

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' SPEAKING FLUENCY AT GRADE XI OF MA KMM KAUMAN PADANG PANJANG

¹Annisa Aditya & ²Hilma Pami Putri
State Islamic Collage of Bukittinggi, Bukittinggi.¹²
annisaaditya17@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were to describe students' fluency level and to identify students' disfluency factors at MA KMM Kauman Padang Panjang. It employed quantitative research method with the class of grade XI students as the research population. There were 25 students taken as the research sample selected through purposive sampling technique. The data were collected through speaking test and a set of questionnaire. In the speaking test, students were allowed to choose one of five topics provided and were asked to deliver short talks for 2 minutes. These short talks were recorded. In addition to the speaking test, there were 20 questions with four options as the answers. These questions represented five main factors of disfluency such as task with task difficulty, meaning focused, time pressure, planning and preparation, and task repetition. The collected data were mainly in the form of transcription texts mined from the recordings of the short talks as well as the answers from the questionnaire. The results of the study show that students' fluency level at grade XI of MA KMM Kauman Padang Panjang is good (level 3). However, the information on disfluency which prevented them to get a higher score were also identified. Most of the main disfluency factors were task with task difficulty, meaningfocused, time pressure, planning and preparation, and task repetition.

Keywords: disfluency factors, speaking fluency, Teaching Speaking Skills,.

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is the productive oral skill that consists of producing systematic verbal utterances to convey meaning (Nunan, 2003 : 48). On the contrary speaking is oral activities developing sound to express idea and construct the meaning. Because of that, students be able to get information and be able to understand the meaning and students be able to share the information to others.

Speaking is base communication, so it is a skill that most important that people have (Fernanda, 2015) . Speaking is one of the aspect language skill that are productive, it means a skill that people have to convey ideas, thoughts, and feelings so that ideas that available in the mind of the speaker can be understood by others. Speaking also is connected someone with others in sharing information.

In the development of skill there are two aspects of oral language will be develop; accuracy and fluency. Accuracy is the extent to which students' speech matches what

people actually say when they use the target language (Nunan, 2003 : 55). Thus, accuracy is control activities to give students' persuasion and encouragement who focus on mastery a language. Fluency is the extent to which speakers use the language quickly and confidently, with few hesitations or unnatural pause, false starts, word searches, etc (Nunan, 2003 : 55). Thus, speaking fluency will give students to more practice and use English as a tool communication.

Nowadays, students life at the time where speaking English as a second language fluently are important. In the development of speaking fluency, students must be mastered any components of English language. Speaking fluency has known as the pure ability to speak spontaneously, fastly and comprehensibly with a number of errors that can divert the speakers attention from the speaker's message.

When the researcher did the obseravation toward grade XI of MA KMM Kauman Padang Panjang. The researcher found several problems related to speaking fluency. First, Students often used such hesitation when they feel hesistant about their speech. When students spoke with their friend or in front of the class, they often said *hmm*, *aaaa*, and *uuuu*. It took many times because they difsssficult to express their idea and can not explain well about what are going to say. Thus, when the students often said *hmm*, *aaa*, and *uuu* during speaking, it caused they cannot express their idea well.

Second, Student feel-blocked mind because of they were afraid of making mistake. Over much focused on the script made students difficult to speak freely. When students spoke in front of class they could not enjoy and they still like remembering something. Therefore, they were difficult to speak freely because they only focused on the script.

Third, students had difficulties in expressing idea spontaneously because had lack of vocabulary. Lack of vocabulary made students pauses too long and did not know what they are going to say. It caused they rarely read a book related to English and lack of practice. Sometimes, when they difficult to express their ideas and did not know what its vocabulary, they choosed alternative way to use code mixing and code switching. Thus, in this case lack of vocabulary was affected students to speak fluently because they difficult to expressing idea spontaneously.

