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The aim of this research is to find out the differences and similarities in students’ performances in performing three different learning tasks. (1) memory strategies: strategies that help learners store and retrieve new information, (2) cognitive strategies: strategies that enable learners to understand and produce new language by many different means, (3) compensation strategies: strategies that aid learners in overcoming knowledge gaps and continuing to communicate authentically The subjects are students of the third year majoring in teaching English as second/foreign language. These students sit on Speaking subject with 3 credit load.The subjects were 25 sudents of the English Study program, consisting of 17 female and 8 male students. The results showed that students differ in their performances of the three communication strategies. The most prominent strategy applied was cognitive strategy.

**1.1 Background of Problems**

The outbreak of Covid 19 has influenced almost all aspects of human’s life. In educatioal life, the virus has stopped almost all educational activities. Children could no longer go to school, teachers stay at home and every body stays at home. However, many teachers and university lecturers still tried hard to educate children and students through computer based program. COVID-19 is an infectious disease caused by a newly discovered type of coronavirus. This is a new virus and disease that was not known before the outbreak in Wuhan, China, in December 2019.

The learning activities proposed in this research is an attempt to fulfill educational activities during the outbreak of Covid 19. The activities are arranged to accommodate the learning time during the holidays. Students learn from home, the teacher teaches through computer. This learning process takes place from the first week of April, 2021 and ended untill second week of August, 2021. During the class hours, the teacher instructs the students to follow regular curriculum program. Only the teacher gives guidance from home through computer and the students follow teacher’s instruction from homes.

In the normal situation, the teaching of speaking as subject taught at the English department will go on as normal situation. The lecturer provides topics to be discussed and the students accomplishh the speaking tasks, either inndividually or small group tasks.During the pancdemic situation, the students learn and work from home and accomplish speakint tasks throgh computers. This sitation demands creativity from the lecturer to make sure that the institutional objectives can be met.

Speaking is "the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols, in a variety of contexts" (Chaney, 1998, p. 13) Speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing and receiving and processing information (Brown, 1994; Burns & Joyce, 1997).

Speaking English is the main goal of many adult learners. Their personalities play a large role in determining how quickly and how correctly they will accomplish this goal. Those who are risk-takers unafraid of making mistakes will generally be more talkative, but with many errors that could become hard to break habits. Conservative, shy students may take a long time to speak confidently, but when they do, their English often contains fewer errors and they will be proud of their English ability. It's a matter of quantity vs. quality, and neither approach is wrong so how shall we prioritize the two clearly important speaker goals of accurate(clear, articulate,grammatically and phonologically correct) language and fluent (flowing, natural) language? However, if the aim of speaking is communication and that does not require perfect English, then it makes sense to encourage quantity in your classroom. Break the silence and get students communicating with whatever English they can use, correct or not, and selectively address errors.

Speaking activities addressed in this study are designed for adult students whose major is English. The students are learning English in order that they can teach English upon they finish their studies.

**1**.**2 Research Objectives**

The research aims at:

1. Finding out whether there is any significant difference in students’ speaking scores taught through three different language learning strategies
2. Finding out which learning strategies produced better speaking performa nce.
3. Fingding out what students perceive on their speaking performance during accomplishing the speaking tasks

**1.3 The Research Urgency**

Practically the research is expected

1. To obtain learning materials for higher education level of English education at the university by optmizing all students’ potentials, maximizing language learning and acquisition to reach the goal of English language learning at the university.
2. The learning which is suitable with students’ characteristics and in acccordance with the demand of science and technology..
3. The output of this research is applicable to be used as reference to most current development of science and technology.

**2. Frame of theories**

1. **Language Learning Strategies**

All language learners use language learning strategies in their learning process. Learning strategies are commonly defined as the operations or processes which are consciously (or unconsciously) selected and employed by the learner to learn the target language or facilitate a language task Skehan and Foster ( (1999)). Aside from that, Chamot (1987) defines Learning Strategies as techniques, approaches or deliberate actions that students take in order to facilitate the learning and recall of both linguistic and content area information

Many researchers have defined language learning strategies. Oxford (1990) states that Language learning strategies are specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable more self-directed, more effective and more transferable to new situation. According to (Galal, 1993:18) strategy refers to the procedure or the techniques that a person follows to achieve a required goal. It is important that the teacher should be aware of various learning strategies and accordingly apply it in his /her teaching. Learning will be more productive when teachers/students are conscious of the learning strategies they are going to apply in the language class.

