A Naturalistic Study Design of The Warm-Up Prompt and Online Planning Effect on Fluency in Informal Dialogues

Hanafi
Universitas Andalas Padang

***Corresponding Authors**
Email: hanafi@hum.unand.ac.id

Abstract

As many studies on pre-task planning and a few on online planning were designed in experimental settings, this research article offers a naturalistic model for investigating the effect of warm-up prompt and online planning effect on fluency in informal dialogues. Among Skehan's (1996) three parameters of oral language performance, the researcher focused only on measuring the fluency of two male Indonesian learners of English as a Second Language. The participants were also explicitly prepared for the topic through preconditioning information and warm-up prompts. They were also implicitly allowed to have 'rapid planning' (Ochs, 1979) or online planning strategy in response to the questions. Their entire informal conversations were audio-taped, transcribed, and analyzed according to Ellis and Barkhuizen's (2005) scheme of measuring spoken language. The result shows that participants of different proficiencies committed errors of fluency by choice as their online planning strategy. However, the high proficient learner produced fewer errors that the low proficient learner did. They both used the errors for making rapid / online planning to buy time but for two different purposes. The high proficient speaker planned for strategic purposes and formulating a better answer while the low proficient speaker planned mostly for overcoming shortage of vocabularies. The errors were also found to be used in combined format thereby giving the full time-buying benefit for the speakers in their online planning mode.

Keywords*: naturalistic study design, warm-up prompt, online planning, fluency*

INTRODUCTION

Studies of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) continuously have attracted researchers from various perspectives and disciplines encompassing linguistics, psychology, sociology, and education (Pica, 2005). Researchers are still in debate concerning the formal origin of this study. Many believed that Corder's construct of "Transitional Competence" (1967), Selinker's concept of "Interlanguage" (henceforth IL) (1972), and Richards' notion of "Error Analysis" (henceforth EA) (1974) were argued to provide the underlying research principles for works in this field (Pica, 2005). This formal research evidences may confirm the claim that the shifting focus on observing language acquisition phenomena from language teaching to language learning methods resulted from a long psychological debate over the nature of learning in 1960s (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991, p.5). Therefore, Corder's research may seem to have initiated such new research agenda of recent SLA studies because fast growing interest in this field was evidenced by the four-folded growth of SLA articles published in various journals during 1978-1980 (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Raimes, 1983).

In later studies, conceptual details of IL and EA theories has been further analyzed and refined. The term "error" was critically distinguished from unsystematic "mistakes" (Corder, 1981) which is argued to result from

unsystematic flaws in language performance while IL reconsidered error more as an "idiosyncratic dialect" (Corder, 1971). However, IL may still be regarded as a more appropriate approach in SLA largely due to its emphasis on the continuum of "nativelike"-ness (Selinker, 1972). Through this continuum, the growth of second language (L2) proficiency cannot be interpreted as always improving because the language acquisition development may cease to upgrade at a certain point. Language learners may undergo a fossilized pace in their attainment in which their language ability can no longer undergo further improvement no matter how hard the learners try. This fossilized condition is typical of L2 development and commonly experienced by most L2 learners (Ellis, 1997). Accordingly, learners normally develop ongoing strategies to cope with their learning difficulties. This paper intends to assess whether this strategy is successful by means of measuring learner language performance.

Measuring learner language performance

To analyze learner language performance, Skehan (1996a) had set three parameters of measurement in oral performance particularly with regard to foreign language learning. They are accuracy, complexity, and fluency. Accuracy constitutes the well-formed production of the target language in compliance with the target language's rules (Skehan, 1996b). Complexity refers to "the stage and elaboration of the underlying interlanguage system" (Skehan, 1996a, p.46) and fluency is defined as the production of language in real time uninterrupted by excessive pauses or hesitations. Fluency constitutes the real-time production of language uninterrupted by pauses and hesitation (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005; Skehan, 1996b, p.22). Due to the space limit, this study model concentrates on assessing how the fluency of the participants whose informal and loosely-structured dialogues were audio-recorded were influenced by warm-up prompts and online planning strategies.

