

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Theoretical Concept

1. The Definition of Speaking Assessment

Assessing spoken language can be divided into two main ways. One can either look at language in a holistic way, or then one can divide the language into pieces (grammar, pronunciation etc.) and look at them separately, which is called an analytic way of assessing (Bachman 1991, p. 301-330). Holistic way means assessing the situation overall, and how the subject handles and performs in a situation that is being assessed. Holistic way of assessing is based on the idea that we cannot see grammatical, or other language function that take place inside one's mind, so therefore the interculator cannot judge them. The interculator have to judge the functions we are able to observe: the learner's ability to perform in a given task. Analytic way of assessing means looking at certain, predetermined points, for instance pronunciation, rhythm etc.

According to Knight (1992, p. 300) teachers should focus on using the latter way of assessing, since it is important that the teachers know what exactly needs to be improved in the learners speech, and that they are able to give instructive feedback. Valkonen (2003, p. 189) also talked about the different aspects of assessing language in a holistic or analytic way. She mentions how in a quick classroom situation it is difficult to give analytic feedback and how it is possible that if there are

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

clear analytic instructions for the assessment, it might actually interfere the assessing process, when only certain things are being looked at. However, Valkonen (2003, p. 190) supports the analytic way of assessing, since it is based on the idea, that it is possible to master different areas of language with different ability and teachers should be able to give correct feedback for all of these areas. In my study I also focused on the analytic way of assessing oral skills, since I wanted to find out clear, detailed answers and not big, overall impressions.

The number of possible categories for oral assessment is huge. The CEFR identifies 12 qualitative categories with relevance to oral assessment, for which they have developed illustrative scales for assessment; each scale describes the level of proficiency. The competence categories are: turn-taking strategies, co-operating strategies, asking for clarification, fluency, flexibility, coherence, thematic development, precision, sociolinguistic competence, general range, vocabulary range, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary control and phonological control. Nevertheless, it is neither recommended nor possible attempting to assess all categories simultaneously. Assessors need to make choices for each assessment situation and select the most appropriate for each assignment and only include 4-5 test criteria in each test situation (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 193).

According to Knight (1992), assessing speaking skills can cause problems in a classroom situation for instance because of the following

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

reasons: assessing oral skills requires time and equipment, the problem of finding productive and relevant tasks, and the problem of assessing students in a consistent way, even though the situations change. Bachman (1991, p. 39) also mentions the huge amount of variations found in almost every language, so who decides what norm we choose to look at, when assessing the language students produce.

In assessment situations it is also relevant to distinguish between ‘competences’, meaning knowledge/ skills/ the ability to do something and ‘criteria’ for the assessment, 16 meaning standards by which something can be judged. The CEFR states that criterias are factor “which distinguish between the different scores or grades” (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 199). However, these terms might be regarded as overlapping categories since in practice and the same category might be regarded both as a competence and as a criterion. For example, pronunciation is a competence, whereas ‘good pronunciation’ or ‘native-like pronunciations’ are criteria. However, when using these terms there is a tendency to use the word pronunciation to refer to both categories. It is therefore easy to understand why teachers and students in my research often failed to distinguish between the terms competences and criteria.

Most importantly, do the students know what is expected of them and how those expectations might influence the student and his/hers output? A debate of its own is had about whether it is justified

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

to use native speakers as a base for assessment. If native speakers would be the base of assessment it would be difficult to decide which native speakers we choose to look at, since there are numerous styles of English spoken as a native language. In Finland the school system used to focus on British English, nowadays American English is also gaining more attention in classrooms and school books. There are of course a lot of variations inside the British and the American English as well. Although native speakers are, as one could say, the owners and the original users of a language, I do not feel that speaking should be judged on the basis of whether one sounds like a native speaker or not, as long as the speech is understandable for the majority of people. For example Luoma (2004, p. 10) mentioned that there are a number of dialects and variations in one language,

Especially in English, so how to choose which one to use as the norm for pronunciation. Luoma (2004) also mentioned how many people are able to learn very clear and understandable pronunciation, without sounding at all like a native-speaker. I agree with Luoma (2004, p.10) when she says that “Communicative effectiveness, which is based on comprehensibility and probably guided by native speaker standards but defined in terms of realistic learner achievement, is a better standard for learner pronunciation.”

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:

- a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
- b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.

