

**NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY**

**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

**LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES AND SPEAKING SKILLS: A  
DESCRIPTIVE CORRELATIONAL STUDY**

**MASTER THESIS**

**EYMAN MOHAMMED**

**Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çise Çavuşođlu**

**NICOSIA**

**February 2020**

**Approval of the Graduate School of Educational Sciences**

---

Prof. Dr. Fahriye Atınay Aksal

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

---

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kurt

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis submitted by Eyman Mohammed titled LANGUAGELEARNING STRATEGIES AND SPEAKING SKILLS: A DESCRIPTIVE CORRELATIONAL STUDY and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çise Çavuşoğlu

Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kurt

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çise Çavuşoğlu

---

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hanife Bensen Bostancı

---

## DECLARATION

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Full name: Eyman Mohammed

Signature:

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çise Çavuşođlu for her wise guidance, support and cooperation to finish this work. I deeply appreciate her contributions of time, ideas, and feedback on my Master's thesis. Without her inspiration, support and guidance during these past few weeks, this thesis would never have been possible. Thank you for your time and kindness and for all your hard work.

I would like to thank all the staff in the English Language Teaching Department. My deepest appreciation goes to my advisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Hanife Bensen Bostancı. Throughout all of those years of my academic program, she has always been available for help and guidance.

I also would like to express my special thanks to my participants for their effective and patient participation.

And I would like to thank the biggest supporting part of my life, my family, my husband and my children who encouraged and believed in me. Whatever I say, I cannot thank them enough. Finally, my special thank for my close friends who added a special flavor to this experience.

**ABSTRACT****LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES AND SPEAKING SKILLS: A  
DESCRIPTIVE CORRELATIONAL STUDY****Mohammed, Eyman****MA Program in English Language Teaching****Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çise Çavuşoğlu****February 2020, 84 pages**

Success in acquiring speaking in a second or foreign language is influenced by many factors that help language learners to enhance their own speaking skills. One of these factors is language learning strategies (LLSs), which assist learners to learn and use the language. The current study aims to identify LLSs that contribute to the development of the speaking skill of high performing students and compares these with low performing students in speaking. It also aims to investigate the possible differences in LLS use between the high and low performing students in English language department at Al Marj University. The participants were 12 undergraduate students studying in their fourth semester. Designed as a comparative descriptive study. Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) designed by Rebecca Oxford (1990) was employed to collect data about their use of LLSs. In addition, a speaking test was conducted via the Messenger App to categorize the participants into high and low performing students in speaking. The collected data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and non-parametric test of Mann-Whitney U and Spearman's rho. The findings identified that high performing students frequently used five categories of LLSs to develop their speaking skills and they did so significantly more than low achieving students. These strategies were memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive and social strategies. In contrast, low performing students used affective strategies more frequently. The findings also showed that there was a statistically significant difference between those who have achieved a high score in the speaking test and those who have achieved a low score in the same test in terms of their frequency of the use of LLSs. This significant difference was in favor of those who have achieved high scores. Finally, it was found that there was a significant and positive correlation between the type of LLSs used and the scores of the students in the given speaking test. This relationship explains that students' speaking level was influenced by their use of LLSs.

**Key words:** Language learning strategies, speaking skills.

## ÖZ

### DİL ÖĞRENME BECERİLERİ VE KONUŞMA BECERİLERİ: TANIMLAYICI KORELASYON ÇALIŞMASI

**Mohammed Eyman**

**İngilizce Dil Öğretimi Master Programı**

**Danışman: Doçent Dr. Çise Çavuşoğlu**

**Şubat 2020, 84sayfalar**

İkinci bir yabancı dil edinme başarısı dil öğrencilerinin konuşma becerilerini geliştirecek birçok etkene dayanmaktadır. Bu etkenlerden biri öğrencilerin dili edinmeleri ve kullanmalarını sağlayan dial öğrenme stratejileridir (DÖS). Bu çalışma ile amaçlanan yüksek performans gösteren öğrencilerin konuşma becerilerini geliştirmeye yönünde katkı sağlayan LLSs stratejisini tamamlamak ve bunu düşük performanslı öğrencilerle karşılaştırmaktır. Aynı zamanda bu çalışmayla amaçlanan Al Marj Üniversitesi'nde İngilizce Bölümünde öğrenim gören düşük ve yüksek performans gösteren öğrenciler üzerinde LLSs kullanımının olası farklılıklarını keşfetmektedir. Bu çalışmada dördüncü dönemlerinden olan 12 öğrenci kullanılmıştır. Karşılaştırmalı açıklamalı bir çalışma olarak hazırlanmıştır. Rebecca Oxford (1990) tarafından ortaya konan Dil Öğrenimine yönelik Envanter Stratejisi (SILL) öğrencilerin DÖS kullanımı hakkında veri toplamak üzere kullanılmıştır. Ek olarak, katılımcıların konuşma becerisi yönünde düşük veya yüksek performanslı olduklarına yönelik ayrımı yapmak üzere Messenger uygulaması üzerinden konuşma testi hazırlanmıştır. Mann Whitney U ve Supermam's rho isimli uzmanlara ait açıklamalı istatistik ve parametrik olmayan test yardımıyla test sonuçları analiz edilmiştir. Bulgular sonucunda yüksek performanslı öğrenciler konuşma becerilerini geliştirmek için 5 farklı kategoride DÖS kullanmakta ve bunu düşük performanslı öğrencilere göre çok iyi bir seviyede yapmaktadırlar. Bu stratejiler arasında bellek, kavrama, kompensasyon, üstbilişsel beceriler ve sosyal stratejiler yer almaktadır. Buna karşın düşük performanslı öğrenciler duyuşsal stratejileri daha sıklıkla kullanmaktadır. Bulgulara göre söz konusu testte yüksek puan elde eden katılımcılar ile DÖS kullanım sıklığı yönünden düşük puan elde eden katılımcılar arasında gözle görülür bir fark bulunduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Bu gözle görülür fark yüksek puan elde edenlerin lehine olmuştur. Sonuç olarak, test sonunda DÖS kullanan ve yüksek puan elde eden katılımcılar ilişkisinde yüksek ve pozitif bir bağ olduğu ortaya konulmuştur. Aradaki bu ilişki ile DÖS kullanımının öğrencilerin konuşma becerilerini büyük ölçüde etkilediğini göstermiştir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Dil Öğrenim hareketleri, konuşma becerileri.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>APPROVAL OF THESIS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>DECLARATION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>ÖZ .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>LIST OF APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Background of the Study .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Statement of the Problem .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Aim of the Study .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Significance of the Study .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Limitations of the Study .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Language Learning Strategies .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Classification of Language Learning Strategies .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Speaking .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Speaking Components .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Pronunciation .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Vocabulary .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Grammar .....</b>	<b>30</b>

<b>Fluency and Accuracy .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Comprehension .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Learning and Teaching speaking skill .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Related Studies .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Research Design .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Context .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Sampling and Sample .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Data Collection Tools .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>The Speaking Test .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>The SILL Inventory .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Reliability and Validity .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Data Collection Procedures .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Data Analysis Procedures .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Ethical Considerations .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Descriptive Analysis of the Overall Strategy Use by Participants .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Differences in Language Learning Strategy Use among Participants ..</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>The Relation between Speaking Test Scores and LLS use .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Discussion .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>The main findings .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Implication and Suggestions .....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>71</b>



**LIST OF TABLES**

<b>Table 1.</b> The Results of Speaking Test.....	<b>42</b>
<b>Table 2.</b> Descriptive Statistics of the Overall Strategy Use.....	<b>48</b>
<b>Table 3.</b> Frequency of the Use of LLSs by High and Low Performing Participants.....	<b>49</b>
<b>Table 4.</b> Significance Test between Groups <sup>a</sup> .....	<b>51</b>
<b>Table 5.</b> Correlations between Students' Speaking Scores and the Frequency of LLSs Used.....	<b>52</b>

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

<b>APPENDIX A: The Speaking Test.....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>APPEDNIX B: The Speaking Criteria.....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>APPEDNIX C: The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning.....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>APPEDNIX D: The Consent Form.....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>APPEDNIX E: Permission 1.....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>APPEDNIX F: Permission 2.....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>APPEDNIX G: Permission 3.....</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>APPEDNIX H: Turnitin Similarity Report.....</b>	<b>84</b>

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATION**

- SILL:** Strategy Inventory for Language Learning
- LLSs:** Language Learning Strategies
- FL:** Foreign Language
- L2:** Second Language
- EFL:** English as a Foreign Language
- ELT:** English Language Teaching
- IELTS:** The International English Language Testing System
- SPSS:** Statistical Packages for the Social Science

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### Introduction

Every learner needs a method or strategy to achieve the ultimate goal of a learning process. Thus, learners employ different learning strategies to enhance their learning processes. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) defined learning strategies as “special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information” (p. 43). In other words, a learning strategy is all of the learning and thinking skills, solving problem skills or, the techniques that learners operate to take in, save and recall inputs during the process of learning (Hardan, 2013). These learning strategies are not restricted to a specific learning process; they aid in learning different subjects and languages, such as Chemistry, Math, English, French, and so on.

In language research recently, the term learning strategies refers to the operation used by the learner in practicing activities of a language (Hardan, 2013). Language learning strategies (LLSs) have a crucial role to play in second and foreign language (L2/FL) learning. Their use obviously “assist learners to become more outstanding and successful in their efforts to acquire and communicate in a second or foreign language”(Ali & Paramasivam, 2016, p. 136). Ghani (2003) defined that LLSs as particular activities, actions or strategies used by learners to enhance their advancement in learning language skill; these may promote the comprehension, storing, retention, or using of target language. Therefore, LLSs have gained great attention in terms of L2/FL learning. Many studies have concentrated on how

effective or successful language learners attempt to learn and these studies have tried to determine what strategies worked for them to understand which strategies are useful for language learning (Ellis, 1997). Moreover, language learners are able to learn LLSs on their own, so “less proficient students can be equipped to a satisfactory level in language learning” (Griffiths, 2004, as cited in Ali & Paramasivam, 2016, p. 136). Research on LLSs scrutinizes the feasibility of helping students get to be effective language learners by providing them with learning strategies described as "good language learners" properties through explanatory studies (Rubin, 1975; Setiyadi, Sukirlan & Mahpul, 2016).

LLSs seem to be one of the crucial influencing variables in L2 performance (Šafranĵ, 2013). Oxford (1990) elucidated that LLSs are particularly significant for language learning as they are instruments for effective, self-directed engagement, which are vital in improving communicative skills. Consequently, applying the appropriate LLSs is considered to be an important element to the growth of communicative competence, which mainly impacts the employment of speaking skills by learners of any foreign language. Thus, language learners should employ various learning strategies to figure out appropriate and effective strategies to communicate properly. “If learners do not have language learning strategies, they will not master English fast and well” (Wirawan, 2017, p. 2).

Oxford (1990) classifies LLSs into two types as direct and indirect strategies. The direct strategies are related to the direct mental processing of language learning in multiple ways and for various tasks. These direct strategies involve three strategies, memory, cognitive and compensation, while the indirect strategies support learning process and these strategies include affective, metacognitive, and social strategies. As Griffiths(2004) indicated that such strategies can be defined as follows:

Memory strategies (which relate to how students remember language), cognitive strategies (which relate to how students think about their learning), compensation strategies (which enable students to make up for limited knowledge), metacognitive strategies (relating to how students manage their own learning), affective strategies (relating to students' feelings) and social strategies (which involve learning by interaction with others) (p. 4).

Since LLSs are substantial for developing learner communicative competence, it is expected that increasing students' awareness of using LLSs would enable them to overcome their speaking difficulties and raise their autonomous learning. In the Libyan context, the Libyan English as a foreign language (EFL) students encounter difficulties due to lack of motivation and teachers' interest in students, lack of confidence to practice English speaking, and the use of traditional teaching approaches of the English language (Abusteen, 2015). However, few students have managed to develop and use their communicative competence properly on their own, while many students complain that "despite spending years in learning English, and building good linguistic knowledge, they fail to employ that knowledge in real communicative situations" (Diaab, 2016, p.338). In this respect, this research sheds light on LLSs that contribute in developing the speaking skill of high performing students and compares these with low performing students in speaking. It also focuses on the differences of using LLSs between the high and low performing students in English language department at Al Marj University in terms of their use of LLSs.

## **Background of the Study**

**Learning and mastering English speaking skills.** English has recently become the world's lingua franca, as it plays a powerful tool in communication. “English is now working as a bridge to make the whole world a small village” (Ha, 2008, p. 72). The huge technological advancement has contributed in the widespread of English along with its use in every field of science. Therefore, knowing English broaden people’s opportunities of getting good education and jobs. As regards to the importance of English, most people worldwide acquire English as a L2 to enhance chances in life. However, English learners are required to have good mastery of speaking skills to communicate in English successfully as speaking is the oral ability of the speaker to convey intended messages of his or her thoughts, opinions, facts, and feelings to others. To convey an intelligible message, “speaking requires that learners not only know how to produce specific points of language such as grammar, pronunciation, or vocabulary (linguistic competence), but also that they understand when, why, and in what ways to produce language (sociolinguistic)” (Abdallah,2018, p. 2-3). In other words, learners must be aware of the use of the five components of speaking; vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar, comprehension, and fluency.

Herianyah (2012) pointed out that:

language learners must also acquire the knowledge of how native speakers use the language in the context of structured interpersonal exchange owing to the fact that effective oral communication is called for the speakers to use the language appropriately in various social interactions(pp. 37-38).

As a reason of these considerations, mastering speaking is considered problematic in learning a language. Zhang (2009) argued that the majority of EFL learners consider speaking mastery the most difficult, and their oral skills remain incomplete. Besides, second/foreign language learners have their own mother tongue and culture that may affect their language learning. Thus, learners have to exert considerable efforts and employ effective and appropriate learning strategies. Lee (2010) adds “When learners start to learn something, they have the ability to respond to the particular learning situation and to manage their learning in an appropriate way. Learners use learning strategies in order to learn something more successfully” (pp. 134-135).

### **Statement of the Problem**

Many Libyan researchers such as Abusteen (2015), Altaieb (2013), Elabbar (2011), Omar (2014) and Orafi (2008) revealed in their studies that teaching English in a communicative way in the Libyan context was unsuccessful. “The focus of English language teaching (ELT) in Libya was on grammar and reading comprehension. Lessons were characterized by oral drills, memorization of vocabulary, and reading aloud. Arabic was widely used in English lessons by teachers and students” (Orafi & Borg, 2009, p. 244). However, because learning English language has become an absolute requirement due to its significant use worldwide, it is noticed that some Libyan students have been able to take their own responsibility in order to improve their speaking skills through different aspects of language learning process while others failed to master competencies in different skills. One of these reasons for this difference is thought to be the use of LLSs.



When I was a student at Al Marj University, I noticed that although the traditional teaching methodologies were adopted by most teachers, some students managed to communicate in English accurately and fluently. Those students employed several LLSs either through joining foreign language centers to practice speaking, making their efforts to develop their performance on their own, or through getting advice to use specific LLSs by someone who has good mastery of English. Recently, students resort the Internet to help them find useful ways in order to enhance their speaking performance. This situation is repeated every year in different institutions across Libya depending on the learners' motivation and interests, and this makes me wonder which LLSs that contribute in improving the speaking skills of high performing students and how these compares to the low performing students in speaking. The question of what the differences can be observed between the high and low performing students in English language department at Al Marj University, in my context, in terms of their use of LLSs remains unanswered.

Reviewing the literature, it is found that most research have been just discussed the issue related to the teaching methodology and there is no a research has investigated self-learning efforts that are endeavored individually by some Libyan students to develop the speaking skill. Thus, focusing on the LLSs which assist those students to be fluent that may pave the way in front of other students who lost their learning interest because the lack of learning and teaching method. Consequently, my choice of this topic was based on the Libyan students' need. The main aim of focusing on this need is the development of students' speaking performance via using the effective and appropriate LLSs.

### **Aim of the Study**

The aim of this study is to identify language learning strategies used by high and low performing students with regard to their contribution to improve speaking skills. It also aims to identify the differences in the participant groups of using these learning strategies. Comparing between the two groups will give Libyan students the opportunity to be aware of how to use the appropriate and effective learning strategies to overcome their speaking difficulties in speaking as well as to make them aware of how to raise their autonomous learning.

In order to reach this aim, the current study will attempt to answer the questions posed:

1. What are the most commonly used language learning strategies (LLSs) among:
  - a. Participants who achieve high scores in a speaking test?
  - b. Participants who achieve low scores in a speaking test?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference between those who have achieved a high score and those who have achieved a low score in terms of their frequency of the use of LLSs?
3. Is there a correlation between the type of LLSs used and the scores of the students in the given speaking test?

### **Significance of the Study**

Oxford (1990) explained the use of LLSs makes “the learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective and more transferable” (p. 8).

Therefore, because of the significant influence of the LLSs on the learning process of

a FL, it is expected that identifying these learning strategies will contribute to improving Libyan students' language learning in general and competencies in speaking in particular by providing them with information about the various effective learning strategies used by high achieving EFL speakers and the influence of LLSs on improving their speaking skills.

### **Limitations of the Study**

The first major limitation in this research was the difficulty of contacting the Libyan students in Libya. This was due to the fact that the researcher could not travel to Libya and the data collection had to be collected over the online via synchronous chats and video calls, which were recorded. This limited the participant number to those students who had had good internet connection. The SILL inventory was sent to the participants via e-mail and the procedures were explained to them via video calls over the Messenger application. This limited the participant number as a very limited number of students had good internet connection. As a result, the current study was limited with 12 participants. In this sense, this limitation provided an advantage of being able to record the participants' performances on the speaking test as well as allowing the researcher to spend time with the individual participants while they were filling in the inventory.

Another limitation of the study is that it uses the 7.0 version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) developed by Oxford in 1990. Therefore, only the main categories as described by Oxford were considered for assessing the frequency of EFL learners' use of the strategies.

Due to the English language importance in communication around the world, learning English has become an inevitable necessity in Libya. However, implementing traditional teaching methods is an obstacle for most Libyan students. Nevertheless, some students have faced this issue and they have taken the responsibility to enhance their English learning via applying various LLSs. The use of LLSs help those students to success in their efforts in acquiring and communicating in English well. Therefore, the need for identifying LLSs used by those students is important through clarifying what LLSs that contribute in developing the speaking skill of high performing students and compares these with low performing students in speaking and what the difference between the high and low performing students in English language department at Al Marj University in terms of their use of LLS.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### **Language Learning Strategies (LLSs)**

Oxford (1990) defined LLSs as “specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations” (p. 8). In addition, Richards, Platt and Platt (1992) stated that “LLSs are intentional behaviour and thoughts that learners make use of during learning in order to better help them understand, learn, or remember new information” (p.209). It is obvious that LLSs represent all behaviors and actions which are consciously or semiconsciously done by learners to deal with the process of language learning. In this regard, Cohen (1990) put forth that “learning strategies are processes which are consciously selected by learners and which may result in actions taken to enhance the learning or use of a second or foreign language through the storage, retention, recall, and application of information about that language” ( p. 4).

Since 1970s, researchers’ interest has increased towards language learning and language learners due to cognitivism revolution. Great efforts were exerted to explain the role of cognitive process in psychology and education. The main goal of LLSs was to identify what successful or good learners do to acquire a L2/FL. Observations and studies were conducted by many researchers (e.g. Rubin, 1975; Rubin &Thompson, 1994; Stern, 1975) to describe “good language learners in terms of personal characteristics, styles, and strategies” (Stern, 1975, p. 311). Zare (2012) has compiled these efforts to come up with a list of good learner characteristics. Accordingly, good language learners:

1. Find their own way, taking responsibility for their own learning,
2. Organize information about language,
3. Are creative, and try to feel the language by experimenting its grammar and words,
4. Create opportunities for practice in using the language inside and outside the classroom,
5. Learn to live with uncertainty by not getting confused and by continuing to talk or listen without understanding every word,
6. Use memory strategies to bring back what has been learned,
7. Make errors work for them and not against them,
8. Use linguistic knowledge, including knowledge of the first language, in learning a second language
9. Use contextual cues to help them in comprehension,
10. Learn to make intelligent guesses,
11. Learn chunks of language as wholes and formalized routines to help them perform “beyond their competence”,
12. Learn to use certain tricks to keep conversations going,
13. Learn certain production strategies to fill in gaps in their own competence,
14. Learn different styles of speech and writing and learn to vary their language regarding the formality of the situation (pp. 162-163).

These studies also give researchers an opportunity to understand how good learners acquire the target language as well as how these learners solve their learning problems. Consequently, the researchers have succeeded in defining the learning strategies of good language learners that less proficient learners can learn to develop

their language skills. O'Malley et al.(1985) stated that LLSs are employed by good language learners while learning a L2, can be identified and classified.

### **Classification of Language Learning Strategies**

Many scholars have classified LLSs into various categories. However, the classifications of LLSs are more or less the same (Ghufron,2017). The taxonomies for Rubin (1987), O'Malley & Chamot (1990), Oxford (1990),and Stern (1992) will be discussed in the paragraphs that follow. Rubin (1987) categorizes LLSs into three major strategies which contribute directly or indirectly to language learning. These strategies are categorized as “learning strategies, communication strategies, and social strategies” (p. 120). Learning strategies are divided into two strategies which directly contribute to developing a language learning, and they are cognitive and metacognitive strategies. “Cognitive strategies refer to the steps or measures which are taken in learning or problem-solving that involves direct analysis, transformation, or synthesis of learning materials”(Rubin, 1987, as cited in Zare, 2012, p. 165). There are six major cognitive strategies that directly contribute to language learning as Rubin (1987) identified which are as follows:

Clarification / Verification, Guessing / Inductive Inferencing, Deductive Reasoning, Practice, Memorization, Monitoring. Metacognitive strategies include planning, prioritizing, setting goals, and self-management, that are used to self-direct language learning (pp. 124-126).

In Rubin’s categorization, communication strategies focus on the communicative function in speech by having the intended meaning of the speaker and clarifying it; thus, they are less directly contributed to language learning. Social strategies reflect practices that give learners great opportunities to put their

experience into action. These strategies have indirect contribution to language learning, as they do not manage directly to the gaining, storing, recalling and utilizing a language (Rubin, 1987).

As an alternative to Rubin's categorization, O'Malley and Chamot (1990) classified three types of learning strategies. They are categorized as "metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, and social/affective strategies" (pp. 44-45):

1. "Metacognitive strategies are higher-order organizational skills that may include planning, monitoring, and evaluating a learning process" (p. 44). They can be relevant to a variety of learning tasks.
2. "Cognitive strategies operate directly on incoming information, manipulating it in ways that enhance learning" (p. 44). They may also be limited to specific learning tasks. Cognitive strategies represent "rehearsal, organization, inferencing, summarizing, reducing, imagery, transfer, and elaboration" (p. 45).
3. Social / affective strategies reflect a wide category involving either contact with another person or ideational influence over the outcomes. These strategies can widely be involved in multi-learning tasks, as they "involve cooperation, questioning for clarification, and self-talk" (p. 45).

Oxford (1990) is believed to have presented "the most comprehensive classification of learning strategies to date" (Drożdżał-Szelest, 1997, p. 41). She classified LLSs into two main types of strategies, direct and indirect strategies that are further subdivided into six categories.



1. Direct strategies represent “mental processing of the language. These strategies involve three sub-strategies, which are memory, cognitive and compensation strategies” (Oxford, 1990, p.37).
  - Memory strategies involve thought processes when necessary for storing and retrieving new inputs in memory, such as “creating mental linkages, applying images and sounds, revising well, and employing action” (p. 38).
  - Cognitive strategies aid learners to understand and generate a target language through multiple forms and ways like “practicing, receiving and sending messages, analyzing and reasoning, and creating structure for input and output” (p. 43).
  - Compensation strategies are applied when learners have a knowledge gap in speaking or writing, which can be employed through “guessing intelligently and overcoming limitations in speaking and writing” (p. 47).
  
2. Indirect strategies “support and manage language learning without involving the target language. These strategies include metacognitive, affective and social strategies” (Oxford, 1990, p. 135).
  - Metacognitive strategies help learners manage their cognition “through centering, arranging, planning, and evaluating their learning” (p.136).
  - Affective strategies enable learners to control their emotions, attitudes, and motivation for learning. These strategies can be done through “lowering anxiety, encouraging oneself, taking emotional temperature” (p. 140).

- Social strategies assist learners to interact communicatively with others through “cooperating, asking questions, and empathizing with others” (p. 145).

Oxford’s efforts provided an instrument for obtaining information related to strategy use of a L2/FL learner. Hence, the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) emerged. The SILL is divided into six categories; each category represents the kind of strategies used in learning foreign language. These are memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social strategies.

Finally, the recent classification has been done by Stern (1992) who put LLSs into five strategies, which are “management and planning strategies, cognitive strategies, communicative - experiential strategies, interpersonal strategies, and affective strategies” (pp. 262-266).

1. Management and planning strategies are related to the learner’s purpose of controlling his own learning and promoting his own planning. In this type of strategies, the teacher can support the learner as an advisor or a resource person. That is, the learner has to:
  - decide what commitment to make to language learning
  - set himself reasonable goals
  - decide on an appropriate methodology, select appropriate resources, and monitor progress,
  - evaluate his achievement in the light of previously determined goals and expectations (p. 263).
2. Cognitive strategies indicate to operations that are employed by learners for enhancing their learning ability of remembering materials and solving

problems with particular tasks. These strategies include “Clarification / Verification, Guessing / Inductive Inferencing, Deductive Reasoning, Practice, Memorization, Monitoring” (p. 264).

3. Communicative-Experiential strategies are used by learners to keep a conversation continuum, “such as circumlocution, gesturing, paraphrase, or asking for repetition and explanation” (p. 265)
4. Interpersonal strategies monitor the progress of learners, and assess their performance. The learners need to communicate with and collaborate with native speakers. The learners need to be acquainted with the target language culture.
5. Affective strategies express feelings that learners have towards a target language and native speakers. These feelings may be negative of some L2 learners. However, “good language learners are more or less conscious of these emotional problems. Good language learners try to create associations of positive affect towards the foreign language and its speakers as well as towards the learning activities involved” (Stern, 1992, p. 266). Language practicing can assist learners to face and resolve emotional difficulties by bringing attention to possible problems or pointing out how they emerge.

### **Speaking Skills**

“Speaking is a tool to communicate ideas that are arranged and developed accordance with listener’s need” (Musaddat, 2008; Tarigan, 1987, as cited in Heriansyah, 2012, p. 37). Similarly, Gert and Hans (2008) stated that “Speaking is speech or utterances with the purpose of having intention to be recognized by speaker and the receiver processes the statements in order to recognize their

intentions” (p. 207). Consequently, speaking is an interchangeable process between listener and speaker to receive and convey ideas, information and feelings, as it is regarded one of the productive skills. In language learning, while speaking, the learner conveys thoughts in a comprehensible spoken form of language considering the arrangement of the sentences and pronunciation. Regarding this, English language learners are required to master certain knowledge of speaking components and sub-skills in order to imply a language in good spoken form. These components and sub-skills are pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. In this regard, Heriansyah (2012) pointed out that:

Burnkart explains that language learners need to have three areas of knowledge involved within speaking namely (1) mechanics of language elements (pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary) which emphasize on use of right words in the right order with the correct pronunciation,(2) the functions of language that deals with speaking performance in the form of transaction and interaction (e.g. knowing how to change information and giving the clarity of essential message), (3) the sociocultural norms (such as turn-taking, rate of speech length of pauses between speakers, relative roles of participants, understanding how to take into account who is speaking to whom in what circumstances, about what, and for what reason)(p.37).

In brief, speaking is difficult skill to master, therefore, learners need to employ appropriate and effective learning strategies to acquire this skill successfully.

**Speaking components.** Riggerbach (1998) puts forth that the principle components of speaking are “pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, accuracy and fluency”(as cited

in Itkonen, 2010, p. 13). These components have a direct impact on promoting speaking skill. Thus, detailed explanations are given below to clarify the importance of each speaking component and sub-skill.

***Pronunciation.*** Pronunciation refers to the way of word utterance when speaking. Luoma (2004) defines pronunciation as a speech sound that “can refer to many features of the speech stream, such as individual sounds, pitch, volume, speed, pausing, stress and intonation” (p.11). Learners can interact effectively and clearly when they have good pronunciation and intonation despite vocabulary and grammar limitations. Ur (1996) demonstrated that the components of ‘pronunciation’ involve:

1. The sound of language or phonology
2. Stress and rhythm
3. Intonation(p. 47).

All components together assist learners to pronounce well. Mastering the sound perfectly may make intelligible speech, however, “still sound foreign because of unacceptable stress and intonation” (Ur, 1996, p. 47). Therefore, having a good mastery for the three components of pronunciation provide learners a native speaker accent. On other hand, Brown (2001) says that “our goal as teachers of English pronunciation should be more realistically focused on clear, comprehensible pronunciation” (p. 284). Hence, the main role of pronunciation is to make speaking comprehensible and clear, even if a learner accent is not a native-like accent.

***Vocabulary.*** “Vocabulary is the total number of words in a language” (Hornby, 1995, p.1331). These words convey meanings in a language either in a spoken or written form. In speaking, it is essential that language learners acquire an

adequate vocabulary for understandable interaction. Schmitt (2000) asserted that “lexical knowledge is central to communicative competence and to the acquisition of a second language” (p. 55). Finocchiaro(1974) classified vocabulary into two types “active and passive vocabulary” (p. 73). The words that used by learners constructively and correctly in writing or speaking, are active vocabulary; while the words that learners can understand them while reading or listening in a context, but they are never used are passive vocabulary. Obviously, vocabulary has the key role in mastering a L2/FL, “the vocabulary that is needed to convey what one wishes to say ... While without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed”(Wilkins, 1972,as cited in Al Qahtani, 2015, p. 22).

**Grammar.** Grammar is defined as “the description of the ways in which words can change their forms and can be combined into sentences in that language”(Harmer, 2001, p.12). Grammar has a crucial role in learning a language, it helps learners how to use and produce correct structures in written and spoken forms. “Grammatical competence helps speakers to use and understand English language structures accurately and immediately, which facilitates their fluency” (Rahnama, Fatehi Rad & Bagheri, 2016, p. 4; Richards &Renandya, 2002).

**Fluency and Accuracy.** Fluency and accuracy dichotomy are considered as one of the important components in speaking. Richard(2006) defines fluency as a natural language flow that make a learner keep on a conversation from breaking down even though a learner does not master adequate linguistic competence. Moreover, Brown (2007) explains that “fluency is probably best achieved by allowing the stream of speech to flow and with the riverbanks of instruction on some details of phonology, grammar, or discourse can channel the speech on more

purposeful course”(p.324). In contrast, accuracy is correct grammatical use of a learner’s output that hinder comprehension. Accuracy is a significant element while speaking should not be ignored, thus, Brown(2007) pointed out that:

While fluency may in many communicative language courses be an initial goal in language teaching, accuracy is achieved to some extent by allowing students to focus on elements of phonology, grammar, and discourse in their spoken output(p. 268).

***Comprehension.*** Since speaking is interchangeable process between sender and receiver of speech using a specific language, it needs good understanding of that language in order to receive and convey ideas. According to Alcántara(2013):

Comprehension is a key piece to keep a conversation. We need to code the message to give an appropriate answer or to make correct decisions in our expressions. Understanding a language is very important to communicate our ideas in a friendly environment(p. 21).

Speaking also requires to comprehend culture and knowledge of a target language, these two aspects play a great impact on language communication and comprehension. “According to Liddicoat et al. (2003), in order to learn communication in a second/foreign language, it is necessary to create awareness on ways in which culture interrelates with language whenever it is used” (as cited in Olusiji, 2016, pp. 44-45).

### **Learning and teaching Speaking**

“Learning is an activity to gain knowledge or skill” (Ahbab, 2011, p. 17).

Knowledge of speaking is not restricted to learning or teaching specific components

such as grammar, vocabulary or pronunciation. According to Thornburry (2005) speaking knowledge is categorized into linguistic knowledge and extralinguistic knowledge. Linguistic knowledge represents language features including discourse knowledge, speech act, and knowledge of grammar, vocabulary and phonology, and extralinguistic knowledge represents “independent knowledge, such as background knowledge of topic and culture” (Thornburry, 2005, p. 26). Learners need to activate them in the learning process. In other words, learners have to be aware of language features and integrate them into their existing knowledge base in order to develop the capacity of these features under real situations autonomously. “This means making decisions rapidly, implementing them smoothly, and adjusting their conversation as unexpected problems appear in their path” (Bygate, 1991, p. 4). In order to implement these areas of knowledge, learning process relies on various subfield within the psychological discipline: processes of acquisition, awareness, memory systems (storage), retrieval, styles and strategies of learning, theories of forgetting and the role of the practice (Siddiqui, 2008). Therefore, learners need strategies or manner that fit their learning of speaking.

Teaching speaking plays a key role in learning and developing learners’ speaking skills. Many researchers and linguists agree that “interacting” is ideal way for learning a target language. This aim can be achieved through communicative language teaching and collaborative learning (Kayi, 2006). This method of teaching enables learners to communicate with each other in the target language based on real life situations. “Teachers are the instrument responsible for creating a good situation in the learning of a foreign language” (Abusteen, 2015, p. 30). According to Harmer (2007) the models of instructional unit should consist of the five stages that follows:



1. Introduction. Explaining the aim of the current lesson to the learners.  
Encouraging them to lay out their background on the subject.
2. Presentation. Learners are required to explain the given topic clearly to check whether they have a good understanding of the topic. In this stage, learners should be given all tools and materials about the task, such as cards, reading texts, and so on.
3. Observation. The teacher observes the activity track that takes place within the class. Teacher intervenes when necessary to ensure learner progression of the lesson aims.
4. Feedback. It would be more appropriate to provide feedback at the end of the activity on the content rather than the grammatical accuracy. Giving learners feedback on their good achievements would enhance their self-confident, inner motivation, and sense of achievement.
5. Follow up activity on the topic. A follow-up assignment can be given to enhance activities in the lesson.

Teaching and learning process involves series of activities which help learners to acquire and develop their speaking knowledge and skill. Furthermore, Harmer (2007) suggested some activities for the speaking classroom. These include: “information-gap activities, telling stories, favorite objects, meeting and greeting, survey, famous people, student presentations, balloon debate, and moral dilemmas” (p. 129). These activities provided by teachers seek to encourage learners’ motivation to engage in speaking class (Ahbab, 2011). Therefore, teachers should use effective teaching methods and good materials of teaching speaking to make learners more involved in teaching and learning process while making their learning more meaningful and enjoyable for them.

## **Related Studies**

Although many researchers have deeply investigated the role of LLSs in developing many aspects of a L2/FL, the interest of this field have recently shifted to a narrower area which is the contribution the LLSs in developing a specific language skill such as reading, writing, listening, or speaking. In the area of concern for this study, a case study conducted by Shofia (2016) in Indonesia found that the dominated learning strategy used by those students with good oral competence is compensation strategy, while the social strategy is the least used. Another study was carried out by Wirawan (2017) showed that there was correlation between student's speaking ability and the metacognitive strategies. Those who were using these strategies had higher scores in speaking compared to the other learning strategies. Moreover, Wahyuni (2013) investigated that there is no significant correlation between the proficient speaking mastery and the use of overall strategies, yet positive. However, the significance of the gender preference was found in the affective strategies.

In the Iranian context, a study was carried out by Najfabadi (2015) which examined the use of speaking strategies by the EFL university students in relation to their gender and proficiency level based on which they were classified into three groups as low, intermediate and high proficient groups. The results revealed no differences in the use of speaking strategies by EFL students in terms of their gender and proficiency levels. A case study in Indonesia was conducted by Ghufon (2017) to examine what LLSs were used by the fluent speakers to reveal their understanding of the advantages of the LLSs in EFL speaking classes at English department. The findings concluded that cognitive and social strategies were the most commonly used

LLSs overall by fluent speakers, and that LLSs were very beneficial in learning English as an FL. The students were able to achieve good accomplishment when using LLSs in developing their speaking abilities.

Saputra and Subeki (2016) explored the speaking learning strategies applied by the students in developing their speaking skills and discussed the contribution of the speaking learning strategies to the students' scores in the speaking class at the English Education Department. The results showed that the students applied almost all LLSs suggested by Oxford (1990), namely memory, metacognitive, cognitive, compensation, affective, and social strategies. In addition, it presented that the assessment results were significantly correlated with the student use of speaking learning strategies. A descriptive study was conducted by Rachmawat (2013) which investigated learners' LLS in learning speaking and the differences in terms of the strategy use between the high- and low-class achievers in speaking. The results revealed that all learners used compensation strategies more frequently and differences in terms of the LLS use between the high and low speaking achievers were found in the varieties and frequency of strategy use, and strategy category. A causal-comparative study was done by Cabaysa and Boetion (2010) in Philippines to examine LLSs by high and low speaking students in school class, and what factors impact the use of these strategies. The results indicated that there were significant differences in the metacognitive strategy use between the two groups in the level of the frequency of these strategies. These factors affected school achievement, students' attitudes towards speaking, subject area, task at hand, and the techniques of teachers in allocating turns to speak and relieving anxiety among students when asked to use the L2. Yunus (2013) investigated the Indirect LLS use in speaking, as well as the rationale for using certain strategies. The findings indicated higher and more

significant use of the social strategies because of personal, social and academic purposes. While there was incoherent use of metacognitive strategies. A study by Gani, Fajrina and Hanifa (2015) was done to explore the use of LLSs in developing the speaking skills of high and low performance student in speaking as well as the differences of these strategy use of the two learner groups. The findings revealed that all LLSs used by high performing students for developing their speaking skills; which are memory, cognitive, compensatory, metacognitive, social, and affective strategies. However, that use was not found with low performing students in speaking.

As a result, the review presented here suggests that LLSs are important factors in learning the English language in general and improving speaking skills in particular. As the presented studies have shown, different strategies were found to be used by different high and low proficiency learners in different EFL contexts. The current review also pointed out that there was no such study in the context of Libya, focusing on strategy use by specific groups of proficient speakers. Hence, the rationale for the current study.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents a detailed explanation of the methodological procedures used in the current study. The research design, the research context, participants and sampling will be discussed respectively followed by data collection clarifying the procedures of collecting data and employed instruments, as well as data analysis.

#### **Research Design**

This research was designed as a comparative descriptive study where correlations were also investigated. This quantitative design is useful since it was based on the problem of the present study to suit its aims. The study aims to identify the Language Learning Strategies (LLSs) that contribute to the development of the speaking skills of high performing students and compares these with low performing students in speaking. It also aims to investigate the difference between the high and low performing students in English language department at Al Marj University in terms of their use of LLSs. Therefore, it is both descriptive and comparative in nature. To achieve these aims, two main instruments were employed to collect; a speaking test and the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning(SILL) that was formalized by Rebecca Oxford (1990). A speaking test was conducted via Messenger to categorize the participants, who were in their fourth semester in the English department, into high and low performing students in speaking. The SILL was used to identify LLSs and their frequency in terms of the use. The data gathered through these two instruments were carefully analyzed according to certain criteria that will be clarified in the section of data analysis.

## **Context**

This study was carried out in Al Marj University in north east of Libya where it is the only university in Al Marj city. All students who study in this university speak Arabic as a native language and they learn English as a FL. The students' population in the English language department at Al Marj University is about 350 students. A majority of them are Libyan. The students who participated in this study were undergraduate students from the fourth semester in English Language Department. Their English program consists of 16 hours a week, including the midterm and final exams. This program allocates two hours a week for the speaking classes in their fourth semester. This is only speaking component of their four-year program. Teaching speaking is mainly influenced by the traditional teaching methods that Libyan instructors were taught when they were students. These teaching methods emphasize on how language is formed and neglect language use. The Libyan students are usually not given the opportunity to use or practice their speaking skills. Learning English is limited to memorizing lists of vocabulary and grammatical rules which do not grant them a distinct sense of English as a communicative language.

## **Sampling and Sample**

The students who enrolled in this study were undergraduate students from the fourth semester in the English Language Department at Al Marj University. There is a total of 35 students studying in year two in the fourth semester where students have two hours of instruction devoted to speaking in their curriculum. All of these students were invited to take a part in the study. Data collection had to be done over the internet due to the travelling difficulty of the researcher to Libya. Therefore, only

12 students who had a good internet connection and agreed to participate were included in the study. There were two male and 10 female participants. All of them were Libyan. Their ages were between 18 to 20 years old. They were given a speaking test to be able to categorize them into two groups as low performing group and high performing group in speaking. The speaking test was conducted in the Fall semester of the 2019-2020 academic year via synchronous chats and video calls, which were also recorded.

### **Data Collection Tools**

In this study, there were two main instruments to collect data; a speaking test and the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL).

**The speaking test.** The speaking test consisted of two optional questions to evaluate students' speaking performance and to categorize them into high and low performing students in speaking. The test scores were transferred into table for data analysis in order to find out if there is a correlation between the type of LLSs used and the scores of the students in the given speaking test. The researcher designed these questions based on the second part of the IELTS test (Appendix A). In this test, "The examinee is given a task card and, after one minute of preparation time, is expected to speak about the topic on the card for between one and two minutes without interruption" (Wagner, n.d., p. 71). The reason behind choosing this design is that giving a question card, some time for preparation and a time schedule to the student is a good way of ensuring that a larger amount of spontaneous speaking about a topic can be elicited and reviewed at length. The difficulty of the card subjects, follow-up questions and scheduled time were adjusted to suit the participants' level. The tests were scored first by the researcher and then by another

rater to ensure inter-rater reliability. The speaking criteria presented in the Student Handbook of English Language Teaching Department at the Near East University were used to rate the speaking performance of the participants (Appendix B). The assessment of speaking test was for four individually rated categories which are fluency (coherence and cohesion), pronunciation (intonation, rhythm, and intelligibility), vocabulary (variety of lexical resource), and grammar (range and accuracy). The speaking criteria was provided with an explicit analytic scale for rating various components of speaking from 1 to 5 points for each component, which were averaged to an overall score out of 20 points.

**The SILL Inventory.** The SILL is a self-reported inventory designed by Rebecca Oxford (1990) based on her taxonomy of LLSs. The reason for choosing LLSs classified by Oxford (1990) because Oxford' classification is considered the most comprehensive up to date (Ellis, 1994; Griffiths, 2004). In addition, Oxford's inventory had an Arabic version of the SILL which was scientifically validated. "The SILL is a structured questionnaire, aiming to assess how often learners employ specific language learning strategies" (Kazamia, 2010, p.277). There are two versions of the SILL; 5.1 version (80 items) was designed for native speakers of English and 7.0 version (50 items) was developed for ESL/EFL. In this study, the researcher adopted the 7.0 version of SILL to investigate the type and the frequency of LLSs employed by high and low performing students in speaking (Appendix C). This version consists of 50 items which grouped into six categories of LLSs. Wirawan(2017) stated that these six categories of assessment are grouped as the following:



(a) memory strategies (9 items) which represent remembering effectively, (b) cognitive strategies (14 items) which represent using mental process, (c) compensation strategies (6 items) which represent compensating for missing knowledge, (d) meta-cognitive strategies (9 items) which represent organizing and evaluating the learning, (e) affective strategies (6 items) which represent managing emotion, and (f) social strategies (6 items) which represent learning with others ( pp.45-46).

The SILL involves a five point Likert- scale to rate students' responses from "Never or almost never true of me" to "always or almost always true of me". The scores are averaged by the summative rating scale of the SILL either for each part or across the 50 items. "The overall average indicates how often the learner tends to use learning strategies in general, while averages for each part of the SILL indicate which strategy groups the learner tends to use most frequently" (Oxford, 1990, p. 199).

The SILL was selected to be applied in this study because of its clarity, applicability, and its high reliability and validity. The Arabic version of the SILL was used to help students comprehend the items fully. This version was translated by Ismail and Alkhatib (2013) and validated in a doctoral dissertation by AlKahtani (2016).

### **Reliability and validity**

Ary et al. (2010) state that "the reliability of a measuring instrument is the degree of consistency with which it measures whatever it is measuring" (p. 236). Therefore, the speaking scoring was evaluated by a second rater to ensure that the researcher's evaluation of the speaking test results was reliable. The second rater was

Enas Al Naid, who was working as a teaching fellow at Al Marj University at the time of data collection. Based on this evaluation, students were categorized into high and low performing at speaking as it is illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1  
*The results of speaking test*

Student name	Rater 1	Rater 2
Rana	19	19
Amani	18	18
Dalal	19	19
Maiar	20	20
Ahamed	18	18
Alaa	19	19
Sali	9	9
Salma	7	7
Alia	8	8
Fatin	7	7
Farah	6	6
Ranim	7	7

The speaking criteria provided greater accuracy. The person who grades the test has clear criteria for each component and the ability to give and separate ratings. Ary et al. (2010) define validity as “the extent to which scores on a test enable one to

make meaningful and appropriate interpretations” (p. 24). This ideally made scores more consistent. “The evaluation criteria are more focused, grading tends to be more reliable” (Terry, 1986. p 525). As shown in the table, the assessment made by the two raters was very identical in the final analysis, although they may have rated different sections of the speaking criteria differently for individual participants.

The SILL has been known for its reliability and validity that were extensively checked in various approaches (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995, as cited in Owada, 2006). Therefore, it was applied to gather data from the participants. The SILL has typically been found to have high reliability indices using Cronbach alpha with an average ranging from .93 to .98 based on the participants' response to the SILL whether it was in the target languages or in their own languages (Green & Oxford, 1995). The SILL version 7.0 (ESL/EFL) has been translated into many languages. In most studies, “the internal consistency of the entire SILL, measured with Cronbach's alpha, was high when administered in the native language of the learners,  $\alpha$  above .90” (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995, as cited in AlKahtani, 2016). For example, the high Cronbach alpha coefficient of .94 was stated when using the translated Chinese version (Hsiao & Oxford, 2002). “The reliability for the Arabic version of the inventory was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha measuring the overall reliability which revealed an excellent internal consistency of ( $\alpha = .95$ ) for the overall SILL” (AlKahtani, 2016, p. 65).

### **Data Collection Procedures**

To start gathering the data for the present study, the researcher firstly obtained a permission from the head of the English Language Department in Al Marj University. Secondly, when all the participants agreed to participate after reading

consent form, they received the SILL via email to be answered. The researcher explained all issues in the SILL that were not understood to the participants on a Messenger group before they started to fill it in. Participants were requested to respond honestly to items according their learning experience. As soon as the participants finished filling the SILL in, they resent them back. Thirdly, the speaking test was conducted online using the Messenger Application and by which the conversations recorded. Since all the participants have the Messenger application on their computers or phones, the application was selected to conduct and record the interviews with and also to discuss any issue related to the SILL. The participants were not required to write nor mention their names during the speaking test or on the SILL. The following were the steps followed by the researcher to conduct the speaking test:

1. The students were given the choice to choose one of two task cards, that was on two particular topics related to their life. They were given a minute to write notes if they wished.
2. The students were required to answer during 2 to 3 minutes to speak about the chosen topic, as their answers were recorded.
3. A teaching fellow from the English department at Al Marj University and the researcher evaluated the test scores based on speaking criteria of the English Language Teaching Department at the Near East University.
4. The students were divided into two groups according to the assessment of the test. Six students were the high performing students and six others were the low performing students in speaking.

### **Data Analysis Procedures**

The data gathered of the speaking test and the SILL were analyzed quantitatively by using the Statistical Packages for the Social Science (SPSS) version 20.0. The descriptive statistics included frequency analysis, mean and median scores calculations, which were used to specify which were the most frequently used LLSs by high and low performing students in speaking. Then, non-parametric test of the Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare the frequencies of the use of LLSs used by those who have achieved a high score in the speaking test and those who have achieved a low score in order to observe if there was a statistically significant difference in terms of their frequency of the use of LLSs. Finally, Spearman's rho was used to measure the correlation between the frequency of LLSs used and the scores of the students in the given speaking test. The tests used for comparison and correlation had to be non-parametric due to the small number of participants in the study as well as the lack of proof for a normal distribution in the scores. As explained by Nahm (2016), "if the distribution of the sample is skewed toward one side or the distribution is unknown due to the small sample size, parametric statistical techniques cannot be used. In such cases, nonparametric statistical techniques are excellent alternatives" (p. 9).

### **Ethical Considerations**

Ethical approval was obtained from the Near East University for the current study (Appendix F). In order to conduct this study at Al Marj University, a written consent was signed and stamped by the Head of English Language Department and

the Dean of Al Marj University(see Appendix E). Hence, the ethical aspects of research are followed very strictly in this research. In this regard, full consent was obtained from all participants individually via emails prior the study by providing them with an information sheet and a consent form (see Appendix D). Through the consent form, the participants were provided with clear information about the aims of the study, the procedures and the way in which ethics would be observed throughout the procedures. Confidentiality was maintained adequately to ensure the privacy of their data. While the speaking test was recorded as a face-to- face online synchronous conversation, each video obtained from this interaction was turned into an audio file before they were shared with the second rater. Besides, pseudonyms were assigned to each of the participants to allow anonymity. However, the participants were drawn their awareness for any potential technological risks that may threat their information.

The employed methodology was presented in detail in this chapter. As the rationale was given for choosing this quantitative study. The context, sampling, data collecting, and analysis data were all comprehensively. The coming chapter will be explained in the results of the data analysis.

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the analysis will be discussed in this chapter. The results will be presented in line with the research questions described previously. The chapter identifies LLSs used by high and low performing students with regard to their contribution to improve speaking skills. It also identifies the differences in the participant groups of using these learning strategies in the English language department at Al Marj University.

#### **A Descriptive Analysis of the Overall Strategy Use by Participants**

With respect to the SILL analysis, the following table indicates the overall strategy use among high and low performing participants. The findings show that metacognitive and affective strategies are the most commonly used by high and low performing students ( $M= 3.38$ ) equivalently ( $SD: 0.73$  and  $0.80$  respectively). These are followed by social strategies ( $M=3.07$ ,  $SD=1.09$ ), compensation ( $M=3.05$ ,  $SD=0.71$ ), and then cognitive strategies ( $M=3.00$ ,  $SD=0.85$ ). While the least commonly used strategies by high and low performing students are memory strategies ( $M=2.9$ ,  $SD=0.79$ ) as illustrates in Table 2 below.

Table 2

*Descriptive statistics of the overall strategy use*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Memory Strategies	12	2.94	0.79
Cognitive Strategies	12	3.00	0.85
Compensation Strategies	12	3.05	0.71
Metacognitive Strategies	12	3.38	0.73
Affective Strategies	12	3.38	0.80
Social Strategies	12	3.07	1.09
Valid N (listwise)	12		

### **Differences in Language Learning Strategies Use among Participants**

With respect to the participants' speaking test scores and the SILL analysis, the findings demonstrated that high performing participants used memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive and social strategies more frequently than those who have performed lower. The low performing participants who used the affective strategies most frequently in developing their speaking skills.



Table 3.  
*Frequency of LLSs use by high and low performing participants.*

Strategy Type	Level of Achievement	Mean Rank
Memory Strategies	High Achievers	9.50
	Low Achievers	3.50
Cognitive Strategies	High Achievers	9.50
	Low Achievers	3.50
Compensation Strategies	High Achievers	9.50
	Low Achievers	3.50
Metacognitive Strategies	High Achievers	9.50
	Low Achievers	3.50
Affective Strategies	High Achievers	9.17
	Low Achievers	3.83
Social Strategies	High Achievers	9.50
	Low Achievers	3.50

As it is shown in Table 3, the overall use of Language Learning Strategies by high performing participants (Mdn=9.50) is significantly higher compared to the low performing participants (Mdn=3.50). However, there is a slight decrease in terms of affective strategy use by high performing participants (Mdn=9.17), while the same strategy use shows an increase (Mdn= 3.83) compared to the others strategies (Mdn= 3.50) when used by low performing students in speaking.

It can be clearly seen that high performing participants used all LLSs in developing their speaking skills; in particular, they used five strategies most frequently, which are memory, cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies. On other hand, the low performing participants used the affective strategies most frequently. The students who often used various LLSs, they achieved higher scores

in the speaking test while participants who used limited LLSs, they had low scores in the speaking test.

It has been argued by many scholars that when learning a language, successful language learners appeared to use more LLSs (Bruen, 2001; Davies and Elder, 2006; Green & Oxford, 2007). In addition, less successful learners deploy fewer strategies (O'Mally & Chamot, 1990). This finding of the current study that there was a difference in the strategies used by high and low performing participants was in line with Gani, Fajrina and Hanifa's (2015) findings, who stated that high performing students in speaking tended to use all LLSs; memory, cognitive, compensatory, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies for developing their speaking, while that use was not found with low performing students in speaking. However, the finding also was not parallel with some previous studies carried out to investigate the frequent use of LLSs when learning speaking by different levels of learners. For example, Shofia (2016) found out that the dominated learning strategy used by those students with good oral competence is compensation strategy, while in a more recent study Ghufon (2017) demonstrated that cognitive and social strategies were the most frequently used LLSs overall by fluent speakers. Moreover, Rachmawati (2013) indicated that all learners used compensation strategies more frequently and differences in terms of the LLS use between the high and low speaking achievers were found in the varieties and frequency of strategy use, and strategy category.

To find out if there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups of participants in terms of their frequency of the use of LLSs, the Mann-Whitney U test was carried out. The results indicated that there was a statistically

significant difference between the high and low performing groups in terms of their frequency of the use of LLSs.

Table 4

*Significance Test between Groups<sup>a</sup>*

	Memory Strategies	Cognitive Strategies	Compensation Strategies	Metacognitive Strategies	Affective Strategies	Social Strat.
Mann-Whitney U	.000	.000	.000	.000	2.000	.000
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.002 <sup>b</sup>	.002 <sup>b</sup>	.002 <sup>b</sup>	.002 <sup>b</sup>	.009 <sup>b</sup>	.002 <sup>b</sup>

a. Grouping Variable: Level of Achievement

As it is clearly seen in Table 4, P-value for five strategies is the same ( $p = .002$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). These strategies are memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive and social. These five strategies were used most frequently by those who achieve high scores in the speaking test. The result conforms to the 5% level of significance ( $p = <0.05$ ). Therefore, the null hypothesis can be rejected. The implication is that there is a statistically significant difference between the groups in the use of all strategy groups in favor of those who have achieved high scores in terms of their frequency of the use of LLSs. For affective strategies, which was the only strategy used slightly higher more than the others by low achieving participants, the result still shows a significant difference between the two groups.

The results of the significant tests show that a statistically significant difference in favor of those who have achieved a high score in the speaking test in terms of their frequency of the use of LLSs in all categories. This indicates that the

greatest difference between high and low performing participants lies in their frequency of the use of LLSs in which high performing participants achieved high scores and low performing participants achieved low scores in the speaking test. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) stated that efficient learners typically employ a wider range of strategies as they employ them in ways that help in achieving their language tasks effectively; in contrary, inefficient learners who employ fewer strategies; their strategy use is often irrelevant to accomplish their tasks successfully. The results of the current study tend to be in line with O'Malley and Chamot's arguments.

### **The Relation between Speaking Test Scores and LLS Use**

Based on the frequency of LLSs used and the scores of the students' speaking test, Spearman's rho was used to measure the correlation between them. The findings showed that there is a perfectly significant and positive relationship between the frequency of LLSs used and the scores of the students in the given speaking test. The following table illustrates the results of this analysis.

Table 5

*Correlations between students' speaking scores and the frequency of LLSs used*

		Speaking Test Score	Language Learning Strategy Use
Spearman's rho	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.794**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.002
	N	12	12
	Correlation Coefficient	.794**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.
	N	12	12

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5 shows the Spearman's correlation between the students' scores of the speaking test and the frequency of LLSs use. Accordingly, Lani (2010) pointed out that "all correlation analyses express the strength of linkage or co-occurrence between two variables in a single value (Correlation Coefficient) between -1 and +1" (p. 1). The Spearman's Correlation of the frequency of LLSs use and speaking test score is  $r=0.794$ . Therefore, the result points out that the strength of relation between the two variables is very high and that the correlation coefficient is very highly significant ( $P < 0.01$ ). It can be concluded that the variation in speaking test score can be explained by the frequency of use of LLSs. The students who employed many strategies in developing their speaking skill obtained high assessment scores, meanwhile the students who used limited LLSs in developing their speaking skills had low assessment scores. In line with this, Gharbavi and Mousavi (2012) stated that "the more proficient the learners are, the greater number of LLSs they apply" (p. 120). The findings were also parallel with Saputra and Subeki (2016) who stated in their study that there was a significant correlation between the speaking classes' results and the student use of speaking learning strategies.

## **Discussion**

Oxford (1990) claimed that LLSs are used by all language learners but more successful learners use them more consciously, more effectively and more frequently. The finding showed that high performing participants seem to be aware of their language learning needs, therefore, they appeared to employ more LLSs to help them master their speaking competences.

Oxford (1996) and Wenden (1990) stated the conscious employment of LLSs makes successful language learners (as cited in Saputra & Subekti, 2016). It was apparent from the difference of frequent use that high performing participants were more aware of using LLSs that made them achieve high scores in the speaking test. Unlike, low performing participants who used affective strategies more frequently and they achieved low scores as a result. Thus, low performing participants needs to focus more on using various LLSs to improve their speaking skills and not only use affective strategies.

To conclude, the findings of this comparative and descriptive study revealed the LLSs that contribute in developing the speaking skill of high performing students. It also found out that there is a statistical difference between the high and low performing students in terms of their use of LLSs as well as a perfect and positive relationship between the employed strategies and the speaking scores. The students who employed various strategies in developing their speaking skill obtained high scores in the assessment, while the students who had limited LLSs use in developing their speaking skills had low assessment scores.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

This chapter draws a brief synopsis of the current study which intended to identify Language Learning Strategies (LLSs) used by high and low performing students with regard to their contribution to improving speaking skills. It also intended to identify the differences between the two performing groups in terms of using these LLSs in the English department at Al Marj University. Implications are presented in this chapter as well as some suggestions for further research.