The role of pre-task and online planning in fluency measurement

In light of oral proficiency measurement, a number of studies have also shown that provision of planning time would certainly help learners improving their output to be more comprehensible and more native-like (Crookes, 1989; Ellis, 1987; Foster & Skehan, 1996; Ortega, 1999; Yuan & Ellis, 2003). Planning time is best in favour of complexity and accuracy in the oral performance (Crookes, 1989; Mehnert, 2000; Yuan & Ellis, 2003). Yuan and Ellis (2003) found out that pre-task planning and online planning influence fluency in different ways. On the one hand, pre-task planning provides more time and allows better preparation for a speaker to engage in oral production. On the other hand, when the speakers are given planning time only as they produce oral output, their fluency level is affected because they need to divide their attention and decide whether to attend on form or meaning (Yuan & Ellis, 2003).

Unlike pre-task planning, online planning occurs in an accelerated and ongoing pace while a speaker is talking which allows the speaker to plan or replan his/her speech and monitors the output. This online planning may also be conceptualized as the 'rapid planning' or 'unplanned language use' (1979) since they both use very limited time to plan and produce speech at the same time. In this respect, a study on the effect of online planning may have been slowed down in its

development since the nature of this study require a more naturalistic setting which may reside in SLA discipline rather than the common experimental study design in language teaching or learning discipline. Accordingly, this very study is designed to fill in the empty space on the literature of measuring fluency in relation to warm-up prompts and online planning strategy.

A plenty of recent studies on pre-task planning effect on oral performance have been conducted in task-based experimental settings (e.g. Khatib & Mehrang & Rahimpour, 2010; Abdi, Eslami, & Zahedi, 2012; Moradi & Talebi, 2014; Farahanynia, 2020). These studies appear to have confirmed the learners' strategic benefit of using pre-task planning procedures / prompts in performing monologic talk in terms of their complexity and fluency. Nevertheless, there were only a few studies done on online planning effect on fluency (e.g. Yuan & Ellis, 2003; Baleghizadeh & Shahri, 2013) possibly due to the fact that the construct of online planning is relatively new and has not manifested in measurable explication premises (Yuan and Ellis, 2003, p.5). There were even fewer studies, which may be closed to none, done on the effect on online planning on fluency in naturalistic setting.

METHOD

To measure learners' oral fluency, this study used the naturalistic design where speakers were simply directed to the task casually and informally through a simple preconditioning prompt in a realistic conversation with the researcher. Through this informal setting and unstructured dialogue, the participants' true level of oral performance can be consequently elicited as naturalistically as possible and measured as accurately as possible.

Research Questions

Despite different conditions and consequences of planning time, giving a clue and letting a speaker think for seconds about it before asking them to produce oral outputs is surely useful and facilitative for the content of production but fortunately influential for fluency. However, most studies in planning time were mostly conducted in monologic situation (Foster & Skehan, 1996; Mehnert, 2000; Yuan & Ellis, 2003). Therefore, this research intends to find out the effect of pre-prompt signs and online planning on the topic of the question proposed to a speaker with regard to a dialogic situation. Does leading speakers with warm-up questions and online planning to their particularly favorite topic on an ongoing relax dialogue help their fluency level? How different in fluency do high and low proficient speakers express their thoughts on the topic by the help of warm-up questions and the online planning strategy?

Participants

For this research, two participants from different language backgrounds were invited to join in. Both were Indonesians whose second language was Indonesian. The first participant is David Frank, a 25-year-old sophomore male student at Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology. David speaks Indonesian as a second language while his first language is Hok Kien, a Chinese dialect. He has learned English as a foreign language since his elementary schools. After having a 3-year preparation in IDP's English course in Medan before departing to Australia,

David proved that he had obtained a good command of English. His IELTS score was 6.5 overall and 6 for his speaking test. Since his arrival in Australia, his oral proficiency of English was assumed to have developed because he was an active student who engaged himself not only in academic but also social environment. Therefore, David Frank became the model for a high proficiency learner of EFL in this study.

The second informant is a 28-year-old Indonesian man, Agus. This 28-year-old Javanese man staying in Melbourne temporarily as a spouse to his student wife. This made it as his first time living in an English-speaking country. Three years before arriving in Australia, Agus undertook an institutional Paper-Based TOEFL with a score of around 500 (he could not recall his exact score). During his high school period in Indonesia, Agus learned English at LIA (*Lembaga Indonesia Amerika*), an English course founded by an Indonesian-American joint foundation, for one year. This English course institution is commonly known for applying a grammar-based approach in its language teaching that emphasizes more on grammar skills rather than communicative skills. Therefore, in spite of benefiting from the leading questions and loose structure of conversation, it is assumed that Agus' fluency of oral English production would still be relatively lower than David.

Recording: Data Elicitation

To elicit data, a separately 10-minute meeting with each of the participants was arranged during their leisure time. The convenient time, i.e. at lunch break, was deliberately chosen in the hope that the participants would equally feel as conveniently as they possibly were. David was interviewed at his home and Agus was recorded at an Indonesian restaurant. Then, both were informed in a plain language that this study is intended to know about their English mastery only and that their response to the simple questions would be recorded. They were informed that since the researcher would ask a few questions they feel easy and enjoyable to answer, their confirmation as to whether questions about movies would be easy and exciting for them was demanded. Fortunately, both participants enthusiastically admitted that they like watching movies and confirmed that it was a very interesting topic for them.

In this regard, this clear preconditioning information and loose structure of conversation may be seemingly necessary to help them speak as fluent as they could in the absence of time and task pressures. Also, the prompts were simple and consist of general questions which partially encouraged them with an online planning time. This procedure did not constitute a fully planned time task-based performance measurement because it was performed in a naturalistic informal conversation at a place of their choice. Participants were not explicitly suggested to formulate their answer but implicitly encouraged to have a 'rapid planning' (Ochs, 1979) while talking. The data elicitation setting resembled as closely as possible to the normal conversational setting between friends or acquaintances thereby minimizing all possible effects commonly resulting from experimental situation.

In the process of data elicitation, participants were firstly asked about movies they liked. David was directly asked about his most favourite kind of movie as a warm up question. As he appeared to have warmed up enough, David was asked to explain one particular movie that he felt mostly interesting. During his reply, an extremely minimum interruption or back-channelled was applied in order

for him to produce his most fluent uninterrupted description. At the end, he was thanked and the recording was ended. Similarly, Agus was also asked about the kind of movie he liked. Regardless the researcher's assessment that he might have not been ready as indicated by his short answer to the warm-up question, Agus was prompted to mention one particular movie and describe why he took it as his favourite film. Finally, he managed to provide a long reply.

Data Transcription and Analysis

After completing the data collection procedure, recorded conversations with both participants were orthographically transcribed, each of which consists of the warm-up talk and the long remark. The analysis of fluency has actually begun from the transcribing process where measurement aspects such as pause lengths, false stars, repetitions, etc. were identified, marked, and coded as throughout the transcription. Once the transcription is fully completed, the analysis of fluency measurement was performed according to Ellis and Barkhuizen's system of measuring spoken language (2005, pp.156-158; Foster, Tonkyn, & Wigglesworth, 2000).

Table 1. Transcription Codes (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005, p.147)

Key	Meaning
//	AS Unit boundary
::	subordinate clause boundary
{ }	disfluency
( )	pause more than 0.5 seconds
(…)	pause less or equal 0.5 seconds
-	incomplete word being pronounced

RESULTS

Based on the transcription, there are two parts of the dialogues extracted as data, i.e. warm-up and long remarks. Extracts of the short and long remarks from both participants are provided as follows:

Extract 1. Warm-up remark: David

1 H: // eerr what is actually {eerr (1.5)} movie you like most? //
2 D: // (2.9) {mmhh} if you are talking about movie, :: I think that :: {0.6} I prefer ::
3 {1.8} that something that related with {eerr like} the science :: because I have
4 {(0.6) eerr pa- a} passion about the science or technology especially // {(0.9)
5 mmmhhhh (0.8) which can make} which can add {en-} knowledge for me //
6 {about} like {the (1.5)} the development of science in nowsaday.// I think that ::
7 {yuh I'd-} I like the movie about that // you know // (0.6) yup.//

(Total answering time 32.4 seconds)

Measurement of fluency begins from the end of the interviewer's question to the end of the participant's response. In this first remark, David used 32.4 seconds to complete his response.

Extract 2. Warm-up remark: Agus

1 H: // *Mas* Agus, {eerr} I would like to ask you {eerr} one question. //
2 A: // Yup //
3 H: // {er um..(1.0) er what-} what kind of movie do you like? //
4 A: // {eerr} I think is {(1.6) action (…)} action movie :: {eerr (…)} then (…) drama :::
5 (1.6)} and (1.2) just like the legend movie like {er …} samurai X :: (…) like {er
6 (…)} Troy // (…) yes (1.0) // {and (…)} that's it. // Yup. //

(Total answering time 22.40 seconds)

In his turn, Agus made use of 22.40 seconds to answer the warm-up question. The two responses were then measured to identify the level of participants' fluency. Table 2 presents comparative analyses of fluency between the two participants' short remarks.

Table 2. Comparison of fluency in warm-up remark

Measure	**Extract 1 David**	**Extract 2 Agus**
Speech rate (syllable per second)	2.7	1.4
Pause length (seconds)	11.7	8
Average length of run	5.5	5
False starts	-	-
Repetitions (words)	4	1
Reformulations	3	4
Replacements	2	1

In the first phase of the dialogues, i.e. the warm-up remarks, David clearly produced higher rate of syllable than Agus did. They both have almost similar level of average length of run and equally did not make any false start. However, David surprisingly committed more pauses, repetition, and replacements than Agus, which might indicate that David did not do very well in his warm-up remark. However, the fact that David produced longer answer (more or less 10 seconds longer than Agus') may be able to explain why David was detected to make such mistakes (Corder, 1971) whereas Agus produced shorter response and made use of almost as long pause as David used that might avoid him from making more mistakes.

Now, let us turn to the long remark. The following extract comes from David's long response to the interviewer's primary question:

Extract 3. Long remark: David

1 H: // That movie? //
2 D: // yup //
3 H: // Okay // {eerr} could you mention {one (…)} one particular movie :: that you
4 like most? //
5 D: // {(1.2) mmhh (1.5)} I think :: that last time {I (0.7)} I saw in discovery channel
6 {that is eerr (1.1) mmhh (3.3) oh (…) eerr} // the title of the movie is 'Beyond
7 Our Future' {(1.2)} // is in the discovery channel // is {eerr} give more knowledge
8 :: about {(0.6)} what will be our future looks like. // For example :: maybe in the

future :: maybe most of our time we spent :: like {(1.4) mmhh} sitting in front of computer in our house. // Maybe we do every transaction :: maybe buy like the vegetable (unclear) :: everything from the internet. {(0.7)} // Maybe we talking to our friend :: maybe like not via the phone anymore // maybe all them via the internet. // I'm really really interested in that movie {(0.8)} // because {I can see that (1.0) nowadays en} I think // that there is a little bit concept of that movie :: we can realize // you know. // I mean to that :: we can see in the reality. // For example {(0.7) eerr now (…)} nowsaday we spend {most of our (…)} most of our time in front of computer :: maybe {looking er} doing our {(0.9)} simple job :: like {er} word processing :: {(0.5) mmhh (0.8)} playing the games :: (…) lots of them :: you know // we spend our time in front of computer. // {So I think that (…) that movie is (1.0)} you feel something like the truth :: you know // about what will happen in the future. //

(Total answering time 1 minute 32.20 seconds)

As David used 1 minute and 32.20 seconds in his turn to give a long answer, Agus took a little shorter time to complete his long answer as shown in the following extract:

Extract 4. Long remark: Agus

H: // {oohh (…) eerr (…)} why do you like that movie? //
A: // eerr //
H: // Could you mention one movie (and} and could you tell me about that? //
A: // Okay (…) okay. // {I like er (0.9) egs- …} for example like {uumm} Troy // {(0.8) because (…) I like thi-} I like this movie because I {(1.0) I's- I's eerr (2.4) beside this eerr} // you know :: {the star- the star (…)} the guest star is {eerr (…)} Brad Pitt // {is a good (…)} is good act // {and then eerr (1.5) he {(0.8) can (1.1) can (…) what is that oh can act like er like er (…)} I don't remember what's his name in {the (…)} Troy // {and that (…) and then (1.9) eeerrr (1.8) this I- I can-} I can learn about this history of Troy {…} I can learn about the {history of Turkeys (…)} Turkey's history. // And then {(1.4) yeah (…) yeah because (1.0)} because I can learn :: and then I can know {what's what's} what's happen in this past year (…) the (0.8)} // a century ago // about this Turkeys :: {about (…)} maybe about the Japan // about the samurai X in the Samurai X. // That's it. // Yup. // Thanks. //

(Total answering time 1 minute 11.50 seconds)

Despite the minor time difference, both speakers consumed relatively the same amount of time to provide answer for the similar question. The level of participants' fluency from these long remarks were then measured and presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Comparison of long remarks

Measure	Extract 3 David	Extract 4 Agus
Speech rate (syllable per minute)	189	112
Pause length (seconds)	17	21
Average length of run	6.2	5
False starts	2	3
Repetitions (words)	4	15
Reformulations	2	4
Replacements	2	5
Self-Clarification	-	1

In this table, fluency performances between the two participants from two different proficiency levels were proved to be different. As the high proficient ESL learner, David still managed to produce a higher rate of syllable and less pause length. On the contrary, Agus committed more false starts, repeated more words, reformulated more words and phrases and made more replacements. Overall, David still used much more time and produced longer answer but did fewer pauses, fewer false starts, and repeated words. He also reformulated and replace fewer words or phrases than Agus did. Another criterion discovered here is the 'self-clarification' formula' which allows the speaker to buy some extra time, e.g. Agus' clarification-seeking question "*what is that*?" (Extract 4, line 5).

DISCUSSION

As far as the research questions are concerned, the fluency measurement shows that a casual leading-up prompt as implemented in the first session as warm-up question ("*what kind of movie you like / you like most*") managed to prepare the speakers for the longer run of oral performance in the later session. Unlike in many previous studies' experimental settings (Khatib & Mehrang & Rahimpour, 2010; Abdi, Eslami, & Zahedi, 2012; Moradi & Talebi, 2014; Farahanynia, 2020), the informal setting of the conversation taking place at a venue convenient for the speaker seems to have played a facilitative role for the speaker to have sufficient preparation for their talk as evidenced through their speech production. Agus and David gave short answer (less than one minute) when they were asked about a topic they admitted as their favorite one. Despite few disfluencies, David managed to provide longer and more complex output than Agus. Later on in the longer session, David made it up by providing longer but more fluent remark. Overall, in terms of fluency, David demonstrated a higher level of oral proficiency than Agus did which was indicated by more fluent output David managed to produce.

Despite showing a better fluency performance, David still experienced some disfluencies through his exercise of pauses, fillers, like-phrase, and repetitions, such as:

1. (2.9) {mmhh} (Extract 1, line 2)
2. :: I think that :: {0.6} (Extract 1, line 2)
3. {eerr like} (Extract 1, line 3)
4. {(0.9) mmmhhhh (0.8) which can make} (Extract 1, line 5)

5. {that is eerr (1.1) mmhh (3.3) oh (…) eerr} (Extract 3, line 6)
6. {(0.7) eerr now (...)} (Extract 3, line 16)
7. {most of our (…)} most of our (Extract 3, line 16)

These examples of disfluency appear to be meaningful and systematic as far as planning is concerned. These are not systematic errors that indicate David's effort of finding the vocabulary needed to express his opinion because the speaker clearly has the necessary repertoire of words to respond to this simple question. These dysfluencies appear to be used as online planning devices to buy more time for the speaker to choose a better alternative of response. A combination of those errors had also been used such as the use of false start, short pause, filler, long pause, another false start and filler in example number 5 of David's error of performance shows that these errors are not technical but rather functional. They are employed as strategic tools for making online planning in deciding which movie to be described. Such combinatory errors of fluency may be common in the beginning of a long conversation or prior to decision-making process that a speaker must make in facing a request to produce a response and they cannot be considered as weakness or even mistakes because they are deliberately chosen to be used for strategic purposes. In a natural conversational setting, this kind of dysfluencies is commonly acceptable as long as they do not take bigger proportion of time which forces the listener to wait longer than necessary for the speaker to produce their response.

Unlike David, the second participant, Agus, seemed to make extensive use of online strategies more possibly due to technical reason, i.e. his low level of proficiency. Here are some examples of Agus error of fluency:

1. :: like {er (...)} samurai X (Extract 2, line 5)
2. :: (...) like {er (...)} Troy (Extract 2, line 5-6)
3. {like er (0.9) egs- (…)} (Extract 4, line 4)
4. for example like {uumm} Troy (Extract 4, line 4)
5. I {(1.0) I's- I's eerr (2.4) beside this eerr} (Extract 4, line 5-6)
6. he {(0.8) can (1.1) can (...) what is that oh can act like er like er (…)} (Extract 4, line 7-8)
7. {and that (...) and then (1.9) eeerrr (1.8) this I- I can-} (Extract 4, line 9-10)

In the warm-up session, Agus managed to provide few errors in fluency in spite of his short answer. He gave briefly one-word or phrasal propositions presumably to avoid more mistakes and gain a better performance of fluency. Typically, Agus exemplified his answer in either remark by performing the like-phrase, filler, and pauses. However, in the longer remark, Agus appeared to use more combinatory form of fluency errors which were seemingly used for both technical (finding the right words or sentential arrangement) and strategic purposes (online planning to buy time for finding the correct answer). His performance error number 6 shows that the first combined lines of errors (short pause, repetition, longer pause, clarification) appeared to be more technical where he tried hard to find and reuse the word 'act' (line 6). However, in the last part of those series of error, Agus indicated to use error as the online planning for accessing his long-termed memory to find a specific information. His self-clarification afterwards ("I don't remember what's his name in {the (…)} Troy") confirmed this use of error for such

meaningful reason.

From the error perspective, the words '*like'* mostly followed by noun were intended to create a simple formulaic answer of 'like-phrase'. This like-phrase means a simple formulaic exemplification by adding especially familiar nominal lexical item after the head 'like'. Consequently, the speakers can use this errors to avoid the pressure of making more complex construction that may inhibit their fluency by having this fillers (Mehnert, 2000; Yuan & Ellis, 2003) and simplifying their propositions by making such shorter phrase as the like-phrase.

Finally, during two phases or sessions of the dialogue, both participants appeared to apply almost similar strategies of online planning. There are some strategies that have been identified before in early studies on fluency measurement (Foster & Skehan, 1996; Mehnert, 2000; Ortega, 1999; Yuan & Ellis, 2003) which were confirmed by later empirical research (e.g. Khatib & Mehrang & Rahimpour, 2010; Abdi, Eslami, & Zahedi, 2012; Moradi & Talebi, 2014; Farahanynia, 2020). These strategies include false starts and repetition, which may not only indicate certain level of disfluency but also a strategy of committing an online planning. One strategy both informants made use in their performance is the "you-know" sentence, which may fall under either filler or clarification index. Nevertheless, as previous studies on error performance of fluency (Khatib & Mehrang & Rahimpour, 2010; Abdi, Eslami, & Zahedi, 2012; Moradi & Talebi, 2014; Farahanynia, 2020) apparently focused on the errors under the influence of the first school of thoughts (Corder, 1967, p.162) where errors are considered to be unwanted weakness that should be eliminated from the performance, this study adheres to the other school of thoughts where errors were inevitably, frequently, and even consciously made by the speakers for much more complex reasons and purposes. Therefore, data of conversation should not only be treated quantitatively but also described qualitatively in order to identify evidence for the real purpose of the errors committed by the speakers in their effort of interaction.

CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that the naturalistic setting of data elicitation may have help the research elicit data as authentically as possible, avoid any effect commonly generated from experimental setting, and assure the participants' convenient in following the research procedure. The study also measured the performance of fluency between two ESL learners from Indonesia who lived in Australia and investigated how the online planning strategies were used through the conversational errors that the speakers consciously made. The analyses had confirmed that both speakers were distinct from each other in terms of fluency most primarily due to their different proficiency levels in English language. These different proficiency levels were indicated by the different pattern of the errors they applied in their speech. The high proficient learner had committed errors mostly to buy time and make a more strategic planning while the low proficient speaker used the errors to buy time in order to get the technical tools to complete his delivery of thoughts. In addition, this study discovered that these errors seem to be made by choice, not due to their systematic underdeveloped performance of speaking skill. In other words, the errors were intended for meaningful reason, instead of being due to imperfection in their competencies. Last but not least, this study also discovered that the errors could be made in a combined formation by aligning

alternative forms of fluency errors subsequently in order to provide ample amount of time to achieve the full online planning advantage so that the speakers can fulfill the required conversational task at hand.

LIMITATION

This study has a few limitations which can feed essential information for the future empirical studies on the measurement of fluency. First of all, there were only two participants in this study which may have turned this study to present a study model with the naturalistic design and the qualitative rather than quantitative approach. By using larger number of participants, the next researchers may be able to verify or falsify the finding in this study. Then, this study strictly focused on fluency and disregard the implication of the errors to the other two aspects of learner's oral performance, namely accuracy and complexity. Even though space limit clarification has been made, the findings may be inadequately argued since the description did not include the overall picture of the effects of errors on fluency to the two other important aspect of oral performance. Last but not least, a methodological flaw may disadvantage this study in that the interviewer did not present a uniform question to both speakers. The first question to David was to ask his opinion about the movie he like most while the question for Agus was only about the kind of movie that he liked. These are in fact different in their emphasis and demand for answer. The first question is lighter and less demanding if compared to the second one. To some extent, this difference may play some role in the quality and quantity of the response the learners had provided. Consequently, next researchers may have to make sure that participants are given exactly the same questions in order to avoid different load of pressure on the side of the participants which may eventually affect the elicited data.

REFERENCES

Abdi, M., Eslami, H., & Zahedi, Y. (2012). The impact of pre-task planning on the fluency and accuracy of Iranian EFL learners' oral performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 69, 2281-2288.

Baleghizadeh, S. & Shahri, M. N. N. (2013). The effect of online planning, strategic planning and rehearsal across two proficiency levels. *The Language Learning Journal*, 41. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2013.808258

Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of leaners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 5*, 161-169.

Corder, S. P. (1971). Idiosyncratic Dialect and Error Analysis. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 9*, 147-159.

Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crookes, G. (1989). Planning and interlanguage variation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11*, 367-383.

Ellis, R. (1987). Planning and interlanguage variation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 9*, 12-20.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning and task type on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 12-20.

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

Khatib, M. & Farahanynia, M. (2020). Planning conditions (strategic planning, task repetition, and joint planning), cognitive task complexity, and task type: Effects on L2 oral performance. *System*, 93(102297). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102297

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

Moradi, Z. & Talebi, S. H. (2014). The Effect of Pre-speaking Strategies Instruction in Strategic Planning on Iranian EFL Students' Awareness as well as Students' Fluency and Lexical Resources in Speaking. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1224-1231.

Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. H. (1991). *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Longman.

Mehnert, U. (2000). The effects of different lengths of time for planning on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20*(01), 83-108.

Ochs, E. (1979). Planned and unplanned discourse. In T. Givon (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics* (Vol. 12). New York: Academic Press.

Ortega, L. (1999). Planning and focus on form in L2 oral performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21*, 108-148.

Pica, T. (2005). Second language acquisition research and Applied Linguistics. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 263-380). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Raimes, A. (1983). Tradition and revolution in ESL teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 17*, 535-552.

Richards, J. C. (1974). *Error Analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition*. London: Longman.

Selingker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10*, 209-231.

Skehan, P. (1996a). A Framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 17*, 38-62.

Skehan, P. (1996b). Second-language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In J. Willis & D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching* (pp. 17-30). Oxford: Heinemann.

Yuan, F. & Ellis, R. (2003). The Effects of Pre-Task Planning and On-Line Planning on Fluency, Complexity and Accuracy in L2 Monologic Oral Production. *Applied Linguistics, 24*(1), 1-27.