The teachers' suupport is needed in development of students' speaking fluency (Anggraeni et al., 2020). The support was giving like some activities such as; every Tuesday morning, the English teacher asked the student to performed their English talent especially on speech. The teacher gave the schedule for every class, the member of the class choosen 5 students to prepare their performed. The student would speech in the yard of the school and the performance seen by all the students and the teachers. The students were given half an hour to performe their speech and their performance will be assessed by the teacher and will be input into skill scores. This activity was carried out to improve speaking fluency of the students (Fitriani et al., 2020; Marwati & Syamsudarni, 2020).

In learning process, the teachers also asked the students should be mastered on these skills especially on speaking. On the other hand, the school also applied a program to improve their speaking ability. Its program is English week program students must speak English arround the school whether in the classroom, outside, with their friend, their

teacher and the staff. Thus, supposed by that program the students have opportunity to fluent in speaking.

Generally the problem occurs when the students speak to others; the students tried to make the hearers understand about what they want to say (Salam Mairi, 2016) . The students tended to hesitate and fragmentary while speaking. This condition made the students speak hesistantly and fragmented, as mean the frequency of pause filler such as “mmm” and “eee” and also the production of disfluency such as repetition, repair and also restart.

Based on the problem above the researcher expect to conduct the research to know How are the level of students’ speaking fluency ? and What are factors students’ disfluency in speaking?

METHODS

Research Design

Research design is the set of methods and procedures used in collecting and analyzing the research. In this research, the researcher use the descriptive quantitative. Quantitative as a numerical method of describing information or a result of a study and it deals with a mathematical calculation to analyze the data and to search out for the result (Craswell, 2009). The researcher used quantitative research to calculate an ability of students’ speaking fluency and to find out factors influenced students speaking disfluency. The research aims to know the students’ speaking fluency level and factor students’ disfluency at grade XI of MA KMM Kauman Padang Panjang.

Population and Sample

The population in this research is all of students at grade XI of MA KMM Kauman Padang Panjang to get more information about the students’ speaking fluency and factors students’ speaking disfluency. The total populations are 4 classes.

Table 1. The Total of Grade XI Students

No.	Class	Total Students
1.	XI MIPA 1	26 Students
2.	XI MIPA 2	25 Students
3.	XI IPS	27 Students
4.	XI ITT	27 Students
Total		105 Students

Source: Data siswa 2019

In this research, the researcher used purposive sampling technique. The researcher already chosen XI MIPA 2 with total of students are 25 students to be a sample. The researcher choosed XI MIPA 2 class because when the researcher did teaching practice in

that school class XI MIPA 2 is more interested and actived while learning English especially in speaking.

Instrument of the Research

The instrument was used in this research were test and questionnaire. Test aims to know how students' speaking fluency level and questionnaire aims to know what are factors students' speaking disfluency. Test requires the students' short talk to be recorded. The test was used by researcher to know the students' level in speaking fluency. Second, the instrument is questionnaire. The researcher used close questionnaire to find the data. In this research, the researcher gives questionnare in order to know factors students' speaking disfluency.

Technique of collecting Data

The researcher collected data by using oral test. The researcher explained to the students how to do the test. By doing test, the researcher gave five topics to the students. Each students choosed one topic that they wanted and delivered a short talk for 2 minutes long to be record after 20 minutes preparation and not allowed to bring any helping aids like note, picture and so on.

Questionnaire contain of 20 questions to know factors of disfluency. The questions divided into five indicators; task difficulty, meaning-focused, time pressure, planning and preparation and task repetition. In respond to the questionnaire, students indicate wheteher she or he is Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Netral (N), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD) about the questions.

