Chapter IV

Results and Discussions

In this chapter, three main purposes and research finding would be discussed. To begin with, the description of the frequency of using the strategies among EFL learners will be explored in detail. Secondly, the learners' speaking proficiency will be described. Thirdly, the correlation analysis of both variables with Pearson Product moment correlation will be described as well. Finally, this chapter focuses on the discussion within the findings.

Results

This part attempts to present the results of the speaking strategies used, learners' speaking proficiency and lastly, the result of the correlation on the speaking strategies used by EFL learners, and their speaking proficiency.

The speaking strategies used by EFL learners. As discussed previously, the aim of this research was mainly to find out the strategies used by EFL learners of EED UMY batch 2015. As illustrated in Table 4.1, the mean value of the frequency of using the strategies is sharply more than 3.5 value, therefore it is speculated that the most of EFL learners employed the various patterns of speaking strategies differently and received the advantages on using the various strategies. In line with Najafabadi (2014), EFL learners were reported to use groups of the speaking strategies differently. Research finding shows an overall strong concordance with the previous studies in which learners applied various strategies both direct and indirect strategies which appropriate to their needs. The

table below illustrates to respond to the first research question about the most frequent used speaking strategies by EFL learners of UMY batch 2015.

Table 4.1
Mean of Frequency Use Strategies

	N	Minimum	Maximum	**Mean**	Std. Deviation
Metacognitive	312	1	5	**3.86**	.905
Cognitive	260	1	5	**3.75**	.923
Compensation	260	1	5	**3.85**	.871
Memory	260	1	5	**3.71**	.856
Affective	260	1	5	**3.87**	.929
Social	260	2	5	**4.23**	.755
Valid N (listwise)	260				

As displayed in Table 4.1, the statistical analysis results of the strategies used by EFL learners are summarized. In the majority of cases, social strategies revealed a considerably higher level of mean value with mean 4.23 predicated as the most appreciated and the most frequent used strategies by the learners when learning speaking. Compare to the mean value of affective, metacognitive and compensation strategies, have consistent range which were remained the same point of range 0.01 which value on 3.87 (affective), 3.86 (metacognitive), and 3.85 (compensation). It is followed by cognitive strategies which have mean value 3.75, and finally the least preferred strategies, memory strategies (mean= 3.71). The detailed descriptive analysis of each categories have been obtained in each table categories description referring from Oxford (1990) strategies theory including metacognitive, cognitive, compensation, memory, affective, and social strategies. To know the frequency use of the speaking strategies, the researcher

divides the percentages of using the strategies into three including rarely and never as the lowest (did not frequently use the strategies), sometimes (medium), then, often and always as the highest (mostly used the strategies).

Metacognitive strategies. Table 4.2 shows the result of descriptive statistic on the accumulative use of metacognitive strategies among the EFL learners.

Table 4.2
Frequency of Using Metacognitive Strategies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	3	1.0	1	1
	Rarely	15	4.8	4.8	5.8
	Sometimes	90	28.8	28.8	34.6
	Often	120	38.5	38.5	73.1
	Always	84	26.9	26.9	100
	Total	312	100	100	

Table 4.2 shows the participants' responses on using metacognitive strategies. From 52 participants, the number of learners who did not frequently use metacognitive strategies is 5.8% (never + rarely), while medium average is 28.8%, and mostly 65.4% (often + always) of the learners frequently used metacognitive strategies.

Table 4.3
Frequency of Using Cognitive Strategies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	3	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Rarely	17	6.5	6.5	7.7
	Sometimes	82	31.5	31.5	39.2
	Often	98	37.7	37.7	76.9
	Always	60	23.1	23.1	100
	Total	260	100	100	

Cognitive strategies. Table 4.3 above indicates the percentage of using cognitive strategies from 52 of total participants in this study. The highest percentages of using cognitive strategies are remarkably on 68% learners who frequently used cognitive strategies to enhance speaking skill. Afterwards, 31.5% learners used these strategies interpreted as medium, while 7.7% of the learners who did not frequently use these strategies as rarely never.

