# L2 SPEAKING STRATEGIES EMPLOYED BY INDONESIAN EFL TERTIARY STUDENTS ACROSS PROFICIENCY AND GENDER

Sri Wahyuni

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Canberra

Australia

5 February 2013

## ABSTRACT

This study investigates L2 speaking strategies used by Indonesian EFL tertiary students. The study addresses what strategies the students use in relation to L2 and speaking proficiency, as well as gender; how the students use the strategies; and why they use them in specific ways. It employs a mixed method approach, with a questionnaire, proficiency test, documents recording the students' speaking grades obtained at Gajayana University of Malang, speaking learning diaries, and interviews as the data collection instruments. Data collected by means of quantitative methods include questionnaires (N = 65), students' L2 proficiency scores (N = 65), and students' speaking grades (N = 65). Data collected by means of qualitative methods constitute speaking learning diaries (N = 20, 4 each) and interviews (N = 20). The study demonstrates that the students used a wide range of strategies that spread over six strategy groups, favouring metacognitive strategies. Regarding strategy use in relation to learner factors, the study reveals a statistically significant relationship between L2 proficiency and students' overall strategy use. It also shows that speaking proficiency and gender significantly affected the use of affective strategies only. The study also demonstrates that the students used strategies consciously, confidently, effortfully, or persistently because of the usefulness of the strategies or pleasure in using them. Implications for Indonesian EFL teachers, curriculum developers, and students are made.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Elke Stracke and Dr. Jeremy Jones for guidance, ideas, and feedback given to me throughout the research supervisory process. Such abundant assistance has played a crucial role in my success in carrying out this research. Additionally, interactions with both of them have undeniably taught me a good many 'lessons' that help me become more mature in handling professional and personal matters in my life.

I would also like to sincerely thank the Indonesian Directorate General of Higher Education for the financial support they made available to me. Without their sponsorship, my dream of pursuing a PhD would have remained a dream. Likewise, my gratitude goes to Gajayana Educational Foundation and Gajayana University of Malang for their support, in any form, throughout the research process.

Finally, I would like to thank colleagues whose assistance at certain stages of the research process has significantly contributed to the completion of this study: in alphabetical order Mr. Abdurrohman, for constant help regarding distance access of certain documents; Dr. Gunadi, for assistance concerning statistical data analysis; and Ms. Pradnya Paramita Dewi, for her tireless assistance during the data collection in the field.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract……..iii