Table2. Level of Speaking Fluency

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

Source : Mairi et al (2017)

Tabel 3. Likert Scale

Point Value	Explanation	Average Score
5	Strongly Agree	4,01-5,00
4	Agree	3,01-4,00

3	Neutral	2,01-3,00
2	Disagree	1,01-2,00
1	Strongly Disagree	0,00-1,00

Source : Mairi et al (2017)

After collected the data, the speaking test recorded analysed by four speaking fluency measurement which are Speech Rate (SR), Pause Rate (PR), Disfluent Syllable (DS) and Mean Length of Run (MLR). The data was calculated by using Stockdale' theory as follow (Stockdale, 2009:5):

a. Speech Rate (SR)

$$SR = \frac{\text{Number of Syllable}}{\text{Times in Second}} \times 60$$

Speech Rate Score

$$SRS = \frac{\text{Speech rate}}{230} \times 100$$

b. Pause Rate (PR)

$$PR = \frac{\text{Total of Pause Time}}{\text{The Number of Total Pause}} \times 100$$

Pause Rate Score

$$PRS = 100 - \left(\frac{\text{Total Pause Time}}{120} \times 100 \right)$$

c. Disfluent Syllable (DS)

$$DS = \frac{\text{The Number of Disfluent Syllable}}{\text{The Total Number of Syllable}} \times 100$$

Disfluent Syllable Score

$$DFS = 100 - \left(\frac{\text{Total Number of Disfluent Syllable}}{230} \times 120 \right)$$

d. The Mean Length of Run (MLR)

$$MLR = \frac{\text{Total Number of Syllables}}{\text{Total Number of runs}}$$

The data analysed by using computer softwares which are Audacity and Microsoft Excel. Then scores of students would categories into 6 level whether Disfluent (D), Limited Fluency (LF), Intemediate Fluency (IF), Good Fluency (GF), Advanced Fluency (AF) and Native-Like Fluency (NLF).

For the questionnaire, Likert Scale used to measure the students' disfluency in speaking. In order, to get the mean score of data the researcher used the formula that suggested by Sudijono as follow (Sudijono, 2014:80):

$$M = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

M : Mean

$\sum x$: Total Score

N : Total Responden

RESULTS

a. Test

The data based on the test used to know students' speaking fluency level. Test had given by the students was five topics and they choosed one of the topic to speak. After the researcher collected recording of the students, the researcher got the students' data to be analysed. To know the students' speaking fluency level, the researcher used the table as follow:

Table 4. The Students' Speaking Fluency Level Analysis.

Sample	Speech Rate (SR)	Pause Rate (PR)	Disfluent Syllable (DS)	Mean Length of Run (MLR)	Total Score	Level	Description
1	134,0	79,12	10,4	11,82	58,29	3	Good
2	143,5	81,6	12,9	13,04	55,57	3	Good
3	178,0	53,84	7,0	29,50	64,50	3	Good
4	160,4	79,07	10,3	16,37	58,55	3	Good
5	173,9	73,01	5,6	21,06	64,37	3	Good
6	149,0	75,97	7,1	16,55	54,35	3	Good
7	106,7	79,46	11,8	10,00	55,95	3	Good
8	141,8	60,32	10,9	10,57	57,06	3	Good
9	118,3	74,44	10,7	10,75	53,17	3	Good
10	126,3	62,96	15,1	13,76	57,78	3	Good
11	113,6	62,10	17,2	10,92	53,51	3	Good
12	114,1	56,40	17,9	10,17	50,12	3	Good
13	129,5	59,29	16,5	10,41	53,75	3	Good
14	167,0	47,79	7,2	15,04	59,92	3	Good
15	162,0	47,46	10,7	20,68	64,59	3	Good
16	121,6	60,09	12,4	11,21	54,11	3	Good
17	159,2	54,78	11,5	16,58	59,69	3	Good
18	122,7	62,44	15,4	11,37	52,94	3	Good
19	155,4	52,42	11,1	12,7	60,06	3	Good
20	113,3	45,08	15,1	10,04	53,54	3	Good
21	123,0	66,94	12,6	11,18	56,18	3	Good

22	103,4	52,13	20,8	9,93	49,78	2	Intermediate
23	104,6	46,37	26,11	9,17	50,28	2	Intermediate
24	116,4	63,76	14,21	12,00	52,70	3	Good
25	107,4	62,30	24,84	10,01	50,21	3	Good
TOTAL	3334,2	1563,63	336,53	334,83	1395,68		
MEAN	133,4	62,55	13,46	13,39	55,83	3	Good

It was found that the answer of the first research question seen that most students had low speaking fluency level. In fact, the average speaking fluency level of the grade XI of MA KMM Kauman Padang Panjang is level 3 or Good with the average 55,83 for the 4 measurement. In addition, the table showed that there are exactly 23 students in level 3 (Good) and 2 students in level 2 (Intermediate) from the total 25 students.

b. Questionnaire.

The researcher collect data based on the questionnaire used to identify factors of students' disfluency in speaking. Questionnaire had given by the students, the questions consist of five indicators and they gave a checklist on column whether they Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD). After the researcher collected the answer of the students, the researcher got the students' data to be analyze. To identify the students' factors of students' disfluency in speaking, the researcher used the table as follow:

Table 5. The Analysis of Disfluency Factors

Sample	Difficult task		Meaning focused		Time pressure		Planning and preparation		Task repetition	
	S	D	S	D	S	D	S	D	S	D
1	4,25	SA	2,75	N	3,75	A	3,75	A	2,75	N
2	3,5	A	3,25	A	3,25	A	2,25	N	2,75	N
3	3,75	A	3,25	A	3,5	A	3	N	3	A
4	3,5	A	3,5	A	3,25	A	2,5	N	3,25	A
5	4,25	SA	3,75	A	3	N	2,25	N	2,75	N
6	3,75	A	2,75	N	4,75	SA	4	A	2,75	N
7	4	A	3,5	A	4	A	3,5	A	2,50	N
8	3,5	A	4	A	3	N	2,5	N	3	A
9	3,75	A	3,25	A	4	A	3,25	A	3	A
10	3,5	A	2,5	N	3	N	3,5	A	2,50	N

11	4,5	SA	3,25	A	4,75	SA	5	SA	2,75	N
12	3,5	A	3,75	A	4	A	4,25	SA	3	A
13	3,75	A	3,5	A	4	A	4	A	4	A
14	4,25	SA	3,25	A	4	A	5	SA	2,75	N
15	3,5	A	2,5	N	4,75	SA	4,5	SA	2,25	N
16	3,75	A	2,75	N	4	A	3,5	A	2,50	N
17	3,75	A	3,5	A	2,75	N	3,5	A	2,75	N
18	3,75	A	3	N	3,75	A	3,25	A	3,25	A
19	4	A	3	N	3	N	3,75	A	2,50	N
20	3,75	A	2,75	N	3,25	A	3,25	A	3,50	A
21	4	A	3,25	A	3	N	2,75	N	2,50	N
22	4,25	SA	3,5	A	4,25	A	5	SA	3	A
23	4	A	3,5	A	3,75	A	3,75	A	3	A
24	4,75	SA	2,5	N	4	A	4,5	SA	3	A
25	3,75	A	3,5	A	3,75	A	3,5	A	2,75	N
MEAN	3,88	A	3,2	A	3,7	A	3,6	A	2,87	N

S= Score D=Description

SA : Strongly Agree

A : Agree

N : Neutral

D : Disagree

SD : Strongly Disagree

It was found that the answer of the second research question seen that most students agreed (4) that factors disfluency in speaking are task difficulty, meaning focused, time pressure, planning and preparation. The most students' answered is Neutral (3) it mean task repetition is not an important factor to their disfluency. In fact, the average of disfluency in speaking based on five indicators of the grade XI of MA KMM Kauman Padang Panjang is Agree (A), such as task difficulty is 3,88 (A), meaning focused is 3,2 (A), time pressure is 3,7 (A), planning and preparation is 3,6 (A) and task repetition is 2,87 (N) .

DISCUSSION

This research was to complete two research questions. First how are the level of students' speaking fluency level and second what are factors of students' disfluency in speaking. The researcher also used two instruments test and questionnaire. Test aims to know students' fluency level and questionnaire aims to know factors students' disfluency in

speaking. Based on the data analysis above, the researcher analysed the data used Stockdale's theory to find out students' speaking fluency level and mean score' formula to find out factors of students' disfluency in speaking.

a. Test

In this finding, the measurement of students' speaking fluency level consist of speech rate, pause rate, disfluent syllable and the mean length of run. It was found that the students' speaking fluency is level 3 (Good). Jong and Hulstjin in Mairi stated "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 not too many long pauses, and does not sound staccato (51-70)" (Mairi, 2016 : 164). It will be discussed below:

First, speech rate (SR). From the data on table 4.2, the average of syllable found on the research were 133 syllables per minute to the average of normal syllable was 162-230 syllables. It seen that the students could rounded up 58% of the normal average number of the syllable. The students have to cover ground the lack of 42%. Thus, the score of 58 means mostly the students had good level of speech rate.

Second, Pause Rate (PR). It could be seen on figure 4.1 that the pause rate score of the students was 63. It means the students had lower score on pause rate. It was not to deny the fact that the students who had more pauses and better speaking fluency level. Getting score 63 out 100 points is considered not good with more than half of speech was filled pauses, errors and repetitions. It conclude that most students were not really fluent because the highpause rate.

Third, disfluent syllable. According to the data, It was found that students' disfluent syllable rate was actually low. It was only 14%. It means that most students did not find so many difficulties in minimizing the difluent syllable involvement when their speech. It is proven by their high disfluent syllable score at 86 points. It is a good accomplishment since the students are EFL learner.

Fourth, Mean Length of Run. The current mean length of run of the students on the speaking showed that the average mean length of runs of those students speech still low. It is 13% of the total short talks delivered. It indicates most of students had lower score. Mostly, the average score still shows the unexpected number.

b. Qustionnaire

In this finding, it can be seen the second research question is factors of students' speaking disfluency. The questionnaire consisted 20 questions which were divided into five indicators task difficulty, meaning focused, time pressure, planning and preparation and task repetition. These five indicators will be discussed below:

First, task difficulty. This factor includes several component such as background knowledge, lessons, learned, topics and the familiarity of the task to the students' background knowledge. The students' answered based the statement about task difficulty had the result 3,88. Most of the students were agreed about the statement that the task was difficult.

Second, meaning focused. Speaking test should be meaning focused if its goal is to measure the students' fluency in speaking. When the task is not meaning focused, it will not help the students to increase their good speaking especially in speaking fluency. The students' answers toward the statement about meaning focused had a result of 3.2. Most of the students were agreed which meant meaning focused as a part of disfluency factors.

Next, time pressure. In this research, the researcher applied the time pressure to the students by limiting 20 minutes to preparation and 1-2 minutes to short talk. The time pressure would encourage the students to perform well. In order to know the result, the statements were put in the questionnaire. The students' answers toward the statement about time pressure had a result of 3.6. Most of the students were agreed which meant the students can not perform well without the existence of time pressure.

Then, planning and preparation. Planning and preparation is very important to the students before performing the task. The students did not get enough time for planning and preparation so that they could perform well. It seems based on the result planning and preparation had 3.7 it meant they were agreed planning and preparation is important in students' speaking fluency.

Last, task repetition. This factor includes 4 statements were questioning if the students can speak about the task that they had ever done previously. The result of task repetition had 3.39. This answer meant that they agree to put task repetition as not an important factor to their disfluency.

CONCLUSION

The purposes of this research were to describe speaking fluency level and to identify disfluency factors in speaking of grade XI of MA KMM Kauman Padang Panjang. This research used two instruments; speaking test and questionnaire.

Based on data analysis of speaking test, it was found that most students achieved level 3 or Good fluency level. However, the data also showed two students were at level 2 or Intermediate. Therefore, it is believed that the students at grade XI of MA KMM Kauman Padang Panjang still need to be aware and to concern more on how to improve the fluency level of those in level 2 or Intermediate. Moreover, it is also necessary to concern about the improvement of the students in level 3 or Good. In fact, it was found that disfluent syllable and pause rate were high. The pause rate was the main holders and problems so that the students find it difficult to achieve a higher level.