Table 4.4
Frequency of Using Compensation Strategies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	2	0.8	0.8	0.8
	Rarely	15	5.8	5.8	6.5
	Sometimes	63	24.2	24.2	30.8
	Often	119	45.8	45.8	76.5
	Always	61	23.5	23.5	100
	Total	260	100	100	

Compensation strategies. Table 4.4 below identifies the descriptive frequency of using compensation strategies. It can be seen that often and always reveals a considerably higher percentage of learners employing compensation strategies at total 69.3% of the learners frequently using these strategies. In addition, 24.2% learners sometimes used compensation strategies to deal with speaking difficulties, while 6.6% learners were reported lower in using these strategies as rarely never.

Memory strategies. The results of the frequency percentages of using memory strategies are displayed in Table 4.5. It shows that the number of the learners who most extensively employ memory strategies on their speaking

practice are 56.5%, while 38.1 % learners are medium in using the strategies interpreted as sometimes, and 5.4% learners are reported as the lowest frequently used the strategies.

Table 4.5
Frequency of Using Memory Strategies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	1	0.4	0.4	0.4
	Rarely	13	5	5	5.4
	Sometimes	99	38.1	38.1	43.5
	Often	95	36.5	36.5	80
	Always	52	20	20	100
	Total	260	100	100	

Table 4.6
Frequency of Using Affective Strategies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	5	1.9	1.9	1.9
	Rarely	12	4.6	4.6	6.5
	Sometimes	65	25	25	31.5
	Often	108	41.5	41.5	73.1
	Always	70	26.9	26.9	100
	Total	260	100	100	

Affective strategies. Table 4.6 illustrates that 68.4% of the learners represented appreciably higher level of frequency usage the affective strategies as mostly used the strategies. 25% learners are reported medium used these strategies in speaking. There are 6.5% of the learners who did not frequently use affective strategies interpreted as the lowest used the strategies.

Social strategies. Table 4.7 below reports the results of the frequency of using social strategies among 52 EFL learners. It is noticeable that 81.1% of the

learners who mostly used social strategies when learning to speak English, while 18.5% shows the medium used social strategies in boosting their speaking skill. The lowest frequency of using social strategies are 0.4% which means that 0.4% of the learners did not frequently use social strategies.

Table 4.7
Frequency of Using Social Strategies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Rarely	1	0.4	0.4	0.4
	Sometimes	48	18.5	18.5	18.8
	Often	102	39.2	39.2	58.1
	Always	109	41.9	41.9	100
	Total	260	100	100	

Learners' Speaking Proficiency. This part is written to answer the second research question, "What are the speaking proficiency of EFL learners at EED UMY in Listening and Speaking for Academic Purposes class?" To distinguish the learners' speaking proficiency, the learners' speaking score were used to measure the speaking proficiency. To simplify the score analysis, the researcher presented the score in total score as seen in Appendix I. The descriptive statistic of the speaking proficiency is displayed on Table 4.8 below.

Table 4.8 Descriptive Statistics of Speaking Proficiency

N	Valid	52	Std. Error of Skewness	0.33
	Missing	0	Kurtosis	27.38
Mean		80.3631	Std. Error of Kurtosis	0.65
Median		82.075	Range	90.49
Mode		86.6	Minimum	0
Std. Deviation		13.26031	Maximum	90.49
Variance		175.836	Sum	4178.88
Skewness		-4.834		

Table 4.9 shows the standard to measure the level of the learners' speaking proficiency. The value of each category was found by counting the range of maximum score and minimum score, then dividing it into 5, afterwards, use the range to find the interval values.

Table 4.9 Categories of Speaking Score

No	Interval	Category
1	0.00 – 18.1	Very Low
2	18.2 – 36.4	Low
3	36.5 – 54.8	Fair
4	54.9 – 73.3	Good
5	73.4 – 90.49	Very Good

To know the learners' level of speaking, the researcher used the result of the speaking score by calculating the mean, median, and mode. The result in Table 4.8 shows that the value of mean is 80.36, while the value of median is 82.08, and then the value of mode is 86.60. Afterwards, the researcher used the value of mean in order to determine the learners' speaking proficiency. Since the mean value is 80.36, the result indicates that the participant of this study were in a very good level of speaking proficiency.

Correlation on Speaking Strategies that Most Frequently Used by EFL Learners and Their Speaking Proficiency. In examining the correlation between variables, the researcher used the correlational analysis using Pearson Product Moment correlation (*r*). To measure the strengths and weaknesses of the coefficient correlation between two variables of this study, the researcher employed a range of correlation criteria developed by Sugiyono (2003) in Maulana (2015) as shown in table below.