Form B: Certificate of authorship of thesis.....……..……..v

Acknowledgments……vii

Table of contents…….……...ix

List of abbreviations……..……xv

List of tables……xvii

List of figures……...xxi

1. Chapter one: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction……...1

1.2 Background of the study……...1

1.2.1 Research interest area……....1

1.2.2 Research context……5

1.2.2.1 Status and role of English in Indonesia……6

1.2.2.2 English language learning and teaching at GUM…….…7

1.2.3 Research position in the literature and the Indonesian context……...15

1.3 Research problem……17

1.4 Research purpose……17

1.5 Research questions……..17

1.6 Theoretical foundations……..18

1.6.1 What L2 speaking strategies do students use?.....19

1.6.1.1 Does proficiency in L2, in general, and speaking, in specific, significantly affect strategy use?.....19

1.6.1.2 Does gender significantly affect strategy use?.....21

1.6.2 How do students use L2 speaking strategies?.....21

1.6.3 Why do students use L2 speaking strategies in specific ways?.....21

1.7 Methodology……...23

1.8 Scope of the study……...25

1.9 Contribution of the study……25

1.10 Organization of the study..……26

1.11 Conclusion……....29

2. Chapter two: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction……31

2.2 Learner autonomy……...……31

2.3. Definitions of language learning strategies…….……..35

2.4 Classification of language learning strategies……39

2.5 Language learning strategy studies……49

2.5.1 L2 learning strategy studies outside the Indonesian context..……49

2.5.1.1 Research themes…….……....49

2.5.1.2 Research overview 1970s-2012…..……51

2.5.1.3 Research closely relevant to the study……57

2.5.1.3.1 Strategy use and L2 proficiency……..……57

2.5.1.3.2 Strategy use and speaking proficiency……..……..60

2.5.1.3.3 Strategy use and gender……...……63

2.5.1.3.4 Ways students use language learning strategies…….……66

2.5.1.3.5 Reasons why students use language learning strategies in specific ways...71

2.5.2 L2 learning strategy studies in the Indonesian EFL context…….……..73

2.6 Conclusion……..77

3. Chapter three: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction…….……79

3.2 Research approach……..79

3.2.1 Definition and characteristics of the mixed method approach……79

3.2.2 Four principal mixed method designs…….81

3.2.3 Rationale for the choice of the mixed method approach and the explanatory design.82

3.3 Research design……..84

3.3.1 Research steps…….84

3.3.2 Ensuring the validity and reliability of the study……89

3.4 Research participants……..92

3.5 Data collection……93

3.5.1 Data collection instruments…….93

3.5.1.1 Questionnaire…….……..93

3.5.1.2 Proficiency test……97

3.5.1.3 Documents containing students' speaking grades…….. 98

3.5.1.4 Diaries……..99

3.5.1.5 Interviews……..100

3.5.2 Data collection steps……..103

3.5.2.1 Quantitative data collection...……104

3.5.2.2 Qualitative data collection…….105

3.6 Data management and analysis……108

3.6.1 Data management……..108

3.6.1.1 Quantitative data management……..108

3.6.1.2 Qualitative data management……110

3.6.2 Data analytical techniques……112

3.6.2.1 Analytical techniques for the quantitative data……112

3.6.2.2 Analytical techniques for the qualitative data……113

3.6.2.3 Analytical techniques for the integrated quantitative and qualitative data……119

3.7 Conclusion……120

4. Chapter four: RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction……121

4.2 Quantitative results……121

4.2.1 L2 speaking strategies that students used……121

4.2.2 Strategy and strategy group that students favoured the most and least……129

4.2.3 Strategy use in relation to L2 and speaking proficiency……131

4.2.4 Strategy use in relation to gender……142

4.3 Qualitative results……148

4.3.1 Ways students used strategies……148

4.3.1.1 Conscious use of strategies……148

4.3.1.2 Confident use of strategies……156

4.3.1.3 Effortful use of strategies……159

4.3.1.4 Persistent use of strategies……160

4.3.2 Reasons why students used strategies in specific ways……163

4.3.2.1 Usefulness of strategies……164

4.3.2.2 Pleasure in using strategies……168

4.4 Integrated quantitative and qualitative results……170

4.5 Conclusion……176

5. Chapter five: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

5.1 Introduction……..……..177

5.2 Approaching the data: learner independence……177

5.3 Approaching the research questions…….179

5.3.1 What L2 speaking strategies do students use?.....180

5.3.1.1 What strategy and strategy group do students favour the most and least?.....185

5.3.1.2 Does proficiency in L2 and speaking significantly affect strategy use?.....187

5.3.1.3 Does gender significantly affect strategy use?.....192

5.3.2 How do students use L2 speaking strategies?.....194

5.3.3 Why do students use L2 speaking strategies in specific ways?.....200

5.3.4 How do the qualitative findings explain L2 speaking strategies revealed in the quantitative phase?.....204

5.4 Conclusion……206

6. Chapter six: CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction……..209

6.2 Summary of the purpose and methodology of the study..……209

6.3 Summary of key findings…….……210

6.4 Theoretical and practical implications of the study…….……213

6.5 Research limitations and recommendations…….…….217

References…….……..221

Appendices 1-13…….233

Appendix 1 Competency-based curriculum of the Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters, Gajayana University of Malang……..233

Appendix 2 Questionnaire……..235

Appendix 3 TOEFL Practice Test……..239

Appendix 4 Students' scores and grades…….……...259

Appendix 5 Diary template and an example diary…….……261

Appendix 6 Interview protocols guide……..……..267

Appendix 7 Research ethics approval…….……269

Appendix 8 Research information sheet for participants..…….……271

Appendix 9 Consent form for research participants……..…….273

Appendix 10 Table of TOEFL converted score ranges……..……..275

Appendix 11 Student interviews as recorded on a DVD……..277

Appendix 12 Test of normal distribution…….……279

Appendix 13 An interview transcript followed by its English version..…..……..283

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| DELL | Department of English Language and Literature |
| Di | Diary |
| EFL | English as a Foreign Language |
| ESL | English as a Second Language |
| GECC | Gajayana English Conversation Club |
| GPA | Grade Point Average |
| GUM | Gajayana University of Malang |
| Iv | Interview |
| L2 | Second Language |
| SAC | Self-Access Centre |
| SILL | Strategy Inventory for Language Learning |
| TOEFL | Test of English as a Foreign Language |
| TSE | Test of Spoken English |

