 (1), 41-54.

Ur, P. 1996. *A course in Language Teaching*: practice and theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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