Table 4.10
Coefficient Correlation Interpretation

Standard r_{xy}	Interpretation
0.00 - <0.199	Very weak correlation
>0.20 - <0.399	Low or weak correlation
>0.40 - <0.599	Moderate correlation
>0.60 - <0.799	High or strong correlation
>0.80 - 1.00	Very strong correlation

Table 4.11 Correlations

		Social Strategy	Speaking Proficiency
Social Strategy	Pearson Correlation	1	.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.910
	N	260	52
Speaking Proficiency	Pearson Correlation	.016	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.910	
	N	52	52

As illustrated in Table 4.11, the value of correlation coefficient *(r)* denotes that there is a correlation on the most frequent speaking strategies used by EFL learners and their speaking proficiency. Table 4.10 shows the list of criteria correlation for very low or weak correlation on 0.00-0.199 and very high correlation is on 0.80-1.00. Accurately, there was very weak and significant correlation (r) = 0.016. Since the correlation value of this study is on 0.16, thus, accurately the increased of the most frequent speaking strategies usage correlate very weakly and significantly to the increased of speaking proficiency of the learners.

Discussion

This section covers the analysis of statistical data as reported detail in previous section in order to answer the research question of this study. There are three main purposes of this research namely investigating the learners' speaking strategies used, learners' speaking proficiency, and establishing the correlation on the speaking strategies used by EFL learners and their speaking proficiency.

The speaking strategies that most frequently used by EFL learners. With respect to the first research question, as the results in which reported detail in previous chapter reveal that all the speaking strategies are employed by EFL learners of UMY batch 2015. The result shows that the average value of the speaking strategies usage are more than 3.5 which means the learners are strategic and approved using the strategies extorted from the group of speaking strategies differently. This finding is associated with Najafabadi (2014), stated that EFL learners reported that they employ the speaking strategies differently. Interestingly, almost all of EFL learners reported the greatest choice to employ social strategies with mean value (4.23) in their learning for communication. These decisions were noticeably different from those obtained in Moriam (2014) and recently Skandari, Behjat, and Kargar (2015) study, which stated that EFL major learners frequently used cognitive strategies. Below are the detailed discussions of the categories of strategies as explored in the results. Each categories was analyzed in terms of its overall strategy employment by the learners according to the value of its mean.

Metacognitive strategies. The result reveals that EFL learners at EED UMY often used metacognitive strategies with mean value of 3.86, assuming that many learners are able to regulate and manage their own learning processes. It indicates that the learners are capable of planning, monitoring or controlling, and evaluating their own learning behavior in order to enrich their performance of communication, hence, they know how and what should be improved as noted by Cabaysa and Baetiong (2010). These strategies enable learners to be active on complementing the exact strategy with appropriate activity. Deeply, the various action taken from the learners toward speaking challenges are indicated as paying attention, self-monitoring, seeking practice opportunities, arranging and planning, organizing, and self-evaluating. It can be noticed that the learners are aware of the virtual ways in controlling their own learning process as proposed by Oxford that metacognitive strategies provide ways for learners to organize with their own learning process.

Cognitive strategies. From the result, denote that mean value of 3.75 learners using cognitive strategies potentially categorized as low value. Therefore, it is speculated that the low mean value of cognitive strategies may be caused the learners do not realize the importance of practice. Compare well with Oxford (1990) and most recently Pawapatcharaudom study (2007) which mentioned that language learner do not always realize how indispensable practice is. The represented strategies are listed regarding the answer of questionnaire statement such as practicing naturalistically, imitating native speaker in speaking, repeating

new word, using resources for receiving and sending messages, then, recognizing and using formulas and patterns.

Compensation strategies. There is 3.85 mean value of learners using compensation strategies in learning speaking, which means that many learners applied these strategies through guessing the meaning of a new word with gestures, synonym, and coining word. According to Al Buainain (2010) and Pawapatcharaudom (2007), compensation strategies enable learners to prepare for dealing with the missing word or meaning in the context during the process of producing the target language with guessing. Among these strategies, guessing has the lowest level of frequency usage. It may be caused that learners do not actively involve during the learning processes, thus, they are lack references of knowledge of the language in memory. As Oxford (1990) stated that "good language learners, when confronted with unknown expressions, make educated guesses"(p. 47).