2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

2. Criteria for the Assessment

Since criteria for the assessment is a category that was asked about in both the survey and the interviews in the study, this section will present the assessment criteria that were frequently stated by both the students and the teachers. Categories such as pronunciation, vocabulary, grammatical accuracy and fluency were referred to as very important assessment criteria by both the students and the teachers; thus, these categories will be discussed. These categories are frequently applied criteria for assessing speaking; in addition to being used in the CEFR's illustrative scales, these categories are mentioned in competence aims. A further category that will be discussed is turn-taking. This category was stated as important by three of the interviewed teachers; they stated that the ability to maintain a conversation was an important assessment criterion.

Turn-taking is also a category stated as important in the CEFR, hence, an illustrative scale regarding turn-taking is included. Additionally, turn-taking is regarded as relevant for the assessment; this category is included in one of the competence aims. The aims of the studies are to enable pupils to:

- a. Understand and use a general vocabulary related to different topics
- b. Use the central patterns for pronunciation, intonation, word inflection and different types of sentences in communication

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

- c. Express oneself fluently and coherently, suited to the purpose and situation
- d. Introduce, maintain and terminate conversations on different topics by asking questions and following up on input

The criteria of speaking fluency assessment will divide base on the component of speaking. ‘Fluency’ is a term that requires further clarification, as it includes two different meanings; one general and one technical. The general meaning covers the ability to speak various languages, as in ‘she is fluent in five languages’, whereas the technical meaning is applied to characterize a student’s speech. The technical meaning can also be understood in more than one manner, either as the speaker’s use of pausing, hesitation and speech rate, or as a synonym for ‘speaking proficiency’, meaning one’s general expertise. What make it difficult to assess fluency that features such as flow and smoothness in language, as well as the use of pausing and hesitation markers are complex; they do not just describe a person’s speech but also include the listener’s perception of the speech. Therefore, whether the pausing a speaker produces is disturbing or not is not defined explicitly, but up to each assessor to decide (Luoma, 2014, p. 88-89).

Hasselgren (1998, p.155) defined fluency as “the ability to contribute to what a listener, proficient in the language, would normally perceive as coherent speech”. Such speech is carried out without strain, at a comfortable pace and is not interrupted by excessive hesitation.

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

Hasselgren further suggests that the use of ‘smallwords’ a term defined as “small words and phrases occurring with high frequency in the spoken language”, such as really, I mean and oh makes the speech more smooth.

Moreover, House (1996 p. 232) stated that expressions like yeah, ok, hm, listen and I mean help connecting the interactions in a conversation to make it coherent and smooth. As stated before, the CEFR includes an illustrative scale regarding fluency, and a person on proficiency level C2 can “express him/herself at length with a natural, effortless, unhesitating flow. Pauses only to reflect on precisely the right words to express his/her thoughts or to find an appropriate example or explanation” (Council of Europe, 2001 p. 129). The CEFR also includes a scale illustrating propositional precision, which describes a person’s ability to formulate clear thoughts on a topic during a debate or a conversation. (Council of Europe, 2001, p.128-129).

3. Speaking Fluency

Fluency comes from Latin *fluentia*, from *flure* ‘to flow’ and it has been defined by many ways by expert. Samuel Johnson’s nineteenth century definitions of *fluent* as *liquid, flowing*, and *fluency* as *the quality of flowing, smoothness*, shed light on what the words mean when applied to speech. If someone’s said to speak a language fluently,

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

it is understood that they speak it with a smooth and easy flow. Nation and Newton (2009) defined that is the ability when speaker's able to speak fast and easily without holding up the flow of the speech. Similarly, Lennon in Cucchiarini, Strik and Boves (2002) also defined that fluency is the ability of speaker to produce speech at the same tempo with the native speakers without the problem such as: silent pause, hesitation, filled pauses, self-correction, repetitions and false starts. So, the parameter of good speakers for EFL learners is when they are able to speak as close as possible to the way of native speakers do.

Bygate (2009) stated Fluency is reflected in particular in two aspects: velocity of shipping and regularity, which means that a natural amount and distribution of pauses. On the subject of appropriate placement of pauses. Thornbury (2005) says that:

Natural-sounding pauses | are those that occur at the intersection of clauses, | or after groups of words that form a meaningful unit. | (The vertical lines in the last sentence mark where natural pauses might occur. | midway between related groups of.