## LIST OF TABLES


Table 2.1 Language learning strategies useful for speaking skills……...47

Table 3.1 Research participants' profile…….…….....93

Table 3.2 Distribution of questionnaire items…….……..95

Table 3.3 Questionnaire-completion sessions and test administration…….……...105

Table 4.1 L2 speaking strategies identified from questionnaire (N = 65)..…….…...122

Table 4.2 L2 speaking strategies identified from diaries and interviews (N = 20)...….125

Table 4.3 Strategies added to Oxford's (1990) taxonomy……..….126

Table 4.4 Ranking of mean scores for strategy groups (N = 65)……...….129

Table 4.5 Combined quantitative and qualitative results with reference to the first research question and its first sub-question (N = 65)…….…….130

Table 4.6 L2 speaking strategies used by advanced, intermediate, and elementary students identified from questionnaire (N = 65).……..……..132

Table 4.7 Comparison of mean scores for the overall strategy use of advanced, intermediate, and elementary students (N = 65)……..133

Table 4.8 L2 speaking strategies with the highest mean score used by advanced, intermediate, and elementary students (N = 65)…….……133

Table 4.9 L2 speaking strategies with the lowest mean score used by advanced, intermediate, and elementary students (N = 65)..……134

Table 4.10 Ranking of mean scores for strategy groups used by advanced, intermediate, and elementary students (N = 65)……..….…135

Table 4.11 ANOVA results for the relationship between the students' overall strategy use and L2 proficiency (N = 65)……...…….136

Table 4.12 LSD post hoc test results for the relationship between the students' overall strategy use and L2 proficiency (N = 65)……....136

Table 4.13 L2 speaking strategies used by students with advanced, intermediate, and elementary speaking proficiency identified from questionnaire (N = 65)…..137

Table 4.14 Comparison of mean scores for the overall strategy use of students with advanced, intermediate, and elementary speaking proficiency (N = 65)…....138

Table 4.15 L2 speaking strategies with the highest mean score used by students with advanced, intermediate, and elementary speaking proficiency (N = 65)…....139

Table 4.16 L2 speaking strategies with the lowest mean score used by students with advanced, intermediate, and elementary speaking proficiency (N = 65)…....139

Table 4.17 Ranking of mean scores for strategy groups used by students with advanced, intermediate, and elementary speaking proficiency (N = 65)……...…..140

Table 4.18 ANOVA results for the relationship between the students' overall strategy use and speaking proficiency (N = 65)……..……140

Table 4.19 ANOVA results for the significant relationship between the affective strategy group and speaking proficiency (N = 65)……..……..141

Table 4.20 LSD post hoc test results for a significant relationship between the affective strategy group and speaking proficiency (N = 65)……..……141

Table 4.21 L2 speaking strategies used by male and female students (N = 65)..……142

Table 4.22 Comparison of mean scores for male and female students' overall strategy use (N = 65)……..…….144

Table 4.23 L2 speaking strategies with the highest mean score used by male and female students (N = 65)…….……144

Table 4.24 L2 speaking strategies with the lowest mean score used by male and female students (N = 65)……..……...145

Table 4.25 Ranking of mean scores for strategy groups used by male and female students (N = 65)…….…….…….145

Table 4.26 Independent Samples Test results for the relationship between the students' overall strategy use and gender (N = 65)……..…..……146

Table 4.27 Independent Samples Test results for the significant relationship between the affective strategy group and gender (N = 65)……..……146

Table 4.28 How students used strategies and why they used them in such specific ways164

Table 4.29 Summary of results with reference to research questions……...……170

## LIST OF FIGURES


Figure 1.1 A framework for investigating individual learner differences (Ellis, 1994)…...2

Figure 2.1 Memory strategies…….42

Figure 2.2 Cognitive strategies…….……..43

Figure 2.3 Compensation strategies.…….…….44

Figure 2.4 Metacognitive strategies…….…..45

Figure 2.5 Affective strategies…….…..46

Figure 2.6 Social strategies…….……47

Figure 3.1 Visual diagram of explanatory design procedures for the study…..……..87

Figure 5.1 Expanded taxonomy of compensation strategies……182

Figure 5.2 Expanded taxonomy of affective strategies……183