English language learners’ benefit when more opportunities are given for practicing English language skills. Vogt and Short (2010), say learning is more effective when students have an opportunity to participate fully, actively discussing ideas and information rather than teachers talking and students listening. A learning environment should be constructed in a way that allows students to interact freely.

1. **Classification of Language Learning Strategies**

Language learning strategies have been classified by many researchers; see for examples by Rubin, (1987), Oxford, (1990) and O‟Malley and Chamot, (1990). Rubin (1987) categorizes language learning strategies into three main groups: learning strategies, communication strategies, and social strategies. Learning strategies include all strategies that are directly related to learning (cognitive) or those which indirectly involve the learning process (metacognitive). Cognitive strategies comprise clarification, practice, memorizing, and monitoring. Planning, setting goals and self-management belong to metacognitive strategies. While communication strategies are strategies that less directly relate to language learning since their focus is on the process of participating in a conversation and getting meaning across or clarifying the speaker‟s intention. Communication strategies are used by speakers to overcome communication difficulties. Social strategies are those activities learners engage in which provide them opportunities to practice their knowledge.

Oxford (1990, p. 14-16) differentiates language learning strategies into six groups: (1) memory strategies: strategies that help learners store and retrieve new information, (2) cognitive strategies: strategies that enable learners to understand and produce new language by many different means, (3) compensation strategies: strategies that aid learners in overcoming knowledge gaps and continuing to communicate authentically, (4) affective strategies: strategies that help develop self-confidence, (5) metacognitive strategies: strategies that help learners to regulate their own cognitive abilities and to focus, plan, and evaluate their progress as they move toward communicative competence, and (6) social strategies: strategies that provide increased interaction and more empathetic understanding. She adds that all appropriate language learning strategies contribute to the main goal: becoming communicatively competent.

O‟Malley and Chamot (1990, p. 44-45) also divide language learning strategies into three types, namely: metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, and socio-affective strategies. By metacognitive strategies, O‟Malley and Chamot (1990) mean strategies applied to plan for learning and thinking about the learning process, monitoring production and comprehension as well as evaluation after the completion of an activity. Cognitive strategies involve the direct manipulation of learning techniques, e.g. repetition, translation, deduction, etc. The final group of strategies involves socio-affective strategies which deal with social transactions and social activities.

1. **Accuracy and Fluency**

**Accuracy** and **fluency** are two key components of second **language** acquisition. In today’s world, it seems that learning the usage of grammar and focusing on **accuracy** are emphasized by many language students over **fluency**. Essentially, **accuracy** is the ability to produce correct sentences using correct grammar and vocabular Teachers who concentrate on accuracy help their students produce grammatically correct written and spoken English, ideally aiming towards the accuracy of a native speaker of similar age and background. The emphasis in the classroom will be on grammar presentations and exercises, and reading comprehension, among others.

Teachers who concentrate on fluency help their students to express themselves in English. They pay more attention to meaning and context and are less concerned with grammatical errors. Typical fluency activities include role playing and other communicative activities where English is used as a medium of communication rather than an end in itself.

Fluency improves chances to learn a language either inside or outside the classroom. Moreover, fluency is the most successful tool for the learner to communicate and speak in a particular language. Fluency also entails better communication between the learner and his/her teacher. Additionally, fluency improves oral thinking and helps in speaking and dealing with people as it creates a better understanding between each other.

Fluency is, therefore, the best instrument which somebody could acquire from language learning. On the other hand, less emphasis may be given to accuracy in the early levels of language learning. Language learning today aims generally for fluency and less for accuracy in the early stages. Accuracy in language helps if the teacher gives some grammar or written vocabulary tasks in the classroom, but it will not help if someone openly asks oral question to the students. If teachers keep concentrating on accuracy rather than fluency, learners will not be able even to ask for a cup of tea in a coffee shop. The importance of accuracy comes after fluency in order to enable learners to apply all the skills which support language learning.

Language fluency is used informally to denote broadly a high level of [language proficiency](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Language_proficiency), most typically [foreign language](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign_language) or another learned language, and more narrowly to denote *fluid* language use, as opposed to slow, halting use. In this narrow sense, fluency is *necessary* but not *sufficient* for language proficiency: fluent language users (particularly uneducated native speakers) may have narrow vocabularies, limited discourse strategies, and inaccurate word use. They may be illiterate, as well. Native language speakers are often incorrectly referred to as fluent.