Fluency, in terms of foreign language skill performance, refers to “the rapid, smooth, accurate, lucid, and efficient translation of thought or communicative intention under the temporal constraints of on-line processing”(Lennon, 1990; 2000, p. 26) . The notion of utterance fluency refers to the temporal values of speech or the “oral features of utterances that reflect the operation of underlying cognitive processes” (Segalowitz, 2010, p. 48). Finally, the concept of perceived fluency refers to the

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

“inferences listeners make about a speaker’s cognitive fluency based on their perception of utterance fluency” (Segalowitz, 2010, p. 48).

Fillmore (1979) conceptualized fluency with four distinctive ways. First, he characterized fluency as the capacity to talk finally with few stops and to have the capacity to fill the time with talk. Second, a fluent speaker is equipped for talking without faltering as well as of communicating his/her message in an intelligible, contemplated and "semantically dense" way. Third, a person is considered to be fluent if he/she knows what to say in a wide of range of contexts. Finally, Fillmore (1979) contended that fluent speakers are innovative and creative in their dialect utilize and a maximally fluent speaker has the majority of the previously mentioned capacities. Fillmore's definition of familiarity is exceptionally broad, yet it is indistinct how this conceptualization varies from the meaning of worldwide oral proficiency.

Fluency can be considered one component of oral proficiency, which is often used as one of the scores in assessing candidates’ oral language skills in an exam situation. In addition, Lennon (1990) also pointed out that fluency is differs from the other scores in oral language exams (e.g. accuracy, appropriacy, etc.) and he also says that fluency reflects the speaker’s ability to focus the listener’s attention and Rebhein (1987) provided a similar definition that “fluency means that the activities of planning and uttering can be executed nearly

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

simultaneously by the speaker of the language". Sajavaara (1987) also defined that fluency as the communicative acceptability of the speech act.

Segalowitz (2010) divided there are three kinds of fluency, namely cognitive fluency, utterance fluency and perceived fluency. The kinds of fluency in this research are Utterance Based Test and Perceived Based Test. Lennon (1990) says Perceived or perception fluency as the impression on the listener toward one's speaking as being listened. Perceived fluency is usually measured by rating scale based on the listener's concept of what is fluent or not fluent and usually holistically measured with other aspect of speaking like grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary and etc.

Utterance Fluency decides speaker's fluency by counting the disfluency markers inside the discourse. As per Stockdale (2009) there are three disfluency names or markers as take after:

- a. Restart

Restart is defined as when the speaker restarts the uncompleted section of the speech for various reasons. Usually it happens because of mispronounced or misspoken words and speakers knowledge of the contents like vocabulary or the information.

E.g. Zella buys many **doll** uhh... **Barbie dolls**.

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

b. Self-Correction

Stockdale says it as the moment event noteworthy change in the speaker's discourse. It happens due to selection of words or misspoken words.

E.g. *There is three... ehh There are three bananas.*

c. Repetition

Repetition refers to when speakers make instant occurrence of non-significant change in the speech by simply repeating the same words.

E.g. *I love **reading** hmm **reading** novel.*

Besides all those three indicators, Stockdale also adds another indicator given by Brumfit in Lennon (2004) that the existence of excessive pause. Brumfit in Stokdale (2009) also stated that the length of silences or pauses also affects the listener's toward the speaker's fluency. In addition, Stockdale (2009) set 0.3 second as am appropriate cut-off point or pauses.

4. Speaking Fluency Measurement

In assessing speaking fluency, there are two ways how to measure speaking fluency. The both measurement used same disfluency components. According to Stockdale (2009) there are four disfluency components to indicate the speaking fluency of speakers.

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

a. Speech Rate (SR)

Stockdale (2009) explained about speech rate as a variable to measure the speed of delivery of the word produced for a speech sample per second or minute. The pruned syllables and all disfluencies are to be excluded in the measurement. To calculate speech rate the number of all syllables is divided by the total time required to produce the speech sample in seconds. The result is to be multiplied by 60 to find syllables per minute. According to the Tennessee Study Program of Education Fluency Resource Pacllet (2009) set 162-230 is the number of syllables adolescent or adult normally could produce per minute. The calculations is formulated as following:

$$\frac{ns}{ts} \times 60 = sr \qquad \frac{sr}{230} \times 100 = SRS$$

ns : Number of Syllable

ts : Time in Second

sr : Speech Rate

SRS : Speech rate Score

b. Pause Rate (PR)

