THE EFFECT OF TASK COMPLEXITY ON SPOKEN DATA OF THE ELEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS AT SMAIT DAARUL 'ILMI BANDAR LAMPUNG

(A Thesis)

By

NIKEN WULANDARI

MAGISTER OF ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF LAMPUNG
2023

THE EFFECT OF TASK COMPLEXITY ON SPOKEN DATA OF THE ELEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS AT SMAIT DAARUL 'ILMI BANDAR LAMPUNG

By:
NIKEN WULANDARI

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

MAGISTER OF ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF LAMPUNG
2023

THE EFFECT OF TASK COMPLEXITY ON SPOKEN DATA OF THE ELEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS AT SMAIT DAARUL 'ILMI BANDAR LAMPUNG

Niken Wulandari, Mahpul, Hery
Magister of English Department, Lampung University
nwulandhari@gmail.com

Abstract. The aims of this study were 1) to find out the effect of the three types of tasks on the students' spoken language production in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF), 2) to find out the influence of different levels of proficiency in generating a statistically significant difference of spoken language production for each type of the task in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF). The design was quasi experimental research. The subjects of this research were 15 students of the eleventh grade of SMAIT Daarul 'Ilmi Bandar Lampung. The three types of task were administered and were being recorded to collect the data. The results show that in terms of complexity, Task 3 got the highest score. For the accuracy measurement, Task 2 is the highest. For the fluency measurement, Task 3 is the highest. For high and low levels of proficiency in generating a statistically significant difference of spoken language production of the three types of the task, the mean score for students measurement is dominated by the high proficient student, except for low proficient students in Task 1, where the mean score of low proficient students is higher than the mean score of high proficient students.

Keywords: CAF measurement, students' proficiency level, speaking ability.

Research Title	:	**THE EFFECT OF TASK COMPLEXITY ON SPOKEN DATA OF THE ELEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS AT SMAIT DAARUL 'ILMI BANDAR LAMPUNG**
Student's Name	:	**NIKEN WULANDARI**
Student's Number	:	2023042005
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., P.hD.
NIP. 19650706 199403 1 002

Co-Advisor

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

The Chairperson of Department
of Language and Arts Education

Dr. Nurlaksana Eko R., M.Pd.
NIP. 19640106 198803 1 001

The Chairperson of Master
In English Language Teaching

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

ADMITTED BY

1. Examination Committee

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

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

   Examiners : **1. Prof. Dr. Flora, M.Pd.** .....

   2. Dr. Ari Nurweni, M.A. .....

2. Dean of Teacher Training and Education Faculty

   Prof. Dr. Sunyono, M.Si.
   NIP. 19651230 199111 1 001

3. Director of Postgraduate Program

   Prof. Dr. Ahmad Saudi Samosir, S.T., M.T.
   NIP. 19710415 199803 1 005

4. Graduated on : **January 11th, 2023**

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN

Dengan ini saya menyatakan dengan sebenarnya bahwa:

1. Thesis dengan judul "The Effect of Task Complexity on Spoken Data of the Eleventh Grade Students at SMAIT Daarul 'Ilmi Bandar Lampung" adalah hasil karya sendiri dan saya tidak melakukan penjiplakan atau pengutipan atas karya penulis lain dengan cara tidak sesuai tata etika ilmiah yang berlaku dalam masyarakat akademik atau yang disebut plagiarisme.
2. Hak 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, 11 Januari 2023
Yang membuat pernyataan,

Niken Wulandari
NPM. 2023042005

CURRICULUM VITAE

The writer's complete name is Niken Wulandari, but her friends usually call her Niken. She was born in Bandar Jaya, on June 12th, 1995. She is the third daughter of Haeriyah and Antony. She has two brothers; Prima Wahyudi and Aan Septian. She started her study in Kindergarten at TK Aisyiyah Bustanul Athfal Poncowati in 2000 and graduated in 2001. In the same year, she joined the elementary school of SD Negeri 1 Poncowati and graduated in 2007. Also in 2007, she continued her study at SMP Negeri 1 Terbanggi Besar and SMA Negeri 1 Terbanggi Besar and graduated in 2010 and 2013 for each. She was accepted as a college student at the English Education Department of Lampung University the same year she graduated from high school. She graduated from there in September 2017. Three years later, in September 2020, she was registered as a magister student of Master of English Education at Lampung University.

DEDICATION

I would proudly dedicate this thesis to:

My beloved father and mother; Antony and Haeriyah

My supporting system, zauji jannati, my husband; Sadikin

My lovely daughter; Kin Haqquna Althafunnisa

My best sisters and brothers; Prima Wahyudi, Aan Septian, and their wife

My precious nephews

My beloved best friends

My fabulous friends in Master of English Education

My alma mater University of Lampung

MOTTO

أمّ و ربّطل بيت

(A mom, and manager of her family)

يٰٓاَيُّهَا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللّٰهَ حَقَّ تُقٰتِهٖ وَ لَا تَمُوْتُنَّ اِلَّا وَاَنْتُمْ مُّسْلِمُوْنَ

(Q.S. Ali-Imran: 102)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Alhamdulillaah, first and foremost, the writer would like to praise and thank God, the Almighty, who has granted countless blessings, knowledge, and opportunity to her, that she has been finally able to accomplish the thesis, entitled “The Effect of Task Complexity on Students’ Speaking Ability of Eleventh Grade Students” as one of the requirements to finish her S2 degree at Language and Art Department at Teacher Training and Education Faculty, University of Lampung. Greetings and invocation are presented to the prophet Muhammad SAW, who has guided mankind to the right path blessed by the Lord. The writer has so many people to thank that she doesn't even know where to begin, but she is grateful to them all for helping her finish this thesis. There are too many names to mention, but a few merit her serious and special attention. Words cannot express the writer’s gratitude to her advisors, Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D., and Hery Yufrizal, M.A., Ph.D., for their suggestions, scientific knowledge, invaluable guidance, unlimited patience, and encouragement to the writer during the completion of this thesis. She also could not have undertaken this journey without the dedication of Prof. Dr. Flora, M.Pd., as the first examiner and Dr. Ari Nurweni, M.A., as the second examiner for generously giving much support, input, help, and correction to make this thesis better. Her deepest gratitude goes out to Prof. Dr. Flora, M. Pd., the director of the Master of English Education Study Program, for her immense knowledge and wealth of experience that has motivated the author throughout her studies, as well as to all of the program's lecturers who have made significant contributions throughout the completion process and thesis completion. Nobody has been more important to the writer in the pursuit of this project than the members of her family. She would like to thank her parents, whose love and guidance are with her in whatever she pursued. They are the ultimate role models. Also for her brothers, sisters-in-law, nieces, and nephews, the writer’s life would not have been full of the journey without their presence. Most importantly, she wishes to thank her loving and supportive husband, Sadikin, and her wonderful daughter, Kin Haqquna Althafunnisa, who provides unending inspiration. She also appreciates her classmates' never-

ending assistance, late-night feedback sessions, and moral support; special thanks to Ditha, Helda, Eva, Erin, As'ad, Nabila, Umi, Sari, Nyanuar, Niluh, Asteria, Putri, Sisul, Jaul and more who cannot be named individually for the priceless memories.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter explains about the background of the research, the research question, objective of the research, uses of the research, scope of the research, and definition of terms.

1.1. Background

Speaking is considered one of the main skills in learning English. According to Richards (2009), speaking in traditional methodologies usually meant repeating after the teacher, memorizing a dialog, or responding to drills, reflecting the sentence-based view of proficiency prevailing in the audio-lingual and other drill-based or repetition-based methodologies of the 1970s. In learning English as a second language, communication is the process of transmitting information and common understanding from one person to another (Keyton, 2011) needs speaking. Speaking is very important in our life to communicate that without speaking we cannot know what others are talking about, yet speaking is also a way we use to interact with other people. So, as intention in communication is needed, speaking cannot be expressed only for repeating, memorizing, or responding.

As stated by Brown (2004), speaking is productive skills that can be directly and empirically observed. It makes some students consider learning English, especially speaking, difficult. In line with this, Prasetyaningrum, et. al. (2021) found that some factors influence the students' difficulties in speaking especially in introducing themselves, those are lack of vocabulary, unable to produce words correctly, the students are not confident in introducing themselves, and lack practice of students in speaking English.

To get around this, teachers must give students resources that can deal with these challenges.

To get through challenges, as learning a language needs constant exercises, student needs to perform a task that resembles authentic, “real-life” situations that is really practical. Familiarity with the task will ease the students in implementing the task itself. Situations made by the teacher will help students face difficulties in learning a language. The researcher realizes that in the process of the teaching-learning activity done by applying task-based learning, the teacher will give such kind of tasks in the form of activities done to achieve communication in the target language that students will focus more on the meaning than forms. Therefore, by performing a task, the students will learn a language practically in such a situation that this will fit their needs well. Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is one strategy that is successful when used in language classrooms. For second language learners, TBLT is a method of language instruction. According to Richards (206, p. 30), task-based language teaching makes the case that language acquisition will occur as a result of establishing the proper types of interactional processes in the classroom. The best method to do this is to employ specially created instructional tasks.

This is related to previous research done by Gunawan (2016). The research finding is that students can learn more effectively when their brain focuses on the task of TBLT enables teachers to develop students’ speaking skills and to practice making oral representations immediately. It also stated that the students feel motivated and enthusiastic about learning English. TBLT indirectly force them to do something in the classroom in their own language. Their attitude toward the use of TBLT in the classroom shows

their participation. As Khusnul's (2018) research, the implementation of TBLT makes more than 10 out of 14 students participate in speaking activities in the classroom.

When creating tasks to develop such skills, task designers must increase the task complexity. To do this, they must use an operational framework that allows them to selectively adjust and increase the demands of tasks to gradually approximate real-world performance conditions. Eventually, The Cognition Hypothesis makes a claim regarding how task complexity affects language performance and comprehension quality as well as learning in terms of moving through developmental stages and sequences as well as assimilating new language information while performing a task.

In the research of Vivian (2017), it is found that the researcher elaborates on the task complexity with students' perception of it. The research finding of Vivian (2017) shows that prior knowledge became the key reason for the students to do the task easily, successfully, and confidently. It also arises the students' interest, motivation, and learning opportunities. Task complexity also becomes the main focus of Nur research (2017). The finding shows that the different types of task complexity make the longest time for students in speaking.

In the Triadic Componential Framework proposed by Robinson and Gilabert (2007), task complexity is divided into two; resource-directing, and resource-depleting. Resource-directing includes three variables, that is, +/- here and now, +/- few elements, and +/- reasoning demands, whereas, resource-depleting consists of +/- planning time, +/- single task, and +/- prior knowledge variables. This triadic componential framework enables the

complex classroom learning situation to be analyzed in a manageable way, allowing interactions among these three broad groups of complexity, difficulty, and condition factors to be charted (Robinson, 2003).

Due to this, the researcher chooses TBLT as the teaching approach and will manipulate the task complexity to be done by the students. The ideal task is believed to promote learning when the aspects of resource directing are made complex and the aspects of resource dispersing are made simple. The resource directing in the complex factors (many elements, past tenses/ there and then, and reasoning demand) plus resource dispersing particularly made simple (planning time, single task, and prior knowledge). This task complexity as the cognitive factors is needed to be manipulated since the learners' factors cannot be used to predict the task difficulty in advance. The researcher also looks at the interactive factors that make up each task's complexity. The familiarity of both will ease the students that it can be manipulated to increase or lessen the learners' cognitive engagement when learners are performing a task (Robinson, 2001), the condition of the task also can involve interactive factors (Robinson, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007).

Previous researches mostly focus on one dimension of cognitive factors, either resource directing or resource depleting. There are no study compares every single aspect of the dimensions. Furthermore, the researcher will focus on the different types of task complexity made by complex resource-directing (many elements, past tenses/ there and then, and reasoning demand) and simple resource-depleting (planning time, single task, and prior knowledge). The researcher will compare each of the three types of tasks that the previous research has not done before. The researcher will also find out the influence of different levels of proficiency in generating a

statistically significant difference in spoken language production for each type of task in terms of CAF.

1.2. Formulation of The Problem

1. Is there a statistically significant effect of the three types of tasks on the students' spoken language production in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF)?
2. Do different levels of proficiency generate a statistically significant difference of spoken language production for each type of the task in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF)?

1.3. Objectives of The Research

1. To find out the effect of the three types of tasks on the students' spoken language production in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF).
2. To find out the influence of different levels of proficiency in generating a statistically significant difference of spoken language production for each type of the task in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF).

1.4. Uses

The use of this research, especially in learning English, is intended to make scientific contributions to education. The outcome of this analysis might be useful for:

1. Scientifically, the researcher expects the outcome of this analysis to validate and explain the hypothesis of Task-Based Language Teaching in the learning process, especially in the speaking aspect.

2. Practically, the writer expects the outcome of this analysis to be used as a guideline and concern for English teachers about creating the best task made by the teacher that might help the teachers to ease the teaching and learning activity.

1.5. Scope of The Research

This research is a quasi-experimental study that focuses on improving students' speaking ability using Task-Based and analyzing its impact on students' speaking skills. The sample of this research will be the second-grade students of Senior High School. This research uses TBLT in the teaching-learning activity in the classroom. The activities will be the implementation of three designs of task of TBLT and will be implemented in the form of speaking.

1.6. Definition of Terms

Task Complexity according to Wood (1986) is an important determinant of human performance through the demands it places on the knowledge, skills, and resources of individual task performers that often used as an explanatory variable in discussions of task performance without definition. According to Robinson (2001, 2003), task complexity is represented as a series of options that can be manipulated along resource-directing and resource-dispersing dimensions.

CAF (Complexity, Accuracy, Fluency) are used as performance descriptors for an oral and written assessment of language and have also been used for measuring progress in language learning for the past few decades as an alternative to using standardized proficiency tests (Housen and Kuiken, 2009).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter explains about Task Based Language Teaching, The Cognition Hypothesis, Measures of language production generated form task, theoretical assumptions, and hypothesis.

2.1.Task Based Language Teaching

Richards and Rodgers (2004) believe that Task-Based Learning is a teaching approach that emphasizes tasks as the primary unit. The language used to facilitate communication and learning. Instead of referring to its linguistic forms, goals and purposes will be described in terms of its functions. As stated by Long (1985), learning is task-based, not text-based. Experiential learning is guided by a sequence of pedagogic tasks of gradually increasing complexity, culminating in one or more target tasks for those learners, as identified by the needs analysis. Task selection is designed to transfer knowledge and abilities to serve learners' real-world academic, vocational training, occupational, or social survival needs.

A TBLT framework is designed to help language learners achieve success through a variety of tasks that focus on a common goal. The learners are not focused on language features when carrying out the task, but on achieving their goals. As learners, students are engaged in each task since our experiences and preexisting knowledge support learning. A language is a tool that is used in everyday life, and it can be considered an indicator of a person's interests. One of the goals of TBLT is to provide communication and interaction experiences for learners, which is more purposeful and natural in classroom settings than self-planning.

The following principles can be used as a guide to attain goals in task-based methodology because the main goal is to generate possibilities for language acquisition and skill development through collaborative knowledge.

Table 1.1. Principles of task-based teaching from Willis and Skehan in Ellis (2003)

Willis (1996)		Skehan (1998)	
1	There should be exposure to worth wile and authentic language.	1	Choose a range of target structures, i.e. ensure systematically in language development without adhering rigidly to a structural syllabus.
2	There should be use of language.	2	Choose tasks which meet the utility criterion, i.e. make it 'useful' for students to perform the target structures.
3	Tasks should motivate learners to engage in language use.	3	Sequence tasks to achieve balanced goal development, i.e. prioritize fluency, accuracy, and complexity at different times.
4	There should be a focus on language at some points in a task cycle.	4	Maximize the chances of a focus on form through attentional manipulation.
5	The focus on language should be more or less prominent at different times.	5	Use cycles of accountability, i.e. mobilize students, metacognitive resource to keep track of what has been learned.

The principles listed above are meant to serve as a guideline for teaching task-based lessons rather than a set of rules. Teachers must make their own

methodological judgments based on what they believe would work best with their students.

2.1.1. Definition of Task

A task is an important tool used by learners to gain knowledge. The task of learning isn't just an accidental event, it is something that happens over and over again. The task is an important part of a sequence of learning activities that can help students understand the material. It can be implied that learning includes selecting, modifying, designing, composing, arranging, observing, and evaluating tasks. This function is usually described in textbooks, student worksheets, modules, or other non-teaching-related materials. Sometimes there is a conflict between the tasks the resource and referrals from teachers who are not aligned. The use of a task from another source does not invalidate the task. It's just that when students come up with questions about assignments from other sources, the teacher must be prepared to respond to any pertinent information.

There are some perspectives on the task. Nunan (1989: 10) views the task as “a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form. The task should also have a sense of completeness, being able to stand alone as a communicative act in its own right”. In Long (1985), Candlin describes a task as one of several diverse, orderable problem-posing activities. It involves both teachers and students in some joint selection from a variety of varied cognitive and communicative procedures applied to both new and existing knowledge in the collective

exploration and pursuit of foreseen or emergent goals within a social milieu. Meanwhile, Ellis (2003) proposes a task as a work plan that requires learners to process language pragmatically to achieve an outcome that can be evaluated in terms of content rather than language. In short, the task can be regarded as an activity that is designed by the teacher to be completed by a learner in a language classroom.

The focus of the task is not on the language being used or the form of the language but on how and in what context the language is used or the meaning of the language. The task aims to help learners achieve their communicative purposes or to help learners convey their message in a certain communicative setting. To sum up, tasks are goal-oriented activities designed to allow students to participate in meaningful activities.

2.1.2. The Differences Between Task and Exercise

Task and exercise differ in some ways. For example, a task typically focuses on the meaning of the work, while exercise is more about physical activity. Task share similarities with genres in that they are designed to help people communicate effectively. Furthermore, they can have some practical benefits, such as helping the learners learn new material or improving their language skills. Here is the difference of task and exercise according to Skehan in Ellis (2000):

	Task	**Exercise**
Orientation	Linguistic skills are developed through engaging in communicative activity	Linguistic skills viewed as pre-requisite for learning communicative abilities

Focus	Propositional content and pragmatic communicative meaning (focus on meaning)	Linguistic form and semantic meaning (focus on form)
Goal	Achievement of a communicative goal	Manifestation of code knowledge
Outcome-evaluation	Performance evaluated in terms of whether the communicative goal has been achieved	Performance evaluated in terms of conformity to the code
Real-world relationship	There is a direct and obvious relationship between the activity that arises from the task and natural communicative activity	Internalization of linguistic skills serves as an investment for future use

Nunan (1999) then clarified the fundamental difference between tasks and exercises and argued that the outcome of the task is essentially non-linguistic while the exercise is essentially linguistic. He argued that the task design takes into account the authenticity principle, the form-function principle, and the task dependency principle. Authentic materials are pieces of language that were not intended to be used in educational settings. To him, the form-function principle is all about helping L2 learners become more aware of language use, so they can achieve desired results easier. The task dependency principle deals with deciding which tasks need to be done, in what order, and how they should be integrated.

To be more details, here is the example for task and exercise:

An example of language exercise:

Fill in the blanks with the simple past form of these verbs: write, go, have, study, buy.

1. *Yesterday, Nancy_____to school and _____English.*
2. *Last week, Leila_____ an interesting book about the history of the United States.*
3. *We_____a delicious breakfast this morning.*
4. *She _____ an email to her pen pal last night.*

An example of a task:

Planning a party. Learners will be asked to do the following:

- *agree on what they need for the preparation,*
- *choose the place where the party will be held,*
- *prepare for the party,*
- *write invitation letters…*

2.1.3. Types of Task

A task is a unit of work that is necessary to achieve a goal. For instance, executing a series of particular tasks to reach a goal may be one of the tasks for a project. Task not only describes the content of the work, but also carries information about the author of the task, due date, priority, and stage of completion. Depending on the scope of the project or the overall processes, it may be necessary to define additional parameters: start date, dependencies on other tasks, milestones, etc. Bear in mind, however, that the more detailed the structure of a task is, the more complex the process of adding new tasks becomes.

Here are some types of task;

- Target versus pedagogic task.

  According to Long (1985), target task is tasks that people do in their everyday life, yet the pedagogic task is a simpler version of target tasks that language learners can work on. The goal of pedagogical tasks is to prepare learners for future target task performance in real-life settings where pedagogical tasks often constitute a sub-task of the target task. A second more complex pedagogic task might focus on sections about educational qualifications or previous work experience. Target tasks and pedagogical tasks may occasionally be difficult to distinguish. We can ask our students to carry out real-life target tasks with a pedagogical purpose in mind. For example, in second language settings, students can carry out tasks in the everyday context, like asking for directions in the street or ordering a coffee in a cafe. In foreign language settings, students could write an e-mail to another student who is also a user of the language. For instance, as a part of an international school collaboration project, we can also distinguish tasks based on whether one or more students are responsible for the flow of information.

- One-way versus two-way task.

  In one-way tasks, one participant has all the information to be conveyed. As a result, this participant is responsible for successful task completion. He or she does most of the talking or writing, although the other can indicate whether they can follow or comprehend the speaker or writer. For two-way tasks, participants need to take part in the task so it can be completed successfully.

- Open versus closed task.

  In open tasks, there is no predetermined outcome that participants need to achieve. In close tasks, on the other hand, participants need to reach a given solution. There is a predetermined correct answer. The spot that different task is a closed task because there is a given set of differences that participants need to identify. A story sequencing task in which participants need to put events in the correct order also constitutes a close task if there is only one logical solution. On the other hand, if participants are free to come up with any story using a different and unrelated set of pictures, the task could be categorized as open because there would be no predetermined correct solution.

- Convergent versus divergent task

  In convergent tasks, participants are required to reach an agreement regarding the task outcome. In divergent tasks, on the other hand, participants do not need to agree on the task solution.

- Focused versus unfocused task

  The terms focused and unfocused tasks were coined by Rod Ellis in Long (1985), where focused tasks, then, have two aims; one is to stimulate communicative language use as with unfocused tasks, and the other is to target the use of a particular, predetermined target feature in meaning-centered communication. . . a task-based syllabus. . . can be entirely unfocused (as in Prabhu's [1987] Communicational Teaching Project) or it can be focused (i.e. informed by a list of structural items).

- Input-based versus output-based task

  An input-based task defined by Ellis in Duong (2020) is conceptualized as a type of focused task in which learners' process input via listening or reading; L2 production from learners is not required but not prohibited. According to the Swain Output Hypothesis in Duong (2020), output not only offers opportunities for language use but may also support SLA in a number of ways, including by encouraging noticing, giving students chances to test their hypotheses about how the target language functions, and allowing them to reflect on their language use.

  In short, the task-based approach is a powerful and advancing learning method that can promote learning language knowledge and training skills in the process of performing tasks that will take the pressure off of learning a language but keeps the students engaged with the language.

2.1.4. The Methodology of Task-Based Teaching

Task has functioned as a research tool for studying L2 acquisition as well as a construct that has been studied in its own right, and it has gained a central role in SLA. Tasks are important in both SLA research and language pedagogy. Under the headings of lesson design and participatory structure, two strategies will be examined for choosing and arranging a collection of tasks as well as creating appropriate work schedules for the tasks.

Here is the lesson design.

The stages of components of a task-based lesson that has a task as its primary component are taken into account while designing a task-based lesson. The following phases depict the sequence of a task-based lesson: pre-task, during-task, and post-task. These all have three main phases in common, which are beneficial to both teachers and students. A framework like the one shown below provides a class with a distinct structure while still permitting freedom and variety in the options accessible in each phase.

Table 1.2. Task-Based Design

Pre-task (Consciousness – raising activities)	Framing the activity (e.g. establishing the outcome of the task) Regulating planning time Doing similar task
During Task	Time pressure Regulating topic
Post-task (Focused-communication activities)	Number of participants Learner report Repeat task Reflection

Source: A framework for designing task-based lessons (Ellis, 2003)

1. The Pre-Task Phase

   The goal of this phase is to get kids ready to do tasks that will help them learn. Students must be convinced of the benefits of more "experimental" than traditional "studio" classrooms, as Dornyei

(2001) highlights the necessity of offering a task to encourage learners. Dornyei adds that strategies for whetting students' interests should be included in task preparation, such as helping students complete a task that is comparable to the one they will perform, asking students to watch someone else perform the task, involving students in extracurricular activities to get them ready for the task, and planning the main task's execution.

These will be detailed as follows:

Because this is a whole-class exercise, the students must complete a similar task of the same type with a similar substance to the main task. This activity is meant to scaffold students' execution of the primary work, with the expectation that 'other-regulation' will help students with the 'self-regulation' they need to complete the main job.

Second, for students to watch a model, teachers can provide them with a text, both oral and written, that demonstrates an 'ideal' performance of the work. By doing so, students can lessen their cognitive load by 'observing' others. Students may be required to participate in such exercises to detect and analyze textual aspects. This pre-training can assist pupils in becoming more "adaptable, creative, ingenious, and above all, independent." These tactics may not be effective unless the students work together to complete the task.

Third, when students are familiar with non-task preparatory activities such as brainstorming or mind mapping, they will have

stronger subject schemata and output, as well as fluency and complexity. The recommended activities will emphasize vocabulary rather than grammar. Teaching vocabulary, on the other hand, should be noted because it causes pupils to rehearse pre-selected terms, which can jeopardize the task's integrity. To overcome this, extra activities should be added to keep pupils from focusing on other essential goals while doing the assignment.

Finally, learners can plan how they will complete the assignment through strategic planning. Students may be given the option of carrying out the assignment they have been assigned on their own. Another issue is how much time students will be given to complete pre-task planning, which can be done independently, in groups, or with the teacher.

2. The During-Task Phase

There are two options in during-task phase, called task performance options and process options that will be described as follows.

The first choice is to set a deadline for students to finish the assignment; the second is to decide whether or not to provide students access to input data while they accomplish activities; and the third option is to add an unexpected element to the activity. These solutions are not without pedagogical value because they challenge pupils to cope with the surprise serves. It will, however, help to pique students' interest in completing the work.

Second, there are process options that are not the same as task performance parameters. Instead of pedagogical decisions on how the task will be carried out, process options for the task's discourse should be considered. Process options must be chosen while the task is being executed, unlike performance options, which can be chosen ahead of time.

To summarize, process alternatives are not prescriptive. However, it is possible to identify some goals that task performers should aim to achieve. It is often tough to navigate the process of obtaining something, but it depends on how individuals orient themselves for the work and their skills in executing the tasks involved.

3. The Post-Task Phase

The post-task phase has three major of pedagogic goals:

First, it can be done under the same conditions as the first performance to allow for a repeat performance of the task. Because the students looked at 'threat' while performing the job, it is officially defined as a during-task choice. It will, however, become a post-task option if they are not told to do so after finishing the initial performance.

Second, encouraging students to think about how they can improve their performance can help them develop metacognitive strategies like planning, monitoring, and evaluating, which are important for language learning (O'Malley and Chamot 1990).

Thirdly, to encourage attention to form, teachers can encourage students to concentrate on forms that will undermine the work's "tasks" once the task is completed. The post-task stage is necessary to prevent kids from developing fluency at the expense of accuracy. There are two problems at this point. The first concerns the forms that should be handled, and whether teachers should select forms that students used incorrectly when completing the assignment or forms that they never used at all. The second issue is how the target forms should be treated, specifically for a review of the students' errors, an awareness-raising activity, production-practice tasks, and observational activities.

The accompanying descriptions of each alternative for implementing each stage serve as a reference for the actual task and the teachers' performance monitoring. Teachers must, however, be guided by clear rules while utilizing the framework to develop a lesson to reduce errors.

The technique that determines how the teachers' and students' contributions to the completion of the task are organized is referred to as the participative structure of a lesson. The sort of participation structure chosen will impact how much and what kind of interaction takes place in the classroom, as illustrated in the table below.

Table 1.3. Types of Classroom Participatory Structure

Participatory structure	**Prototypical form of interaction**
A Individual	Intrapersonal, e.g. by means of private speech

B	Social	Interpersonal
	1 Teacher-class	Teacher – students
	2 Student-class	Student – teacher and other students
	3 Small group or pair work	Student – student (teacher)

Here is the explanation for the table above:

- Individual Student Work With Tasks

  Individual students have the advantages of being able to choose whether to take an independent or social approach to the assignment, depending on their personalities and learning styles. Students can also be encouraged to utilize their own private discourse to mediate their way through a task, which can help them develop independence and autonomy. Aside from the benefits already mentioned, there are also drawbacks. Students are completely reliant on their own resources when working individually. Another issue is that students may lack the strategic skills needed to succeed on their own.

- Working on Tasks in Pair and Groups

  The finding of Phitaloka's (2015) research indicates that the students perceive some benefits from group work in the term of engaging the students to speak a lot, helping the students to speak fluently in front of the public, providing enjoyment and fun activities for students' learning process, providing easier learning through helping each other and working together and allowing the students to share opinions and difficulties. However, the students also opine that group work consumes too much time, makes noise, and gives less opportunity for them to ask the teacher.

There are several issues associated with group/pair work, including the fact that it can have a detrimental impact on task performance and that group conversations can be highly noisy and disruptive. During conversations, students may contribute unequally, with some students attempting to dominate while others are freeloading. Teachers, on the other hand, can reconcile the potential benefits of group work by determining the extent to which group activity results in cooperative learning through collaborative conversation. Here are some practical things teachers may do to encourage students to work together in groups or pairs: (1) students should be serious and devoted to the assignment; (2) each student should be held accountable for their contribution to the task's accomplishment, (3) mixed groups are preferable to homogeneous groups; (4) equal information distribution; (5) good physical arrangement of students; (6) collaborative skills on how to dispute and negotiate meaning; (7) group permanence and cohesion; and (8) teachers' role in modeling, observing, and monitoring.

Working in groups has a lots of benefits for reaching effective objectives as well as language acquisition. However, group work alone isn't always enough to ensure these benefits. It is challenging for teachers to have meaningful talks about hard issues, but it is doable.

- Working on Tasks in a Whole-Class Context

Teachers' participation is critical in a whole-class setting. Depending on the assignment, the teacher's input takes three forms.

First is the teacher talk. Teacher talk is a speech that is tailored to the students' L2 proficiency to guarantee that the information is understood. It entails linguistic changes at all levels and is mostly carried out as a talent at the unconscious level.

The second is instructional conversation. The instructional conversation is defined as a dialogic activity in which the teacher leads the pupils in performing a function that they are unable to accomplish on their own. Its purpose is to achieve a task's goal, as well as to utilize effective language and learn new languages. Through whole-class interactions, this is then used to guarantee that the goals of a task-based curriculum are met.

Third is peer teaching. In peer teaching, a student is chosen to function as a teacher and oversee the class's completion of the job. Peer teaching has the following advantages: (1) it has all of the discussion chances that the regular teacher has, (2) other students in the class are more likely to behave 'conversationally,' and (3) the amount of student talk generated by the work is likely to rise. However, there have been reports to the contrary; one of these reported several issues, including some students' lack of participation, and concluded that peer teaching may be more effective with advanced-level students.

The participative structure of several phases of a task-based lesson must be carefully considered while planning it. Teachers must ensure that the design and participatory structure of task-based instruction is based on sound principles, and the main goal of the task-based

approach is to promote language learning and skill development through collaborative knowledge creation. Teachers must establish the unique teaching strategies that are most effective for their students.

2.2.The Cognition Hypothesis

The Cognition Hypothesis predicts that complex tasks will lead to more interaction and negotiation for meaning. The cognitive hypothesis, which is supported by Long (1996), asserts that this negotiation creates a context for focusing on problematic forms in both the input and the output. For complex versions of the task, there will be more attention to and adoption of prominent forms in the process, resulting in a responsive focus on form techniques like recasting. Where proactive focus on form is provided, such as through pre-modified input to the task, then this may lead to more use of this on more complex tasks, rather than simpler tasks.

It should be mentioned that Triadic Componential Framework or The cognition Hypothesis, is not free of critique. The criteria proposed by Robinson (2001, 2003, 2005, 2007) can be divided into two categories: resource-directing and resource-dispersing dimensions. Dimensions of linguistic resource used are those in which the demands on language use made by increases in Task Complexity and increased conceptual demands that can be met by specific aspects of the linguistic system, for example, the temporality of reference (present versus past), and to use distinct deictic expressions (this, that, here, there) to indicate immediately present, versus absent object (See Rahimpour, 1997). In a more recent study, (Robinson, 2007) adds +/- perspective taking and makes a distinction between reasoning: +/- spatial reasoning, +/- causal reasoning, and +/- intentional reasoning.

Table 1.4. The Triadic Componential Framework for Task Classification-Categories, Criteria, Analytic Procedures, and Design Characteristics (From Robinson 2007)

Task complexity (cognitive factors)	Task condition (interactive factors)	Task Difficulty (learner factors)
(classification criteria: Cognitive demands) (classification procedure: Information-theoretic analyses)	(classification criteria: Interactional demands) (classification procedure: behavior-descriptive analyses)	(classification criteria: ability requirements) (classification procedure: ability assessment analyses)
(a)Resource-directing variables making cognitive/conceptual demands	(a) Participation variables making interactional demands	(a) Ability variables and task relevant resource differentials
+/- here and now +/ few elements +/- spatial reasoning +/-causal reasoning -/+ intentional reasoning -/+ perspective-taking	+/- open solution +/- one-way flow +/-convergent solution +/- few participations +/- few contributions needed +/- negotiation not needed	h/l working memory h/l reasoning h/l task-switching h/l aptitude h/l field independence h/l mind/intention-reading
(b) Resource-dispersing Variables making performative/procedural demands	(b) Participant variables making interactant demands	(b) Affective variables and statetrait differentials
+/ planning time +/- single task +/- few steps +/- independency of steps +/- prior knowledge	+/- same proficiency +/- same gender +/- familiar +/- shared content knowledge +/- equal status and order	h/l openness to experience h/l control of emotion h/l task motivation h/l processing anxiety h/l willingness to

	+/- shared cultural knowledge	communicate h/l self-efficacy

The Triadic Componential Framework (TCF) is a tool for classifying taxonomies. The TCF outlines various factors that contribute to the demands made on interaction by pedagogical tasks, categorized under the heading Task Condition (such as whether information exchange is one-way, or reciprocal and two-way). In addition, the TCF describes characteristics that affect the intrinsic cognitive demands of tasks placed on learners, such as whether a task requires reasoning about the mental states of others that cause them to perform actions (–intentional reasoning) versus whether it does (+ intentional reasoning). The Cognition Hypothesis proposes that increasing the cognitive demands of educational tasks using these latter characteristics should be the sole operational basis of task-based syllabus design.

Due to Robinson's Triadic Componential Framework, the researcher will create tasks for the students to complete by creating tasks and will focus on designing the complex (the resource directing) and simple (the resource dispersing). This ideal task to promote learning is when the aspects of resource directing are made complex and the aspects of resource dispersing are made simple. Because it is impossible to predict task difficulty in advance using learner characteristics, task complexity as a cognitive factor is required. The researcher also considers the interplay between the various components that influence task complexity. The familiarity of task can be modified while learners are performing a task to promote or decrease learners' cognitive engagement (Robinson, 2001). The task's condition can be manipulated to increase or decrease learners' cognitive engagement.

2.3.Measures of Language Production Generated from Tasks

Over the past three decades, interest in language production has led to several psycholinguistic models that attempt to explain how language moves from the mind to the mouth. The message captures the features of the speaker's intended meaning, and this raw material is used to encode the phonological structure of the utterance into the output systems. To specify the steps involved in generating a simple utterance, we can follow the steps involved in generating an error. Skehan (1998) recommends that tasks should be sequenced by selecting tasks with characteristics that lead to fluency, accuracy, and complexity, at an appropriate level of task difficulty, as determined by three factors: (1) the complexity of the code, described in 'fairly traditional methods', as in descriptions of structural approaches, or developmental sequences (p.99); (2) Cognitive complexity, which results from familiarity with the task, topic or type, and processing requirements; the type, clarity, organization and amount of information required; and (3) communicative stress, which includes six characteristics including time pressure, number of participants, and opportunities to control interaction. The language production of the students can be measured using CAF, which has been used to study Second Language Acquisition and Applied Linguistics for many years. The increasing focus on complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language acquisition research is having a significant effect. Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF) are commonly used as performance descriptors for oral and written assessments of language skills and have also been used for measuring progress in language learning for the past few decades as an alternative to using standardized proficiency tests (Housen and Kuiken, 2009).

2.3.1. CAF Measures

Skehan (2009) proposed a model that included CAF as three major dimensions of proficiency. The three principles of CAF stand for complexity, accuracy, and fluency of a language. Many studies have focused at the effects of different factors (corrective feedback, task complexity, and planning time) on CAF.

Complexity, accuracy, and fluency have proved useful measures of second language performance, and there is a lot of disagreement about whether or not complexity is the most controversial of the three proficiency measures. A language that is more challenging and difficult is a sign of complexity. Skehan (2009) defines complexity as a more advanced language. According to Alvira (2014), complexity generates 'comprehension and analysis difficulty, leading to a difficulty of assigning them a truth value'.

Lexical complexity was automatically assessed by Coh-Metrix (McNamara, Graesser, McCarthy & Cai, 2014) lexical extent (LMTD, vocd), and lexical frequency (CELEX log word frequency). Type-token ratio (TTR, Templin, 1957) was not used to measure lexical diversity as each speech sample had a wide range of length and TTR is sensitive to the length (McCarthy & Jarvis, 2010). Instead, MLTD and vocd, which are modified TTR to adjust for text length, were used to represent lexical diversity. For grammatical complexity, several sub-ordination per c-unit was used.

Accuracy is regarded as the simplest construct of CAF, and it refers to the degree of conformity to certain language usage norms, primarily in

the areas of lexicon and grammar, where Housen and Kuiken defined accuracy as ‘the extent to which an L2 performance deviates from a norm’ (2009, p.4).

Accuracy features. In terms of lexico-grammatical accuracy, manual checks were done to find mistakes in the syntactic domains., morphology, and word order for grammatical accuracy. Lexical errors (i.e., insufficient or improperly used lexical terms) are identified for lexical appropriateness. The frequency of all errors was changed into several error-free clauses per c-unit for analysis. In terms of analyzing accuracy in lexico-grammar, speech samples in A1 were excluded, because most A1 speech samples comprised a list of words, not clauses. It is for the same reason the A1 level was excluded from the analysis of syntactic complexity.

Fluency refers to a person’s general language proficiency. According to Simensen (2010), perceptions of fluency include features such as speed and effortlessness, smooth and native-like use of language, and a language spoken without many pauses. In addition, there is an understanding of fluency which also gives credit to the use of inaccurate language as well as one that does not represent comprehensive language proficiency.

Fluency features. Fluency features. The macro-level fluency features of each speech sample were automatically extracted using a Praat script developed by de Jong and Wempe (2009). The holistic temporal features include: (1) the number of syllables, (2) speech rate, (3) articulation rate, (4) the number of silent pauses, (5) the mean length of

run, and (6) the number of fillers. Micro-level fluency/ dis fluency features were manually coded on: (1) pause type (i.e., silent and filled pause); (2) pause position (i.e., juncture and non-juncture pauses); (3) possible causes of pause (i.e., lexico-grammatical search and modification, and formulation of content); and (4) pause recovery (i.e., syllable lengthening, repeat, modification, and false start/restart). These features were further normalized and/or transformed into two variables for statistical analysis: (1) the proportion of juncture pauses and (2) success in repairing non-juncture pauses.

The specifications of the CAF chosen are listed below:

Table 1.5. CAF Measures

CAF Measures		
Complexity	**Accuracy**	**Fluency**
Syntactic: AS-Units	% of Error-Free Clauses	Speech Rate B

2.4.Theoretical Assumptions

Assumptions are our assertions about the world that underlie our program plan and the anticipated change process (Guijt, 2013). Thus, the basic assumptions in this study are:

As speaking is needed in daily activities, students are expected to be able to at least can communicate their wants to the people they communicate with. Speaking happens at that time and cannot be edited or revised. However, due to the information on TBLT itself, the researcher believes that it could help students improve their speaking ability.

2.5.Hypothesis

A hypothesis is a statement of the researcher's expectation or prediction about the relationship among study variables (Dayanand, 2018). Based on the theoretical assumptions above, the hypothesis of this study is formulated as follows:

H0: There is no significant effect of the three types of tasks on the students' spoken language production in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF).

H1: There is a significant effect of the three types of tasks on the students' spoken language production in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF)..

In short, based on the explanation of the supporting theories, assumptions, and some previous related studies, the hypothesis is set. The researcher uses the approach and tools discussed in chapter three to test the hypothesis.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter discuss about the research design, setting of the research, source of data, population and sample, research procedure, data collecting technique, data analysis, validity and reliability, normality and homogeneity, and hypothesis testing.

3.1. Research Design

The researcher intends (1) to find out the effect of the three types of tasks on the students' spoken language production in terms of CAF, (2) to find out the influence of different levels of proficiency in generating a statistically significant difference of spoken language production for each type of the task in terms of CAF.

To find out the objectives above, the researcher used tasks as the speaking test, and the results are analyzed after the implementation of the three types of tasks. The research design was a quasi-experimental design with three times meetings of performing tasks. The research design was as follows.

X1 X2 X3

X1= Implementation of Task 1

X2= Implementation of Task 2

X3= Implementation of Task 3

(Hatch and Fahrady in Setiyadi 2006)

All students who received the assignments came in three tasks types of complexity are asked to present them in monologic. The three tasks were as follows.

Task 1: + many elements, + single task, + prior knowledge, + planning time

Task 2: + reasoning demands, + single task, + prior knowledge, + planning time

Task 3: + [there and then], + single task, + prior knowledge, + planning time

3.2.Source of Data

The research aims to get data. The data is an important tool in the research which is in the form of phenomena in the field and numbers. From the data, the researcher knows the result of the research. Collecting the data must be relevant to the problem of research.

The sources of data in this research were:

1. Primary Source

   Primary data sources are information that researchers collect directly from the source. In this case, the researcher acts as a data collector. The primary data of this research are the result of the speaking test of the students.

2. Secondary Sources

   Secondary data sources are information that other parties have collected. So, in this case, the researcher does not directly obtain data from the primary source. Secondary data sources are additional data or complementary data that are complementary to existing data, from this research obtained from documentation, the internet, and other supporting data sources as additional data, such as the English score of the students.

The researcher's second research question is dealing with the student's levels of proficiency. The researcher divided the students into high and low proficiency levels. The student is considered a high-level student when the score ranges from 80-100 and considered a low-level student when the score ranges from 50-70. It is found that there are five students considered high-level students and four students considered low-level students.

3.3.Setting of the Research

The setting included the time and the place of the research. This research was conducted in the academic year of 2022/2023, on August 10th – 12th 2022. It was held at SMA IT Daarul 'Ilmi Bandar Lampung, in class of eleven.

3.4.Population and Sample

A population is a complete set of people with a specialized set of characteristics. A sample is a subset of the population, and the sample taken by purposive sampling. The population of this research was high school students, and the sample was second-grader students. It was 15 eleventh-grade students of SMA IT Daarul 'Ilmi Bandarlampung chosen as the sample of this research.

3.5.Research Procedures

To gain the data, the researcher uses several steps:

1. Administrating treatments

   The participants perform three tasks as follows:

   Task 1 many elements + planning time

   Task 2 reasoning demands + planning time

   Task 3 past activities + planning time

Before giving the task to the sample, the researcher tested it out on a different group of students. It was done to determine whether the three types of tasks were valid and reliable. After conducting the trial, the researcher administered the treatments. The treatments consist of three meetings, each involving a task that has to be completed within 100 minutes of the meeting.

2. Analyzing data gained

The motive behind data analysis in research is to present accurate and reliable data. As far as possible, avoid statistical errors, and find a way to deal with everyday challenges like outliers, missing data, data altering, data mining, or developing graphical representation. The data gained is analyzed to answer the research questions.

3.6.Data Collecting Technique

Students' utterances served as the source of the data gathered. They underwent transcription, coding, analysis, and computation. The researcher took several actions to respond to the research questions. Here are some of them:

3.6.1. Determining the Instruments

Speaking tests were the research's primary tool. For the speaking assessments, the students were given a variety of task complexity levels. Data were gathered by the researcher using a recorder.

3.6.2. Video Recording

Video recording is administered to record the students' ability in terms of speaking. The recording contains moving pictures and sounds of students' performance in speaking during the treatment. Since every student of 15 students performed the task, there were 45 records of the performance of the three types of tasks.

3.6.3. Transcribing Students' Utterances

The students' utterances require transcription. In other words, it is necessary to transfer spoken language production into writing. After doing so, symbols were used to code the textual utterances. The text was coded according to complexity (clauses, AS-unit), accuracy (number of errors, AS-unit), and fluency (number of syllables and duration).

3.7. Data Analysis

The researcher analyzes the data after it has been collected. Data analysis in qualitative research is a process of categorization, description, and systemization. For the description and the interpretation of the phenomenon under investigation, data reduction is required." To conclude, data analysis is the systematic process of analyzing data that has been gathered. However, if the conclusion in the previous data can be evidenced by validity and reliability, the conclusion is credible. In this research, the researcher makes conclusion from the data display.

In short, the steps in analyzing the data are: (1) the researcher collects the data on students' spoken language production through the implementation of the three types of tasks. Then, the researcher selects, identifies, and focuses on the data by referring to the formulation of the research problem. (2) After selecting the data, the researcher displays those data in good sentences. (3) After displaying and coding the data, the conclusion is drawn.

After the necessary data had been gathered, they were coded and tallied in terms of their complexity, accuracy, and fluency. The justification is as follows:

1. Complexity

   Coding and calculating the syntactic complexity can be seen as follows:

   ‖ I will describe the 4 shopping centers. (C) ‖ First, there is Simpur Center. (C) ‖ In Simpur Center, the toilet is less clean (C), but the clothes and shoes are good (C), and low budget. ‖ Then, the hospitality of the staff is humble and kind (C), to access from my home is far (C). ‖

   Based on the example given, AS-units are separated by the vertical lines (‖) and a clause is symbolized by "C" letter. The example from the students' transcription contains five AS-units and six clauses, so the syntactic complexity can be calculated as follows:

$$\frac{total\ number\ of\ clauses}{total\ AS{-}units} = \frac{6}{5} = 1.20$$

   The researcher analyzes every sentence in the transcription above, and the complexity value is 1.20.

2. Accuracy

   The example of calculating accuracy is as follows:

   ‖ Transmart,‖ The toilet is good, rubbish bins *is* good and not too much trash in there. ‖ The trolley is nice and clean. ‖ The quality of the good is very original. ‖ The staff in there are very friendly and kind and the place is maintained. ‖ Access from my house to the mall is not too far, I usually go to the mall using my motorbike. ‖

   By calculating the ratio of the number of error-free AS units to the total number of AS units, accuracy is calculated (Mahpul, 2014: 69). The researcher found five AS units in the transcription above, and there are three AS units that are error-free. Thus, the calculation of accuracy is as follows:

$$\frac{number\ of\ Error-free\ AS\ units}{number\ of\ AS-units} \times 100 = \frac{3}{5} \times 100 = 60.00$$

The researcher analyzes every sentence in the transcription above, and the accuracy value is 60.00.

3. Fluency

   The calculation for fluency in this research is as follows.

   I (1) want (1) to (1) describe (2) this (1) four (1) pictures (2) in (1) my (1) school (1). The (1) first (1) one (1) is (1) the (1) mosque (1). I (1) like (1) this (1) place (1), it (1) is (1) comfortable (4), it (1) makes (1) me (1) calm (1), but (1) when (1) it (1) starts (1) raining (2) it (1) is (1) all (1) wet (1) and (1) that (1) is (1) bad (1).

   The transcription consists of 46 syllables and is done in 28 seconds, so the formula of fluency is:

$$\frac{number\ of\ syllables}{total\ number\ of\ seconds} \times 60 = \frac{46}{28} \times 60 = 98.57$$

   The researcher analyzes every sentence in the transcription above, and the fluency value is 98.57.

After evaluating the complexity, accuracy, and fluency of the students' spoken production, an analysis was conducted using SPSS to look into the statistical significance of mean differences. In analyzing the data gained, the writer analyzed the data into research questions to answer them.

The research questions are:

1. Is there a statistically significant effect of the three types of tasks on the students' spoken language production in terms of CAF?
2. Do different levels of proficiency generate a statistically significant difference of spoken language production for each type of the task in terms of CAF?

To answer the first research question, ANOVA was used. The ANOVA test allows a comparison of more than two groups at the same time to determine whether a relationship exists between them. The result of the ANOVA formula, the F statistic (also called the F-ratio), allows for the analysis of multiple groups of data to determine the variability between samples and within samples. There are two main types of ANOVA: one-way (or unidirectional) and two-way. The researcher used one-way ANOVA that a one-way ANOVA evaluates the impact of a sole factor on a sole response variable. It determines whether all the samples are the same. The one-way ANOVA is used to determine whether there are any statistically significant differences between the means of three or more independent (unrelated) groups.

3.8. Validity and Reliability

The researcher used validity and reliability to consistently and accurately measure how to use a teaching methodology. The validity and reliability used in this research are drawn as follows:

3.8.1. Validity

a. Content validity

Content validity assesses whether a test is representative of all aspects of the construct. To produce valid results, the content of a measurement method must cover all relevant parts of the subject it aims to measure. If some aspects are missing from the measurement (or if irrelevant aspects are included), the validity is threatened. As the population is eleventh grader students of senior high school students, the researcher arranges the materials based on the objective of teaching in the syllabus for the eleventh-grade of senior high school students.

b. Construct validity

Construct validity is to ensure the measurement matches the construct we want to measure. Construct validity evaluates whether a measurement tool represents the thing we are interested in measuring. It's central to establishing the overall validity of a teaching methodology. In this research, the researcher administered three types of tasks and gave scores for the students' speaking ability based on CAF measurements; Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (Skehan, 2009). To measure the validity of the writing test, the researcher uses an inter-rater. There were two raters, the raters were 2 English teachers in SMA IT Daarul 'Ilmi. The results are as follows;

Table 3.1. Validity of Task 1

Questions	1st Rater		2nd Rater	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Are the directions clear?	√		√	
Does task 1 correspond to many elements condition?	√		√	
Does task 2 correspond to reasoning demands condition?	√		√	
Does task 3 correspond to there and then condition?	√		√	
Are the pictures in Task 1 suitable to the task?	√		√	
Are the pictures in Task 2 suitable to the task?	√		√	
Are the pictures in Task 3 suitable to the task?	√		√	

Before administering the validity test to the raters, the researcher told some information to the teachers related to the tasks to get the same perception of the tasks. It can be seen from the table above that the two raters answered "yes" for each question. It means that the task is valid.

3.8.2. Reliability

In statistics, reliability is the overall consistency of a measure. In this research, the researcher used the rank order correlation to measure how reliable the scoring of the speaking tests is. The Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient (Spearman's correlation, for short) is a nonparametric measure of the strength and direction of association that exists between two variables measured on at least an ordinal scale. It is denoted by the symbol *rs* (or the Greek letter ρ, pronounced rho). There were raters too in this research which has become an important area of inquiry in language assessment, so the interpretation of and justification for judgments based on human scores. The more people involved in the team, the more reliable the result will be (Setiyadi, 2018). For this reason, the raters in this research are the researcher and an English teacher at SMAIT Daarul Ilmy Bandar Lampung.

To measure how reliable the scoring is, this study used Rank-order Correlation with the formula:

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6\sum d^2}{n\left(n^2 - 1\right)}$$

Where:

r_s refers to reliability of the test

n refers to number of students

d refers to the difference of rank correlation (mean score from the three tasks)

1-6 refers to the constant number

After finding the coefficient between raters, the researcher then analyzed the coefficient of reliability with the standard of reliability as follows:

A very low reliability	(ranges from 0.00 – 0.19)
A low reliability	(ranges from 0.20 – 0.39)
An average reliability	(ranges from 0.40 – 0.59)
A high reliability	(ranges from 0.60 – 0.79)
A very high reliability	(ranges from 0.80 – 0.100)

Based on the standard of reliability above, it can be concluded that the tasks considered reliable if the tests reach the minimum range of 0.60-0.79 (high reliability) (Arikunto, 1998;260).

The result of the reliability of the three tasks is as follows.

The reliability for Task 1 is 0.96, Task 2 gets 0.84, and Task 3 gets 0.91. Based on the standard of reliability, the reliability score for Task 1, 2, and 3 ranges from 0.80 – 1.00. It can be concluded that the reliability score for Task 1, 2, and 3 are considered to be very high reliability.

3.9.Normality and Homogeneity of the Test

The normality distribution test is a test to measure whether our data has a normal distribution or not. The data gained in this research was statistically analyzed by using SPSS.

The result for normality test for CAF measurement of three types of tasks is as follows.

Table 3.2. Normality Test for CAF Measurement of Three Types of Tasks

Tests of Normality

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Complexity	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Score	Task 1	.182	15	.195	.904	15	.110
	Task 2	.118	15	.200*	.968	15	.822
	Task 3	.119	15	.200*	.954	15	.587
		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Accuracy	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Score	Task 1	.166	15	.200*	.955	15	.609
	Task 2	.177	15	.200*	.890	15	.068
	Task 3	.161	15	.200*	.885	15	.056
		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Fluency	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Score	Task 1	.168	15	.200*	.932	15	.292
	Task 2	.126	15	.200*	.935	15	.328
	Task 3	.117	15	.200*	.977	15	.942

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

The table above shows the normality test of each task for each measurement. The data is assumed to be normally distributed when Sig. > 0.05, and not normally distributed when Sig. < 0.05. As can be seen from the table, all the Shapiro-Wilk Sig. value is > 0.05. In the complexity measurement, Task 1's Sig. value is 0.110, Task 2's Sig. value is 0.822, and Task 3's Sig. value is 0.609. For the accuracy measurement, Task 1's Sig. value is 0.068, Task 2's Sig. value is 0.068, and Task 3's Sig. value is 0.056. For the fluency measurement, Task 1's Sig. value is 0.292, Task 2's Sig. value is 0.328, and Task 3's Sig. value is 0.942. Since all are > 0.05, it can be concluded that all data are normally distributed.

To see the homogeneity of the tasks, the table and its explanation is as follows.

Table 3.3. Homogeneity Test of CAF

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Complexity	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
	.401	2	42	.672
Accuracy	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
	.959	2	42	.392
Fluency	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
	1.073	2	42	.351

The data is assumed homogeny if the Sig. value is > 0.05. From the table above, complexity's Sig. value is 0.672, accuracy's Sig. value is 0.392, and fluency's Sig. value is 0.351. Since all Sig. value is > 0.05, which means that the data variant is all homogeny.

3.10. Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis in this research is stated as below:

For the first research question, the researcher used One-Way ANOVA in SPSS to find out the significant effect of students' speaking ability on the three types of tasks.

The hypothesis is approved if the Sig. value is lower than 0.05. The formulation can be seen as follows:

H0: There is no significant effect of the three types of tasks on the students' spoken language production in terms of CAF.

H1: There is a significant effect of the three types of tasks on the students' spoken language production in terms of CAF.

The Sig. value is at 0.05 only on the accuracy measurement of Task 1 vs. Task 2, and the rest are > 0.05. It can be concluded that there is no significant effect of the three types of tasks on the students' spoken language production in terms of CAF.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter includes recommendations for those interested in conducting additional research in the same field as the researcher.

5.1. Conclusions

The conclusion is highlighted from the findings and discussions around them. All three aspects of CAF would develop as a result of tasks being made simple for resource-depleting tasks (i.e., single task, planning time, prior knowledge) and complicated for resource-directing tasks (i.e., numerous elements, reasoning demand, there and then). Task 2 generates more accuracy that reasoning demand improves error-free clauses the students make on the spoken language production. Task 3 generates more complexity and fluency that [there and then] condition improves speech units and speech rate of the students' spoken language production. For task 1, many elements give no significant effect on all three aspects of CAF that the repetitions in the tasks may cause the possibility to produce long speech with low error-free clauses and speech rate.