In addition, based on the questionnaire of factors disfluency. It was found that most students agreed (4) that factors disfluency in speaking are task difficulty, meaning focused, time pressure, planning and preparation. The most students' answer is Neutral (3) of task repetition, it means task repetition is not an important factor to their disfluency. Thus, implementing the 4 methods which are creating easier task with progressive difficulty, giving appropriate time pressure, planning and preparation well and making meaning focused task to counter those disfluency factors can be helpful in developing a better method of fluency development.

Based on the findings of the researcher. There are some suggestions given based on this research :

1. To the students of grade XI of MA KMM Kauman Padang Panjang the researcher suggests them to practice more so that they could improve their speaking fluency. It is suggested to develop more materials, create more meaning focused activity, progressive task difficulty, and giving more time for the students to plan and prepare themselves. This action will help students achieve higher speaking fluency level and getting better in their speaking ability.
2. For the next researcher, it is expected to include more variable like perceived base test so there will be more comprehensive study of fluency.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

As a result, the writer want to highly express her sincere gratitude and appreciation to the following person for their valuable contributions.

1. Hilma Pami Putri, M. Pd as advisor for her care, time, attention, guidance, valuable advices, suggestion, critics and patience in accomplishing this thesis. Her suggestions and contributions are highly appreciated.
2. All of the lectures who have given their knowledge, ideas, and contributions to the completion of this journal and educated his precious things in many fields during his study.
3. The writer also shows thanks to beloved family, especially for my dad and mom (Aditya Warman and Syafrida, SE), all of my sisters (Fania Aditya, Afifa Aditya and Jihan Aprilda Aditya) who had given their love, pray, and supports to accomplish this thesis soon.
4. The writer also shows thanks to beloved friend Annisa Rahma Nada, Asih Sari Ningrum, Nova syafitri, Indah Paramitha, Ari Saputra, Gebi Rahmatia Putry, Sridewi Sartika, Serly Dwitina, and Yolanda Putri Asyuthi. Thanks for them support, motivate, and give suggestion to finish this study.

REFERENCES

- Anggraeni, W., Wahibah, & Faqihuddin Assafari, A. (2020). Teachers' Strategies in Teaching Speaking Skills at SMAN 1 Palopo. *FOSTER: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 83-97. <https://doi.org/10.24256/foster-jelt.v1i1.9>
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. Longman. New York: Pearson Education.
- Cameron, Lynne. 2001 *Teaching Language to Young Learners*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Farahani, A. & Kouhpaenejad, M. (2017). *The Relationship between Temporal Measures of Oral Fluency and Ratings of Fluency: A Case of Iranian Advanced EFL Learners*. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. Volume: 05 Issue: 03 July-September, 2017

- Fernanda, Yogi. 2014. *Speaking Activity in The English Literary Classroom*. Sumatera Barat: STKIP PGRI Sumbar.
- Fitriani, A., Rustan, & Yahya, A. (2020). Show and Tell Technique in Teaching Speaking Skills at SMAN 2 Palopo. *FOSTER: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(2), 98-113. <https://doi.org/10.24256/foster-jelt.v1i2.12>
- J., W., Creswell. 2009. *Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approach*. (University of Nebraska-Lincoln: Sage.
- Luoma, S. 2004. *Assessing Speaking*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marwati, & Syamsudarni. (2020). Improving Students' Speaking Skill Through Drama at the Eighth Grade of SMPN 9 Palopo. *FOSTER: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 41-54. <https://doi.org/10.24256/foster-jelt.v1i1.6>
- Nation and Newton. 2009. *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking*. New York: Routledge
- Nunan, David. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. Singapore: McGrawHill.
- Schmidt, R. 1992. *Psychological Mechanism Underlying Second Language Fluency. Studies in Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stockdale, D. Ashley. 2009. *Comparing Perception of Oral Fluency to Objective Measures in the EFL Classroom (Unpublished Thesis)*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.