The total number of pauses and filled pauses such as uhm, err, emm and eeee including corrections and repetitions are divided by the total amount of time

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

expressed in seconds and then multiplied by 100. The calculation is formulated as following:

$$\frac{np}{ts} \times 100 = sr$$

$$100 - \left(\frac{np}{120} \times 100 \right) = PRS$$

np	: Number of Pruned Syllable
ts	: Time in Second
sr	: Speech Rate
PRS	: Pause Rate Score

c. Disfluent Syllable Rate (DSR)

Disfluent syllable Rate is calculated by subtracting the number of pruned syllables from the number of the syllables in the sample. Pruned syllables include fillers, errors, and repetitions. The result is the number of disfluent syllables which is then divided by 230 as the highest normal number of syllable per minute and multiplied by the total time in seconds. The calculation is formulated as following:

$$\frac{nd}{230} \times 120 = dsr$$

$$100 - \left(\frac{nd}{230} \times 120 \right) = DSS$$

nd	: Number of Disfluent Syllable
230	: Normal Amount of Syllable/Minute
ds	: Disfluent Syllable Rate
DSS	: Disfluent Syllable Score
100	: Maximum Score

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:

- a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
- b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.

2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

d. Mean Length of Run (MLR)

Mean length of run between pauses measures the average number of syllables produced in runs of speech between pauses and other disfluencies to give an idea how much is said without interruption. Mean length of runs is calculated by subtracting the total number of syllables by the times of pauses above 0.3 seconds and other disfluencies then divided by the normal amount of syllables per minutes for the set time of speech sample which is 2 minutes. The calculation is formulated as following:

$$\frac{ns - np}{460} = MLR$$

ns : Number of total Syllable

np : Number of Pruned Syllable

460 : Normal Amount of Syllables/ 2 minutes

MLR : mean length of Run

With all there four measurements of fluency in which maximum score is 100 the mean score is figured out. The following formula is used to get the mean score of each sample:

$$M = \frac{\sum x}{N} \rightarrow M = \frac{SRS + PRS + DSS + MLR}{4}$$

M : Mean Score

SRS : Speech Rate Score

MLR : Mean Length of Run

4 : Four measurements of Fluency

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

5. Perceived and Utterance Fluency

a. Perceived Fluency

Segalowitz's point of view about perceived fluency is the most complete of the three as it combines cognitive fluency and utterance fluency and adds the listener to the equation. This seems logical, given the difficulties in measuring fluency objectively. As previously illustrated, cognitive fluency is difficult to quantify and temporal and repair phenomena are not always reliable indicators and therefore it is inevitably the listener's impressions that count.

Lennon (1990) claimed that "fluency reflects the speaker's ability to focus the listener's attention on his/her message by presenting a finished product, rather than inviting the listener to focus on the working of the production mechanisms". In other words, if the speaker communicates his/her message effectively without pausing or hesitating unduly, the listener will infer that the speaker possesses cognitive fluency. In light of the centrality of the listener and the subjective element in Lennon's definition of fluency, it seems appropriate to consider the identity of the listeners in past studies. Interestingly, according to Bosker et al. (2012), who use untrained raters in their investigation into what influences perceptions of fluency, fluency judgments from untrained native-speaker raters are equivalent to those of expert

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

raters. They refer to other studies (Derwing et al., 2009; Pinget, Bosker, Quené, & De Jong, 2014), where the same claims are made. Freed in Segalowitz (2000) six judges are also “educated native speakers” of the learners’ L2 with no training or experience in language teaching, and their ratings correlated well with the expert raters’ test scores. In fact, to the researcher’s knowledge, very few studies on perceptions of fluency have used professional teachers as raters. Kormos and Dénes (2004), Wennerstrom (2000), and Préfontaine (2013) are exceptions, but Préfontaine’s study is concerned with exploring learner self-assessment rather than investigating the components of fluency, and Wennerstrom’s focuses exclusively on intonation. The use of experienced teachers as participants in the current study addresses this shortfall.

Past research into perceptions of fluency has considered a variety of variables. Whereas Bosker et al. (2012) restrict their raters to features of breakdown, speed and repair, Freed (2000) asked her judges to describe the basis on which they evaluate the speakers in their own words, and then select from a list the components they consider important in creating an impression of fluency.

The components range from temporal, breakdown and repair variables to considerations such as idiomatic language,

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

vocabulary, accent, grammar and interaction. Freed's findings confirm that the "popular notion of fluency" (p. 262) is subjective, that it includes elements of the narrow sense of the construct such as hesitation and repair phenomena, but is actually much broader. Four out of the six judges specified "better grammar and vocabulary" as major factors that influenced them and half of them selected "better accent" as important. In short, the raters' perceptions of fluency in Freed's study were influenced by an eclectic mix of variables.

Kormos and Dénes (2004) stated that there is a lack of studies that investigate the role of a combination of temporal, linguistic, phonological and interactional variables in perceptions of fluency, and set out to address this gap. They find that their professional teacher participants also consider fluency to be more than a question of temporal phenomena, with accuracy and lexical diversity emerging as important. Moreover, one of their main findings is that pace is a reliable indicator of fluency. The number of stressed words one can say in a minute is found to be more important in perceived fluency than a higher number of unstressed words. Stress, therefore, a component of phonology, is seen to play a significant role. They conclude that a definition of fluency needs to include speed, pace, smoothness and accuracy.

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

b. Utterance Fluency

Segalowitz's second definition of fluency, utterance fluency, refers to the temporal properties of speech and repair. These, according to Segalowitz's vision, depend on the speaker's cognitive fluency. Tavakoli and Skehan (2005) differentiate between three categories of utterance indicators: speed fluency, that is, the density and speed at which speech is delivered; breakdown fluency, that is, the extent to which speech is interrupted by pauses; and repair fluency, for example the number of repetitions and corrections present in speech. The advantage of utterance fluency is that the variables can be measured, for example by using the software Praat, and therefore ratings are more objective.

A large number of different quantitative measures are proposed in the numerous studies that investigate utterance fluency, with different researchers advocating different aspects of production as the best indicators of fluency. Kormos (2006) gave an overview of the ten main measures (Appendix 2), which include mean length of runs, the mean length of pauses, the number of filled pauses per minute, phonation-time ratio (the amount of time spent speaking as a percentage of the total speech sample time), and the number of stressed words per total words. Kormos (2006) stated that most studies (Freed, 2000;

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

Lennon, 1990) conclude that the best predictors are speech rate, that is, the number of syllables articulated per minute, and the mean length of runs, that is, the average number of syllables produced between pauses. However, there are many exceptions, and Tavakoli, Campbell and McCormack (2015) point out that there is a fair amount of overlap between the measures, some being “composite” e.g. speech rate, which combines pausing and speed aspects of fluency, others non-composite e.g. articulation rate, which considers speed only.

Kormos and Dénes (2004) conclude in their study on perceptions of fluency that pace, that is, the number of stressed words per-minute, is one of the best indicators of fluency and has the added advantage of being easy to calculate. They report that findings on the frequency of filled and unfilled pauses and repair phenomena are generally contradictory and demonstrate in their own study that they do not influence perceptions of fluency. The relative unimportance of repair measures is confirmed by Bosker et al. (2012). In short, each study measures a different cocktail of variables using a variety of tools and different sample sizes, and this makes it difficult to draw clear conclusions.

Moreover, De Jong et al. (2015) question the extent to which such fluency measures are valid indicators of L2

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

proficiency. They echo Fillmore (1979) when they argue that fluency is partly determined by individual speaking style and personality, and may also be culture-based. They investigate fluency measures for Turkish and English learners of Dutch in both their L1 and their L2 and conclude that for most measures, especially syllable duration and filled pauses, the speakers' performances correspond in both languages. They argue, therefore, that L1 fluency measures need to be taken into consideration when considering L2 fluency.

Derwing, Munro, Thomson and Rossiter (2009) also found a significant correlation between the L1 and L2 fluency behaviour of Slavic and Mandarin speakers of English. This raises the important question of whether it is reasonable to judge L2 speakers as disfluent if it reflects their L1 speech. Regarding pausing, Tavakoli (2011) helps clarify the question by pointing out that it is where speakers pause that is significant, not the number or length of pauses. Whereas native speakers pause at the end of clauses, L2 speakers tend to pause mid-clause as a result of processing difficulties. A further consideration is whether pausing is due to linguistic planning or content planning (Fulcher, 2003). L1 speakers frequently pause to think about content when speaking spontaneously, and therefore this should not be interpreted as an indication of L2 disfluency. False starts

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

and reformulation are also typical of many L1 speakers, as Conversation Analysis has shown (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977). Deciding which surface features of speech constitute fluency and disfluency, therefore, is not a straightforward matter.

B. Relevant of the Research

As a matter of fact, there are several studies as conducted by some researchers which are relevant to this research.

The first is the dissertation from Stockdale (2009). This dissertation attempts to connect teacher perception of oral fluency in the classroom to established objective measures of oral fluency to determine which measures are informing perception.

The second is the research from Kormos and Dénes (2004). The research explores which variables predict native and non-native speaking teachers' perception of fluency and distinguish fluent from non-fluent L2 learners. In addition to traditional measures of the quality of students' output such as accuracy and lexical diversity and investigated speech samples collected from 16 Hungarian L2 learners at two distinct levels of proficiency with the help of computer technology. The two groups of students were compared and their temporal and linguistic measures were correlated with the fluency scores they received from three experienced native and three non-native speaker teacher judges. The teachers' written comments concerning the students' performance were also taken into

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

consideration. For all the native and nonnative teachers, speech rate, the mean length of utterance, phonation time ratio and the number of stressed words produced per minute were the best predictors of fluency scores. However, the raters differed as regards how much importance they attributed to accuracy, lexical diversity and the mean length of pauses. The number of filled and unfilled pauses and other disfluency phenomena were not found to influence perceptions of fluency.

Then, the research from Préfontaine (2013). This pilot study focuses on whether analysis of perceived fluency and utterance fluency inform and provide support for the workability of three speech elicitation tasks designed to assess second language fluency. Nine intermediate-level French students aged 26 to 68 were asked to respond to three different speaking tasks. Temporal variables of utterance fluency were extracted using PRAAT speech analysis software and examined against holistic ratings of perceived fluency. Utterance fluency was operationalized as speech rate, phonation-time ratio and mean length of runs. Linguistic analysis featured quantitative and qualitative comparisons of ordinal and interval data. The results of this small-scale pilot study indicate that task difficulty impacts speech perception in terms of intra rater reliability, and speech production with regard to pausing, speaking duration, and number of syllables produced. The findings also provide preliminary evidence indicating a link between PRAAT temporal fluency measurements and rater interpretation of holistic descriptors. Extracting temporal variables

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

automatically and comparing them to holistic ratings across tasks elucidates the intricacy of the dynamics between perceived fluency and utterance fluency. For fluency assessment, it also underscores the importance of exploring perceived fluency and utterance fluency together rather than in isolation.

Last, the research from Majan (2016). This study was about speaking fluency level of the fifth semester students of English Study Program of Riau University. This is a descriptive quantitative research with 2 minutes recorded speech as primary data. 24 students were chosen from population of 75 students. The cluster random sampling was used to choose the students from 3 different classes. The speeches were analyzed through 2 steps: Spectrograms analysis & statistical analysis. The study showed that a small number of students speaking fluency level in English Study Program of Riau University are still in level Intermediate and although most students are categorized Good, at least the number of who are in level Advance is three times bigger than those in Intermediate. Despite of the fact the students' speaking fluency can be concluded as good, the writer would like to recommend other researchers to conduct similar research upon other speaking fluency test so that we can compare it for deeper analysis, more objective and holistic picture speaking fluency.

Operational Concept

To talk easily is one desire of each ESL and EFL students. Therefore, this research was carried out to see if the students have the

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:

- a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
- b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.

2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

desired goal. The Operational Concept of this research is described the tools to measure the fluency divide into two they are perceived fluency that is using rater and utterance fluency that is using software. Then, the measurement criteria of speaking fluency from Stockdale (2009) which is accumulated all four disfluency components to indicate the speaking fluency of speakers.

1. Speech Rate (SR): speech rate as a variable to measure the speed of delivery of the word produced for a speech sample per second or minute.
2. Pause Rate (PR): the total number of pauses and filled pauses such as uhm, err, emm and eeee including corrections and repetitions are divided by the total amount of time expressed in seconds and then multiplied by 100
3. Disfluent Syllable Rate (DSR): disfluent syllable rate is calculated by subtracting the number of pruned syllables from the number of the syllables in the sample.
4. Mean Length of Run (MLR): mean length of run between pauses measures the average number of syllables produced in runs of speech between pauses and other disfluencies to give an idea how much is said without interruption.

To answer the first research question, the researcher asked 2 raters who capable and master in speaking fluency to analyzed the samples by following the fluency scale ordinate from De Jong and Hulstjin (2009) and

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

the raters also must mastering the component of the speaking fluency. The average of the score from the raters is the final score of students speaking perceived fluency analysis.

For the second research question the researcher analyzed the samples by using Audacity to calculate the speaking fluency components. After the components has been counted, the researcher used the formula to get the score of students speaking fluency by using utterance analysis. The calculation is formulated as following:

1. Speech Rate (SR)

$$\frac{ns}{ts} \times 60 = sr$$

$$\frac{sr}{230} \times 100 = SRS$$

ns : Number of Syllable

ts : Time in Second

sr : Speech Rate

SRS : Speech rate Score

2. Pause Rate (PR)

$$\frac{np}{ts} \times 100 = sr$$

$$100 - \left(\frac{np}{120} \times 100 \right) = PRS$$

np : Number of Pruned Syllable

ts : Time in Second

sr : Speech Rate

PRS : Pause Rate Score

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

3. Disfluent Syllable Rate (DSR)

$$\frac{nd}{230} \times 120 = dsr$$

$$100 - \left(\frac{nd}{230} \times 120 \right) = DSS$$

nd : Number of Disfluent Syllable

203 : Normal Amount of Syllable/Minute

ds : Disfluent Syllable Rate

DSS : Disfluent Syllable Score

100 : Maximum Score

4. Mean Length of Run (MLR)

$$\frac{ns - np}{460} = MLR$$

ns : Number of total Syllable

np : Number of Pruned Syllable

460 : Normal Amount of Syllables/ 2 minutes

MLR : mean length of Run

With all there four measurements of fluency in which maximum score is 100 the mean score is figured out. The following formula is used to get the mean score of each sample:

$$M = \frac{\sum x}{N} \rightarrow M = \frac{SRS + PRS + DSS + MLR}{4}$$

M : Mean Score

SRS : Speech Rate Score

MLR : Mean Length of Run

4 : Four measurements of Fluency

Hak Cipta Diindungi Undang-Undang

1. Dilarang mengutip sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini tanpa mencantumkan dan menyebutkan sumber:
 - a. Pengutipan hanya untuk kepentingan pendidikan, penelitian, penulisan karya ilmiah, penyusunan laporan, penulisan kritik atau tinjauan suatu masalah.
 - b. Pengutipan tidak merugikan kepentingan yang wajar UIN Suska Riau.
2. Dilarang mengumumkan dan memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh karya tulis ini dalam bentuk apapun tanpa izin UIN Suska Riau.

The scale for both analysis is adopted from Fluency Scale Ordinate Corporation in De Jong and Hulstjin (2009) below:

Table.II.1
Fluency Scale Ordinate Corporation
In De Jong and Hulstjin (2009)

Score	Level	Description
91-100	5	Native-Like
71-90	4	Advance
51-70	3	Good
31-50	2	Intermediate
11-30	1	Limited
1-10	0	Disfluent

Table.II.2
Fluency Scale Ordinate Corporation Description

level	Description
5	NATIVE-LIKE Fluency. Candidate utterance exhibits smooth native-like rhythm and phrasing, with no more than one hesitation, repetitions, false start, or non-native phonological simplification. The overall speech sounds natural.
4	ADVANCE Fluency. Candidate of utterance has acceptable thym, with appropriate phrasing and word emphasis. Utterances have no more than five hesitation, repetitions or false starts. There is only one to five significantly non-native phonological hesitations.
3	GOOD Fluency. Candidate speech has acceptable speed, but may be somewhat uneven. Long utterances may exhibit some hesitations; but most words are spoken in continuous phrases. There are several repetitions or false starts per utterance. Speech has no too many long pauses and does not sound staccato.
2	INTERMEDIATE Fluency. Candidate speech may be uneven or somewhat staccato. Utterance (if >= 6 words) has at least one smooth 3-word run, and there are several hesitations, repetitions or false starts. Speech may have several long pauses, but not unlimited.
1	LIMITED Fluency. Candidate speech is slow and has irregular phrasing or sentence rhythm. Poor phrasing, staccato or syllabic timing, multiple hesitations, many repetitions or false starts render the spoken performance notably uneven or discontinuous. Long utterances have several long pauses.
0	DISFLUENT Candidate Speech is very slow and seems labour and very poor, with many discernable phase grouping and with multiple hesitations, pauses, false starts and/or major phonological simplifications. In an utterance, most words are isolated and there are many long pauses,