Memory strategies. From the result, the least frequently used speaking strategies appear to be "memory strategies" at average value (3.71) even though these strategies might have powerful role to learning speaking. As revealed by Pawapatcharaudom (2007), some research found that language learners rarely employ memory strategies even though it can have strong contributors to language learning. She also believed that learners do not realize how often and how much they use these strategies. This result also supported the findings of Al-Buainan (2010) and Liu (2004) who reported that memory strategies were the least favored strategies as received by participants of their studies. Meanwhile,

memory strategies include several ways such as practicing and placing a new word into a context, representing a picture in memory, associating or elaborating, and using imagery. These strategies can assist the learners to cope with the problems in remembering a new word, and to store new word in memory then retrieve it when needed for communication.

Affective strategies. Based on the results, the affective strategies have high mean value of 3.87. This indicates that EFL learners prefer to use affective strategies during the process of learning speaking English through managing their feeling or emotion, motivation and attitudes. Perhaps, the learners realized that feeling or mood played important roles for supporting the process of language input, because it can influence the learners' focus during the learning. In accordance with Pawapatcharaudom (2007), affective strategies are one of the biggest influences on language learning success or failure when speaking up the language, and good language learners are able to control their emotions and attitudes toward learning. By organizing their feeling and attitudes, learners can create effective and enjoyable in learning speaking, thus, they are able to lower their anxiety during the speaking process. There were sub strategies or ways under affective strategies namely lowering anxiety, encouraging oneself through rewarding oneself and making positive statement, the last taking one's emotional temperature such as sharing feeling in learning and listening to one's body.

Social strategies. As illustrated in the results, it is worth pointing out that among the six strategies represented in questionnaire distribution, social strategies appear appreciably to be the most frequently used strategies with the highest mean

at 4.23 in Table 4.1. In line with Li (2010) that social strategies mainly concern on interaction with people and found to be more popular for the learners. Indeed, there were sub strategies under social strategies namely asking question for clarification and correction which has occurred with the greatest values of using the strategy to learn speaking with 57.7% as in (item30) and 55.8% as in (item 28) from total respondent interpreted as always. It is evident that the result of asking for clarification/verification obtained here are in exceptionally good agreement with previous results on Hendriani (2013) stated that involving counterpart or other people to deal with speaking problem including asking question for clarification/verification have become one of the familiar strategies employed from 24 strategies by college learners. As proposed by Oxford (1990) stated that "asking questions help learners get closer to intended meaning, and thus aids their understanding" (p.145). It is because this action provides more benefit in enhancing learners' knowledge and for increasing the learners' confidence to be more active in gaining input and producing the target language.

Learners' Speaking Proficiency. The researcher also found the data of learners' speaking proficiency which was measured by the lecturer of Listening and Speaking for Academic Purposes in second semester. As can be seen from Table 4.8 that the value of mean on learners' speaking proficiency was identified with value 80.36. It can be summarized that learners batch 2015 have a very good speaking proficiency. This finding eventually become an interesting part because they were freshmen who had very good level of speaking skill. Perhaps, they seem to be more motivated towards language learning, therefore, they are more

enthusiastic to communicate in English and focus their attention on how to reinforce their speaking ability.

Correlation on Speaking Strategies that Most Frequently Used by EFL learners and Their Speaking Proficiency. The result of the correlational analysis on the most frequent speaking strategies used by EFL learners and their speaking proficiency using Pearson Product Moment correlation *(r)* are represented by Table 4.11. The coefficient value of correlation in this study was (r = 0.016), it means that there was positive and significance correlation. While Table 4.10 showed the list of criteria correlation for low or weak correlation on 0.20-0.399 and very high correlation is on 0.80-1.00. Since the correlation value of this study was on 0.016, thus, this means that there was a very low correlation on the speaking strategies that most frequently used by EFL learners and their speaking proficiency. It is conceivable that the increased of the social strategies used will be followed very weakly but significantly by the increased speaking proficiency of the learners. On the other words, the frequency usage of strategies and English proficiency were positively linked to each other and other similar findings (Liu, 2004; Maldonado, 2015; Radwan, 2010).

To sum up that the correlation result shows there was a positive and significant correlation on social strategies and speaking proficiency, hence the alternate hypothesis (H_a) was accepted which indicates there is correlation on the most frequent speaking strategies used by EFL learners and their speaking proficiency. Meanwhile, the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected.