

STRATEGY-BASED INSTRUCTION (SBI) USE FOR SPEAKING SKILL

Febti Ismiatun

Universitas Islam Malang
febtiismi@unisma.ac.id

Abstract : *This study explored the implementation of strategy-based instruction, as a treatment, to the group of experimental students; whereas, the control group was not given by the treatment of SBI. The quasi-experimental study was used to seek out the difference of learning result between those groups. The pre test was able to identify that each group, group D and E, had the same level of ability in speaking class. Then, group D was as an experimental group and group E was a control. After given a treatment to experimental group, the post test was conducted to all the groups. The results of post test scores were analyzed through an independent t-test. The average of post test score of experimental group was higher than the control group, and then the value of sig. 2 tailed was .000. From the data analysis, it could be stated that there was significant difference between students who were taught by implementing SBI with the students who were not taught by that treatment, or on the other words, students who were taught by giving SBI showed better speaking skill that those who were not.*

Keywords: *Strategy-based Instruction, Speaking Skill*

INTRODUCTION

The result of language learning at all levels of education still remains low. Many of practitioners think to change the level of content material than to explore the subjects of learning itself. As Stern (1983) stated that “The results of a study are influenced by the learning process and the learning process is influenced by the internal characteristics of learners and learning conditions”. It means that by renewing the students’ mental in language learning, the teachers of language learning can automatically direct students to understand the main objective of the

learning. However, it does not always apply to all students since they have different character and capacity in language learning.

Focusing on the students’ exploration, some effective learning strategies are offered to enhance the students’ motivation and result in language learning. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) agreed that learning strategies are specific ways of processing information that enhance the understanding, learning, and retaining information.

Learning strategies are defined as “specific actions, behaviors, steps, or

techniques --such as seeking out conversation partners, or giving oneself encouragement to tackle a difficult language task -- used by students to enhance their own learning” (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992:63). When the learner consciously chooses strategies that fit his or her learning style and the L2 task at hand, these strategies become a useful toolkit for active, conscious, and purposeful self-regulation of learning. Learning strategies can be classified into six groups: cognitive, meta-cognitive, memory-related, compensatory, affective, and social (Oxford: 2003).

The implementation of leaning strategy in speaking is very important to increase students’ speaking skill in classroom context, since speaking becomes one of the most difficult skills in foreign language learning. Syamsudin (2015) stated that to cope with the difficulties in speaking and speak fluently, learners need to understand well about communication strategies. The strategies are determined based on the need, character, and material of the students. A profile of learning strategies used need to be founded, so it can be known what the high frequently used of learning strategies by the students are. Mulyani, S. et al (2014) revealed that:

“There are at least seven characteristics of Indonesian good EFL learners: (1) coming from ordinary families and diverse family backgrounds, (2) having high motivation and positive attitude, (3) having extrovert, sociable, confident and goal oriented personality traits and diverse language aptitude, (4) having good intellectual competence (smart), (5) being able to take charge of their own learning by taking various learning actions (creative), (6) being actively participate and not afraid of making mistakes and, (7) having willingness or ability to personalize the language”.

According to Ismiatun (2013), she stated that:

“Affective strategy becomes the highest used intensity when learners speak English; this means aspect psychology is applied continuously because it is very important to help students in learning speaking skill. Meanwhile, the least frequently used strategy is cognitive. It is predicted that strategies in cognitive are not done continuously because it does not really influence their learning, especially in speaking. For example, students do not really concern in preferring practice English inside and outside the classroom”.

Since researchers conducted studies on language learning strategies, mostly they only focused on the theories of learning strategies, and they were lack of practical usage of strategies. Then Hendriani (2013), one of the researchers who started conducting study on learning strategies practically, she developed language learning strategy model of speaking English at college. She collected data through questionnaire, speaking test, interview, and documentary study. She found that an appropriate model of speaking learning strategy is an effective way to help learners overcome problems psychologically, social, managerial, and linguistic while and after speaking. Other researchers who did the same studies as Hendriani are (1) Ismiatun (2015), she stated that designing model of learning strategy-based instruction was very effective to be implemented for senior school students. The implementation is divided by three steps: implementing strategies before, while, and after speaking. (2) Pramusinta (2015) developed complementary material for young EFL students through strategy-based instruction (SBI). In his study, he tried to apply development research that produced English

teaching products for grade 4. The products produced by Pramusinta were complementary materials for teaching English through SBI that focused on vocabulary material for grade 4 SDIT Al-Kautsar, Sukoharjo.

After understanding the importance of strategy-based instruction through some literatures, it is crucial to be implemented to the EFL students, especially in speaking skill. So, it further focuses on the implementation model of strategy-based instruction to the university students. Moreover, the strategies used are determined by the materials. Then the objective is to compare the impact of implementing strategy-based instruction (SBI).

METHOD

This quasi experimental study aimed at exploring the students' activities through strategy-based instruction. This purposed for comparing the learning result of students' speaking skill, between students who were treated by SBI and those who were not treated by SBI. This study provided two hypotheses: (1) Ho: There is a significant difference between students who were taught by SBI than those who were not taught by SBI, (2) Ha: There is no significant

difference between students who were taught by SBI than those who were not taught by SBI.

Research Subject

This study was done to the students' English department of fourth semester. The subject of research was chosen randomly since both of the groups had equal ability in speaking class and it was also reflected from their pre test scores. Both of the groups consisted of 25 students by dividing into two groups, experimental (class D) and control group (class E).

Research Instrument and Procedures

Primary source of the data were collected through pre test and post test scores from control and experimental group. Moreover, the post test scores were not obtained directly after the pre test conducted, however one of the groups --experimental-- must be given by a treatment of strategy-based instruction (SBI). On the other hand, the control groups were not given by the treatment. The lesson that was discussing by those groups of fourth semester was about "debate". So, both of the groups were taught by debate material, yet only one of them was taught by SBI.

Instrument and procedures

	Pre test	Treatment	Post test
Experimental group	Interview test	Debate and Interview test implementation of SBI	
Control group	Interview test	Debate	Interview test

In the treatment of strategy-based instruction, the students of experimental group were focused on presenting the strategies through 'debate' material. The implementation completed by Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

(Oxford, 1990) by doing some adaptation which was based on the need of this research. The procedures were strategies before speaking, while speaking, and after speaking. Moreover, those procedures were not given to the control group.

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed through independent sample t-test. It functioned to test the hypothesis between two groups, whether there was a significant difference or not after treating by strategy-based instruction.

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{(n_1 - 1)S_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)}}$$

where $\bar{x}_1$ = mean of sample 1

$\bar{x}_2$ = mean of sample 2

n_1 = number of subjects in sample 1

n_2 = number of subjects in sample 2

s_1^2 = variance of sample 1 = $\frac{\sum(x_1 - \bar{x}_1)^2}{n_1}$

s_2^2 = variance of sample 2 = $\frac{\sum(x_2 - \bar{x}_2)^2}{n_2}$

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Post test Score of Experimental and Control Group

Group Statistics					
	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Speaking score	Class D	25	77,0000	7,63763	1,52753
	Class E	25	66,0000	8,89757	1,77951

Based on the table 1, it reflected the mean scores of experimental and control group in the interview test activity, or better called as post test. Class E, experiment group, got higher means scores (77) after

given by the strategy-based instruction treatment that the control group (66). It means that the implementation of SBI in speaking activity impact positively to the students speaking skill

Table 2: Learning Result

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Speaking score	Equal variances assumed	,371	,545	4,690	48	,000	11,00000	2,34521	6,28464	15,71536
	Equal variances not assumed			4,690	46,923	,000	11,00000	2,34521	6,28185	15,71815

Table 2 reflected the learning result between two groups –experimental and control—after implementing the strategy-based instruction for debate material of

speaking skill. It was clearly seen from the sig. 2 tailed of independent t-test, that the result accepted the Ho and rejected Ha. If the sig. 2 tailed of the test was under 0.05, it

meant that there was a significant difference between two groups after giving the treatment, yet there was no difference if the sig. 2 tailed was above 0.05.

The result of the t-test showed that there was a significant difference between students who were taught by the strategy-based instruction and those who were not. It indicated that the implementation of strategy-based instruction gave positive impact to the students' improvement in speaking skill. This finding kindly supported a study by Nakatani (2005), she revealed that students who were taught speaking strategies made a significant improvement in their oral tests.

The implementation of strategy-based instruction in speaking skill started from the preparation up to the evaluation really made students confident in speaking English. It means that building students' awareness of strategies while speaking is very important for their communication skill. Kinoshita (2003) expressed that "language learning instruction is a teaching approach that aims to raise learners' awareness of learning strategies and provide learners with a systematic practice, reinforcement, and self-monitoring of their strategy use while attending to language learning activity".

The main instruction of implementing strategies was in the presenting strategies. This step focused on practicing the strategies before, while, and after speaking in debate class. Formerly, the students were directed to understand how importance the strategy is in debate. In the before speaking step, the students were raised their awareness of affective strategy since mostly the Indonesian students need to be improved their mental while speaking foreign language. The strategies included *lowering students' anxiety level by taking a*

depth breath, doing positive self talk, and talking about feelings. From these strategies, the students motivated to do better work. Then, in while speaking step, students implemented cognitive, compensatory and social strategy such as *outlining, taking notes, gestures and pause words, asking question to get verification, asking for clarification of a confusing point, and asking for help in doing a language task.* Chamot and Robbins (2005) state language learners who work with others can build confidence in contrast to the learners who have cooperation absence, and they can give and receive feedback readily. Shortly, this develops learners' perception. The last one is after speaking step, this strategy focused on *rewarding one self and reviewing on the performance* which included in the affective and meta-cognitive strategy.

In the post test, many of the students in the experimental group performed better than their pre test after giving strategy-based instruction treatment in debate. In the interview test, they are more motivated and well-organized in responding some questions. Then they got well understanding in solving the problem while speaking, like doing depth breathing, doing self talk, utilizing gestures which helped them confidently express their opinion. According to O'Malley and Chamot (1990), "Speaking strategies are crucial because they help foreign language learners in negotiating meaning where either linguistic structures or sociolinguistic rules are not shared between a second language learner and a speaker of the target language."

CONCLUSION

The implementation of learning strategies is very crucial to be implemented in the context of EFL classroom, since many of the students have different problem in learning

English, especially in speaking skill. Each problem has different learning strategies preferences as the problem solving. As discussed by some researchers, they agree that learning strategies must be given to the students with different character and problem in learning English in which the implementation is delivered in through strategy-based instruction (SBI). To test whether SBI is effective or not, it is implemented to group of experimental and control. After giving the treatment to the experimental students, the post test is conducted to all groups. Then the scores are analyzed through independent sample t-test. From the analysis, the mean scores of two groups are quite different. The mean score of experimental group is 77.00; which the control group is 66.00. The result of t-test H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. It means that there is significant difference between students who are taught by strategy-based instruction (SBI) than those who are not taught by SBI.

SUGGESTION

Comprehending the students' learning characters is very important for all teachers. One of them is seeking out the students' learning strategies in the classroom context, including what their difficulties are and how to solve them. In speaking skill activity, the difficulties mostly come from the students' internal problem, such as low motivation, high anxiety, low self-confidence, vocabulary limitation, and etc, as an impact, those problems direct students to be low learners in the speaking activity, so the teachers must understand what their learning strategies preferences are. The discussion of learning strategies is not only appropriate for speaking skill, but also for other skills like listening, reading, and writing. The strategies used for those skills

will be based on the students' need, since many of strategies style preferences can be effective to overcome the EFL students' problem in learning English, such as cognitive, meta-cognitive, compensation, affective, and social strategy.

REFERENCES

- Hendriani, S. 2013. *Developing a Model of Learning Strategy of Speaking English at College*. ¹International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities, Vol. 6 (1), 104-112
- Ismiatun, F. 2013. *A Profile of Students Language Learning Strategies in Speaking Skill*. Malang: ²Universitas Islam Malang
- Ismiatun, F. 2015. *Designing Teacher's Handbook of Language Learning Strategy-based Instruction* ³(SBI). Malang: Universitas Islam Malang
- Mulyani, S., Haryanto, & Dollah, S. (2014). *GLLs Revisited: Language Learning Strategies* ⁴Employed by Good Indonesian EFL Learners. Journal of Education and Practice. Vol. 5 (37)
- O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. ⁵New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. 2003. Language learning styles and strategies: An overview. Learning ⁶Styles & Strategies/Oxford, GALA, 1-25.
- Syamsudin. 2015. *Communication Strategies in Speaking Skill of EFL Learners*. English and ⁷Literature Journal. Vol. 2 (1)
- Stern, H. H. 1983. *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University ⁸Press.