To some extent, these skills can be acquired separately. Generally, the later in life a learner approaches the study of a foreign language, the harder it is to acquire receptive ([auditory](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hearing_%28sense%29)) comprehension and fluent production (speaking) skills; however, the [Critical Period Hypothesis](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical_Period_Hypothesis) is a hotly debated topic. For instance, reading and writing skills in a foreign language can be acquired more easily after the primary [language acquisition](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Language_acquisition) period of youth is over/

Essentially accuracy is the ability to produce correct sentences using correct [grammar‏‎](http://www.icaltefl.com/index.php/the-free-ical-english-grammar-guide/grammar.html) and [vocabulary‏‎](http://www.icaltefl.com/index.php/vocabulary/vocabulary.html). On the other hand, fluency is the ability to [produce‏‎](http://www.icaltefl.com/index.php/teaching-techniques/production.html) language easily and smoothly.

Accuracy is relative. A very young child isn't capable of the same level of accuracy as an adult. The child will make mistakes and misuse vocabulary.

Teachers who concentrate on accuracy help their students to produce grammatically correct written and spoken English, ideally aiming towards the accuracy of a [native speaker](http://www.icaltefl.com/index.php/linguistics-for-english-teachers/native-vs-non-native-vs-near-native-speakers.html) of similar age and background.

The emphasis in the classroom will be on grammar presentations and exercises, [reading comprehension‏‎](http://www.icaltefl.com/index.php/skills/reading-comprehension.html) and suchlike.

Accuracy refers to the mechanics of the language. Students address and improve on the following ideas:

1. Clear and articulate speaking or writing.
2. Language free from grammar mistakes.
3. Words spelled and/or pronounced correctly.
4. Language appropriate to the situation and/or context.

When a teacher, classroom, or student fails to consider accuracy in the class, then students may sound less fluent and capable with the language. This can quickly cause problems when students need to use the language for more than casual conversation.

For example, let's say a businessperson uses English for email, as well as regularly attends teleconferences with the head office. Because English ability is so visible, it oftentimes easily gets confused with overall job ability or competence. The businessperson thus sounds less capable in the world of business, especially with peers and colleagues he doesn't regularly and directly work. It really isn't much different than a colleague who dresses in shorts and stained t-shirts. In most business industries, peers simply don't take him seriously or believe him to be fully competent.

# The Research Method

The study implemented quasi experimental research design. Quasi-experimental research designs, like experimental designs, test causal hypotheses. In both experimental (i.e., randomized controlled trials or RCTs) and quasi-experimental designs, the programme or policy is viewed as an ‘intervention’ in which a treatment – comprising the elements of the programme/policy being evaluated – is tested for how well it achieves its objectives, as measured by a prespecified set of indicators (White and Sabarwal 2014). In this case, the subjects of the research are students who are enrolled as participants at ‘Intermediate Speaking subject at the University of Lampung, The students are both as the population and sample of the research.

The subjects are students of the second year majoring in teaching English as second/foreign language. These students sit on Speaking subject wth 2 credit load.The subjects were 25 sudents of the English Study program, consisting of 17 female and 8 male students.

The design of the study is quasi experimental research involving three learning atmospheres: 1) memory strategies: strategies that help learners store and retrieve new information, (2) cognitive strategies: strategies that enable learners to understand and produce new language by many different means, (3) compensation strategies, strategies that aid learners in overcoming knowledge gaps and continuing to communicate authentically

Evaluating Oral Performances

There are five criteria to evaluate oral performances in second language learning. Quality of presentation, Responding to questions, Language Use, Media use, and Mastery of subject.

1. Quality of presentation

A presentation is a means of communication that can be adapted to various speaking situations, such as talking to a group, addressing a meeting or briefing a team. A presentation can also be used as a broad term that encompasses other ‘speaking engagements’ such as making a speech at a wedding, or getting a point across in a video conference.To be effective, step-by-step preparation and the method and means of presenting the information should be carefully considered.  A presentation requires you to get a message across to the listeners and will often contain a 'persuasive' element.

1. Responding to questions

One of the main problems with question and answer sessions is that the presenter’s nerves frequently force an inappropriate response. This could be because a question has been misinterpreted or that only key words from the question have been heard rather than the full content.

1. Language Use: What does language use mean?

Language use refers to the communicative meaning of language. It can be compared to usage, which refers to the rules for making language and the structures we use to make it. ... A key stage in awareness of how English works is when learners understand that usage and use are not necessarily connected.

1. Media use

Media usage, also called media consumption or media diet, is defined as “the sum of information and entertainment media taken in by an individual or group” (source: Wikipedia). On Statista, users can find statistics presenting data on various aspects of media usage.

1. Mastery of subject

The mastery of subject matter is the foundation upon which the education of a teacher is based. The teacher requires among other things the skill of mastering the subject matter and being able to establish the interrelationships between different subjects. (Jul 7, 2014).

# Results and Discussion

This research was accomplished within two extreme situations, the first situation is the normal situation where the teaching learning processes were done in normal situation and the second situation was done under the spread of the pandemic COVID 19. Under the normal situation, students learned in face to face meetings. Lecturers teach the subjects delivered by lecture team in four meetings and ended by giving examination for the block. The Covid 19 autbroke at the second session (the sixth normal meeting and consequently change the overall plan for the rest of the program
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| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1. Descriptive statistics of students’scores on three learning strategies

|  |
| --- |
| **Descriptive Statistics** |
|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| memory | 25 | 46,00 | 66,00 | 60,8000 | 6,13732 |
| cognitive | 25 | 64,00 | 87,00 | 77,4800 | 5,96601 |
| compensation | 25 | 65,00 | 89,00 | 74,8000 | 6,11010 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 25 |  |  |  |  |

The table shows the summary of descriptive statistics on three measurements used in the study. There are three blocks of learning strategies applied in the study. The first strategy is memory strategy applid to 25 students resulting the mean score of 60,00 wih a standard deviation (SD) of 6,13. The second strategy is cognitive straetgy resulting in the mean score of 77,48 and SD of 5,96. The third strategy is compensation straetgy resulting in the mean score of 74,80 and SD of 6,11.. The followings are the results of statistical analyses of the correlations between three applications of the teaching of three learning strategies: memory strategy, cognitive strategy, and compensation strategy on students’ speaking performances.Table 2: One sample correlation among three learning strategies

|  |
| --- |
| **Correlations** |
|  | memory | cognitive | compensation |
| memory | Pearson Correlation | 1 | ,656\*\* | ,240 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |  | ,000 | ,248 |
| N | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| cognitive | Pearson Correlation | ,656\*\* | 1 | ,730\*\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | ,000 |  | ,000 |
| N | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| compensation | Pearson Correlation | ,240 | ,730\*\* | 1 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | ,248 | ,000 |  |
| N | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). |

TaTable 4.Paired sample test for three learning strategies**Paired Samples Statistics** |
|  | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Pair 1 | memory | 60,8000 | 25 | 6,13732 | 1,22746 |
| cognitive | 77,4800 | 25 | 5,96601 | 1,19320 |
| Pair 2 | memory | 60,8000 | 25 | 6,13732 | 1,22746 |
| compensation | 74,8000 | 25 | 6,11010 | 1,22202 |
| Pair 3 | cognitive | 77,4800 | 25 | 5,96601 | 1,19320 |
| compensation | 74,8000 | 25 | 6,11010 | 1,22202 |

1. The result of speaking scores on three learning strategies

Table 2: Summary of test results in three learning strategies

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Memory | Cognitive | Compensation |
| 1 | 62,00 | 83,00 | 74,00 |
| 2 | 62,00 | 77,00 | 73,00 |
| 3 | 54,00 | 79,00 | 82,00 |
| 4 | 60,00 | 75,00 | 70,00 |
| 5 | 46,00 | 64,00 | 69,00 |
| 6 | 64,00 | 84,00 | 81,00 |
| 7 | 64,00 | 74,00 | 70,00 |
| 8. | 46,00 | 67,00 | 68,00 |
| 9. | 60,00 | 69,00 | 67,00 |
| 10. | 60,00 | 67,00 | 72,00 |
| 11. | 64,00 | 81,00 | 75,00 |
| 12. | 66,00 | 81,00 | 77,00 |
| 13. | 64,00 | 72,00 | 65,00 |
| 14. | 62,00 | 77,00 | 68,00 |
| 15. | 66,00 | 81,00 | 74,00 |
| 16. | 64,00 | 81,00 | 78,00 |
| 17. | 64,00 | 84,00 | 89,00 |
| 18. | 46,00 | 75,00 | 79,00 |
| 19. | 64,00 | 82,00 | 77,00 |
| 20. | 66,00 | 87,00 | 86,00 |
| 21. | 62,00 | 79,00 | 75,00 |
| 22. | 64,00 | 77,00 | 76,00 |
| 23. | 62,00 | 79,00 | 70,00 |
| 24. | 62,00 | 78,00 | 72,00 |
| 25 | 66,00 | 84,00 | 83,00 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Correlations** |
|  | memory | cognitive | compensation |
| memory | Pearson Correlation | 1 | ,656\*\* | ,562\*\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |  | ,000 | ,003 |
| N | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| cognitive | Pearson Correlation | ,656\*\* | 1 | ,833\*\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | ,000 |  | ,000 |
| N | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| compensation | Pearson Correlation | ,562\*\* | ,833\*\* | 1 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | ,003 | ,000 |  |
| N | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). |

The table reveals that there is a positive significant correlation between students’ scores of speaking between memory strategy and cognitive strategy (,656\*\*) . Then, there is a positive significants correlation between memory strategy and compensation strategy (562\*\*). There is also positive significant correlation between cognitive strategy and compensation strategy ((730\*\*\*)

1. Comparison Analysis

In comparison analyses, the study compares the students’ scores in three learning situations: the use of memory strategies, cognitive strategies, and compensation strategies.

Table 5. Paired sample t-test among three subtests

|  |
| --- |
| **Paired Samples Test** |
|  | Paired Differences | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Pair 1 | memory - cognitive | -16,68000 | 5,02262 | 1,00452 | -16,605 | 24 | ,000 |
| Pair 2 | memory - compensation | -14,00000 | 7,54983 | 1,50997 | -9,246 | 24 | ,000 |
| Pair 3 | cognitive - compensation | 2,68000 | 4,44147 | ,88829 | 3,017 | 24 | ,006 |

The table reveals that there is a significant diffference between the students’ speaking scores in memory strategy and cognitive strategy (t-value = 16,60). The table also reveals that there is a significant difference between the students’ speaking scores in memory strategy and compensation strategy (t-value = 9,24). Finally the table also reveals that there is a significant difference between the students’ speaking scores in cognitive strategy and compensation strategy (t-value = 3,01.

**Discussion of findings**

Oxford (1990, p. 14-16) categirizes language learning strategies into six groups: (1) memory strategies: strategies that help learners store and retrieve new information, (2) cognitive strategies: strategies that enable learners to understand and produce new language by many different means, (3) compensation strategies: strategies that aid learners in overcoming knowledge gaps and continuing to communicate authentically, (4) affective strategies: strategies that help develop self-confidence, (5) metacognitive strategies: strategies that help learners to regulate their own cognitive abilities and to focus, plan, and evaluate their progress as they move toward communicative competence, and (6) social strategies: strategies that provide increased interaction and more empathetic understanding.. However, in this study only three strategies which were observed. The strategies are (1) memory strategies: strategies that help learners store and retrieve new information, (2) cognitive strategies: strategies that enable learners to understand and produce new language by many different means, (3) compensation strategies: strategies that aid learners in overcoming knowledge gaps and continuing to communicate authentically.

There are four most important findings from the current study. The first important finding is that there is a significant difference of students’ achievement according to the learning strategies applied. The data showed that there is a significant diffference between the students’ speaking scores in memory strategy and cognitive strategy (t-value = 16,60). This means that students who applied memory strategy get better achievement than while they appled cognitive strategy. Meanwhile, the application of compensatory strategy results in better score than the memory strategy (t-value = 9,24). Furthermore, the application of memory strategy resulted in better score than cognitive strategy (t-value = 3.01).

Students’ performances were measured in five measures: quality of presentation, responding to questions, language use, media use and mastery of subject. The followings are the results of students’ performances

Table 5: Descriptive statistics of students’ performances in five measures

|  |
| --- |
| **One-Sample Test** |
|  | Test Value = 0 |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference |
| QP | 17,170 | 24 | ,000 | 3,88000 |
| RQ | 11,947 | 24 | ,000 | 2,92000 |
| LU | 14,715 | 24 | ,000 | 2,56000 |
| MU | 19,553 | 24 | ,000 | 4,12000 |
| MS | 14,462 | 24 | ,000 | 2,32000 |

The descriptive statistics on students’ performances in five measures: quality of presentation, responding to questions, language use, media use and mastery of subject show the following results for the quality of performances (DP) the mean difference was 3,88,. For the measure on how the students respond to questions (RQ), the mean score was 2,92. For the measures language use (LU), the mean score was 2,56 For the measure of media use (MU), the mean score was 4,12. While for the measure of mastery of subject (MS), the meas score was 2,32.

The table reveals that there is a significant difference in the students’ responses to quality of presentation wth a t-value of 17,17 and mean difference of 3,88. There is also a significant difference in the students’ ability to respond to questions with a t value of 11,97 and mean difference of 2,92. The table also reveals that there is a significant diiferent in the students’ language use wth a t-value of 14,71 and mean difference of 2,56. The table also reveals that there is a significant defference in media use with a t-value of 4,12 and mean difference of 19,55. Finallly the table also reveals that there is significant difference in the mastery of subject with a t-value of 14,46 and mean difference of 2,32.

**Conclusions and Suggestions**

The research has revealed that students differ significantly in terms of their achievement when they are engaged in learning activities that involve learnibng strategies. The conclusions that can be drawn from this study is : There is a significant differece in students’ performance based on the students’ learning strategies.. There is a significant difference between the students’ achievement in learning three students’ learning strategies. Students’ achievement in memory strategies differed significantly with students’ achievement in cognitive strategies. There is no significant difference in students’ achievement in cognitive strategies and compensation strategies, but there is significant difference in students’ achievement through cognitive strategies and compensation strategies. This result shows different performances the students reveal in accomplishing the task.

**Suggestions**

Based on the results of the study, there are some suggestions that can be proposed:

The teaching of content language teaching could be accomplished in several innovative ways. One of the methods to teach the subject matter was through quasi experimental method of research. This method of research does not require control group as a comparison but rather it requires strict measures of the application so that it can be comapered within the same subject matter. However, strict procedurs of the application of steps in the application should be carefully observed so that maximum results can be obtained. The quasi experimental metod of research requires disciplines from all parties involved in the activity. The rearcher as the leader of the execution must have a strict discipline manner to ensure that each step in the methodology could be operationalized as clearly as possible.

**References**

Abidin, M. J. Z.,Rezaee, A. A., Abdullah, H. N., Singh, K. K. B., 2011. *Learning*

*Styles and Overall Academic Achievement in a Specific Education System*. International Journal of Humanities ans Social Science, 143

Anne Burns, Helen Joyce 1997. *Focus on speaking*. North Ryde, N.S.W. : National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.

Beckman Anthony R, Angela. (March 2008) Output strategies for English-language learners: Theory to practice, The Reading Teacher, vol. 61, No. 6

Brookes, MD, Huttenlocher, J., Vasilyeva, M., Cymerman, E., & Levine, S. (2002) Language Input and Child Syntax. Cognitive Psychology, 45, 337-374

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents*

Chaney, A. L., & Burk, T. L. (1998). *Teaching Oral Communication in Grades K-8.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon

Cenoz, Jasone. (1998), Pauses and communication strategies in second language speech, US Department of Education, University of the Basque country, Report-Research

Chamot, A. (1987). The Learning Strategies of ESL Students. In A. Wenden, & J. Rubin (Eds*.), Learner Strategy in Language Learning* (pp. 71-83). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc

Ellis, Rod, Barkhuizen, Gary. (2005) Analysing learner language, Oxford university press, Oxford, UK

Hart, B., & Risley, T.R. (1995) Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children, Baltimore,

Nakatani, Yusuo. (2006) Developing an oral communication strategy inventory, The Modern Language Journal, 90, ii

O’Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Pezhman Zare. 2012. Language Learning Strategies Among EFL/ESL Learners: A Review of Literature. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. Vol. 2 No. 5;

Rubin, J. (1987) Learner Strategies: Theoretical Assumptions, Research History and Typology. In: Wenden, A.L. and Rubin, J., Eds., *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 15-30

Skehan, P. (1998) Task-based instruction, Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 18:268-286

Skehan, P and Foster, P, (1999). The Influence of Task Structure and Processing Conditions on Narrative Retellings. Language Learning, v49 n1 p93-120

Swain, M. (2005) The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E., Hinkel (Ed.), Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning (pp. 471-483), Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Tarone, E. & Yule, G., (1983) Communication strategies in East-West interaction, Paper presented at the Conference on English as an international language: Discourse patterns across cultures, Honolulu, Hawaii. In Smith, L, Ed., Discourse across cultures, New York: Prentice hall, (1987:49-65)

VanPatten, B. (2003) From input to output: A teacher’s guide to second language acquisition, Boston: McGraw-Hill

Vogt, M. E., Echevarria, J., & Short, D. (2010). *The SIOP Model for Teaching English-Language Arts to English Learners*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.