The different levels of proficiency generate a statistically significantly different in spoken language production for each type of task in terms of CAF, except for Task 1 for complexity measurement. Task 1 generates students with low-level proficiency to get a higher score than the students with high-level proficiency that many elements may ease the students with low proficiency to be more careful in producing spoken language. As complexity is measured by calculating the total number of clauses and AS-units, students with low proficiency levels generate it better than students with high proficiency levels.

5.2. Suggestions

5.2.1. For the Teachers

As task 1' score gets the lowest score among the three types of tasks, the teacher can manipulate the task based on students' needs so that by the use of task complexity, the students' productivity is easily under control.

The implementation of the three types of tasks is not overall affected by the different levels of proficiency of the students, as Task 1's low-level students got a higher score than high-level students in terms of complexity measurement. The teacher can create such an environment to make the students meet the requirement to get the high score for the measurement the teacher wished.

5.2.2. For Further Researchers

1. In Task 1, the high-level students cannot score maximally in terms of complexity measurement. It seems that the repetition of many elements in Task 1 eases the low-level students, and challenges the high-level students so that they generate results beyond the researcher's expectations. The further researcher can do a trial and directly code the data to see whether the manipulation of the elements in task 1 is successful or not.
2. The implementation of the task that is sequentially made the result of the students' spoken production get higher from Task 1 to Task 3. The further researcher can randomize the

implementation of the task to see whether it gives a significant effect on the students' spoken language production or not.

3. The further researcher can look into another variable of interactive factors to see whether other factors whether or if it has a significant effect on students' language production.

REFERENCES

Agustina, V. (2017). *The Use of Task Complexity in Spoken Performance by the 10th Students of SMAN 2 Padang Cermin*. Retrieved from http://digilib.unila.ac.id/29427

Alvira, R. (2014). *The Definition of Complex and Complexity*. 10.13140/2.1.2072.8963

Awwad, A. (2017). *The Effects of Task Complexity Manipulated by Intentional Reasoning Demands on Second Language Learners' Speech Performance: Interaction with Language Proficiency and Working Memory.* University of Reading

Brown. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practice*. San Fransisco State University.

De Jong, N. H., & Wempe, T. (2009). *PRAAT Script to Detect Syllable Nuclei and Measure Speech Rate Automatically*. Behavior research methods, 41(2), 385-390

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational Strategies in The Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Duong, T., Montero, P., Maribel, Desmet, Piet, Peters, & Elke. (2020). *Differential Effects of Input-based and Output-based Tasks on L2 Vocabulary Learning*. Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics. 24. 10.37213/cjal.2021.31183

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford University Press: New York

Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press: Oxford

Ellis, R. (2000). *Task-Based Research and Language Pedagogy*. Language Teaching Research, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 193 ± 220

Guijt, I. (2013). *Working with Assumptions in a Theory of Change Process*. Retrieved from https://content.changeroo.com/wp-content/uploads/Academy/2017/07/toc_notes_3_working_with_assumptions_in_a_toc_process.pdf

Gunawan (2016). *The Effect of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) Approach in Developing Speaking Skill of The Eighth Grade Students Of Smpnegeri 6 Watampone and Their Attitude Toward English*

Hanafiah, Nur. (2017). Designing Task Complexity on the Quantity of Interaction and Negotiation of Meaning. Lampung University

Hidalgo, M., Ibarolla, A. (2020). Task Repetition and Collaborative Writing by EFL Children: Beyond CAF Measures. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.14746/sslt.2020.10.3.5.

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

Housen, A., Kuiken, F., & Vedder, I. (2012). *Dimensions of L2 performance and proficiency: Complexity, accuracy and fluency in SLA*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ishikawa, T. (2007). *The Effect of Manipulating Task Complexity Along the (Here and Now) Dimension on L2 Written Narrative Discourse*. The Journal of Asia TEFL

Ishikawa, T. (2008). *The Effect of Task Demands of Intentional Reasoning on L2 Speech Performance*. The Journal of Asia TEFL., 5(1)

Keyton, J. (2011). *Communication and Organizational Culture*: *A Key to Understanding Work Experience*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Khotimah, K. (2018). *Implementing Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT) Instruction to Improve Students' Speaking Participation in Islamic Boarding School of Maulana Malik Ibrahim, State Islamic University Of Malang*. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.30736/ej.v5i2.67

Kilinc, K., Yildirim, O. (2020). *The Effects of Test Type, Pronunciation, and Proficiency Level on EFL Learners' Speaking Exam Scores.* Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v10n3p95

Long, M. H. (1985). *A Role for Instruction in Second Language Acquisition: Task-Based Language Teaching*. In K. Hyltenstam and M. Pienemann (eds.), Modelling and assessing second language acquisition. (pp. 77-79). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Long, M. H. (1997). *"Focus on Form in Task-Based Language Teaching"*. www.mhhe.com. McGraw-Hill Companies

Long, M. H. (1997). *"Focus on Form in Task-Based Language Teaching"*. www.mhhe.com. McGraw-Hill Companies

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

McCarthy, Jarvis (2010). *MTLD, vocd-D, and HD-D: A Validation Study of Sophisticated Approaches to Lexical Diversity Assessment.* Retrieved from doi:10.3758/BRM.42.2.381

McNamara, D. S., Graesser, A. C., McCarthy, P. M., & Cai, Z. (2014). *Automated Evaluation of Text and Discourse With Coh-Metrix*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

O'Malley, J. and Chamot, A. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524490

Phitaloka, Theodora (2015). *Students' Opinion on the Use of Group Work in Interpersonal Speaking Class: A Study at the English Department Of Satya Wacana Christian University*. Retrieved from: https://repository.uksw.edu/bitstream/123456789/10160/2/T1_112010076_Full%20text.pdf

Prasetyaningrum, A., Jaelani, S. R., & Azima, M. F. F. (2021). *An Analysis on Students' Difficulties in Speaking.* Humanitatis: Journal of Language and Literature, 7(2), 187-192.

Rahimpour, M. (1997). *Task Complexity, Task Condition and Variation in L2 Oral Discourse*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2004). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Richards, Jack. (2009). *Teaching Listening and Speaking: From Theory to Practice.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255634567

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

Robinson, P. (2003). *Attention and Memory During SLA.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259841400

Robinson, P. (2007). *Criteria for Grading and Sequencing Pedagogic Tasks.* Retrieved from: doi: 10.21832/9781853599286-004

Robinson, P., & Gilabert, R. (2007). *Task Complexity, the Cognition Hypothesis and Second Language Learning and Performance*. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259823675

Setiyadi, A. B., (2006). *Metode Penelitian untuk Pengajaran Bahasa Asing Pendekatan Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif.* Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu

Simensen, A. (2010). *Fluency: an Aim in Teaching and a Criterion in Assessment*. Acda Didactica Norge. 4. 10.5617/adno.1048

Skehan, P. (1998). *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Skehan, P. (2009). *Modelling Second Language Performance: Integrating Complexity, Accuracy, Fluency, and Lexis.* Applied Linguistics, 30(4), 510–532

Suharsimi, A. (2011). *Prosedur Penelitian : Suatu Pendekatan Praktik / Suharsimi Arikunto*. Jakarta :: Rineka Cipta

Tabari, M. (2016). *The Effects of Planning Time on Complexity, Accuracy, Fluency, and Lexical Variety in L2 Descriptive Writing. Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *1*(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0015-6

Ugla, R., Abidin, M., Abdullah, M. (2019). *The Influence of Proficiency Level on the Use and Choice Of L1/L2 Communication Strategies Used by Iraqi EFL Students.* Retrieved from DOI: 10.11591/ijere.v8i1.15179

Widyaningrum, L., Faridi, A., Saleh, M. (2020). *The Relationship between Communication Strategies and Language Proficiency among the English Department Students of IAIN Kudus.* Retrieved from https:// DOI 10.15294/eej.v10i4.40035

Wood, Robert. (1986). *Task Complexity: Definition of the Construct*. Retrieved from: doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(86)90044-0