#### **The Main Findings**

Based on the speaking test scores and the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) analysis, this comparative and descriptive study identified that the high performing students most frequently used five LLSs to develop their speaking skills significantly more than low achieving students. These strategies were memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive and social strategies. In contrast, low performing students used affective strategies more frequently.

The findings also demonstrated that there was a statistically significant difference between those who have achieved a high score in the speaking test and those who have achieved a low score in the same test in terms of their frequency of the use of LLSs. This significant difference was in favor of those who have achieved high scores. Finally, it was found that there was a significant and positive correlation

between the type of LLSs used and the scores of the students in the given speaking test. This relationship explains that students' speaking level was influenced by their use of LLSs.

### **Implications and Suggestions**

Since this study was based on the Libyan students' needs, many implications are suggested for the Libyan learners and teachers. First, the results indicated that low performing students showed inconsequential use of LLSs compared to high performing students. Low performing students might not be conscious of using all feasible learning strategies. Therefore, Libyan students should be explicitly taught how to use various LLSs. They should be made aware of the appropriate and effective strategies specifically that could fit their needs in terms of improving speaking skills. When collecting the data, some low performing participants expressed that they were motivated to improve their speaking skills. That would give them the opportunity to overcome their speaking difficulties as well as to make them aware of how to raise their autonomous learning regardless of the teaching methodologies used by their lectures.

Second, teachers should also be encouraged to be aware of LLSs. If they are trained in this regard and in encouraging their students to use these, that will enable them to assist their students in acquiring the English language and improving their speaking performance properly. Chamot (1999) indicated that "learning strategies can be integrated through every program to help students develop awareness of their own learning process" (p. 1). If teachers are aware of their students' LLSs, they will be able to select speaking teaching methodologies that fits their students' need to



overcome their speaking difficulties. Since the high performing students were found to be used all kind of LLSs, teachers should be able to identify the strategy use of their students and encourage the students to use the less frequently used ones too. Furthermore, teachers could assess their own learning strategies that may reflect on their teaching methodologies.

The current study identified LLSs used by high and low performing students for improving their speaking skill and compared the differences in terms of their use. Further research studies are recommended in the following arise:

1. Further research could identify other factors including the factors examined in the current study and those factors not investigated, including the motivation of the students, the purpose of learning, the learning style and the methods of teaching applied, and which could be related to speaking learning strategies.
2. Further research may be conducted on low performing students after teaching them applying LLSs to investigate whether explicit teaching of LLSs will improve their speaking competence.
3. Regarding to the limitations that were mentioned earlier, the current study was carried out with limited number of participants. Future research may involve a replication of the study on a large number of participants through various educational levels at the same university. Including a large number of participants from other educational levels would consider the results more generalizable for a broader Libyan EFL learner population. Oxford (1994) proposed study replication on LLSs in order to make more reliable and validated information available within and across different learner categories.

4. This study was of a strictly quantitative kind, focused on analysis of the data gathered from a speaking test and the (SILL). In order to obtain more comprehensive information about speaking learning strategies, future research may require to integrate some qualitative approaches together with quantitative research approaches like observation, interviews, diaries and thought-aloud protocol.

## REFERENCES

- Abdallah, N.S. (2018). Speaking difficulties that face Libyan EFL university students. *Human and Community Studies Journal*, 6, 1-17. Retrieved from: <http://stc-rs.com.ly/hcsj/docs/volumes/Speaking%20Difficulties.pdf>
- Abdallah, O. A. (2019). A study of Communicative Language Teaching in schools in Misurata city: A Libyan context. *Journal of Academic Research*, 13, 88-107. Retrieved from <http://lam.edu.ly/ar/images/acadj/issue13/EN10.pdf>
- Abusteen, E. F. (2015). *The most common challenges in learning English speaking skills: The case of Libyan university students*. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Near East University, Nicosia, Cyprus.
- Ahbab, M. (2011). *Teaching and learning process of speaking skill*. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Wlisongo State Institute for Islamic Studies. Semarang, Indonesia.
- Alcántara, N. (2013). *A Workshop of meaningful strategies to do an important improvement in speaking English skill founded on task-based learning by Jane Willis with thirdgrade students of secondary level at “José carlos mariàtegui” school in San Ignacio*. (Unpublished Master Thesis). The university of Nacional Pedro Gallo, Cajamarca, Peru.
- Ali, H. & Paramasivam, S. (2016). Language learning strategies across proficiency levels among EFL pre-university students. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3(4), 135-148. doi: 2376-760X

- Alkahtani, S. S. (2016). *Language learning strategies among Saudi EFL college students and their relationship to students' perceptual learning style, gender, academic major and proficiency level*. (Unpublished PhD dissertation). University of Tennessee, Knoxville, The USA.
- Al Qahtani, M. (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, III(3), 21-34. doi: 10.20472/TE.2015.3.3.002
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Razavieh, A. & Sorensen, C. K. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Hult Rinchart & Wiston.
- Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman Inc.
- Brown, D. H. (2007). *Principles of language learning & teaching*. (5<sup>th</sup>ed.). Pearson: Longman.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Teaching the spoken Language*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, A. L., Bransford, J. D., Ferrara, R. A., & Campione, J. C. (1983). Learning, remembering, and understanding. In J. H. Flavell & E. M. Markman (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Cognitive development* (4th ed.) (pp. 77-166). New York: Wiley.
- Bruen, J. (2001). Strategies for success: Profiling the effective learner of German. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34, 216-225. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.2001.tb02403.x

- Bygate, M. (1991). *Speaking*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Cabaysa, C. C.& Baetiong, L. R. (2010). Language learning strategies of students at different levels of speaking proficiency. *Education Quarterly*. 68(1), 16-35.  
Retrieved from:<https://journals.upd.edu.ph/index.php/edq/article/view/2131>
- Davies, A. & Elder, C. (2006). *The handbook of applied linguistics* (1<sup>st</sup>ed.).Malden:Blackwell.
- Diaab, S. (2016). Role of faulty instructional methods in Libyan EFL learners' speaking difficulties. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232, 338-345. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.032
- Drożdżiał – Szelest, K. ( 1997). *Language learning strategies in the process of acquiring a foreign language*. Poznań: Motiwex.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Finocchiaro, M. (1974). *English as a second language from theory to practice*. New York, NY: Regent Publishing Company.
- Gani, E., Fajrina, D.& Hanifa, R. (2015). Students' learning strategies for developing speaking ability. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 2(1), 17-30.  
doi: 2355-2794.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*( 19<sup>th</sup> ed.). Columbus: Merrill Greenwood.

- Gert, R. & Hans, S. (2008). *Handbook of communication competence*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ghani, M. (2003). Language learning strategies employed by L2 learners. *Journal of Research( Faculty of Language & Islamic Studies)*, 4, 31-38. doi: 237583528
- Ghufron, M. A. (2017). Language learning strategies used by EFL fluent speakers: A case in Indonesian context. *Indonesian Journal of English Teaching*, 6(2), 184-202. doi: 10.15642/ijet.
- Green, J. & Oxford, R. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 261-297. Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/i285096>
- Gharbavi, A. & Mousavi, S. A. (2012). Do language proficiency levels correspond to language learning strategy adoption? *English Language Teaching*, 5(7), 110-122. doi: 5.10.5539/elt.v5n7p110.
- Grix, J. (2004). *The foundations of research*. Basingstoke. Palgrave: Macmillan.
- Griffiths, C. (2004). *Language learning strategies: Theory and research (Occasional Paper 1)*. Auckland, New Zealand: School of Foundations Studies, AIS.
- Ha, P. L. (2008). *Teaching English as an international language: Identity, resistance, and negotiation*. Clevedon, Buffalo, and Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

- Hardan, A. (2013). Language learning strategies: A general overview. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 106(2013)1712-1726. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.194.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.)*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education limited.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Heriansyah, H. (2012). Speaking problems faced by the English department students of Syiah Kuala University. *Lingua Didaktika: Journal Bahasa Dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, 6(1),37-44. doi: 6. 37. 10.24036/ld.v6i1.7398.
- Hornby, A. S. (1995). *The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (5<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. Oxford university press(sd).
- Hsiao, T. & Oxford, R. (2002). Comparing theories of language learning strategies: A confirmatory analysis. *Modern Language Journal*, 86, 365-383. doi: 10.1111/1540-4781.00155.
- Hussein, S. (2018). *Factors affecting the implementation of communicative language teaching in Libyan secondary schools*. (Unpublished Phd dissertation).Sheffield Hallam University,Sheffield, UK.
- Ismail, S. & Al Khatib, A. (2013). Investigating the language learning strategies of students in the foundation program of United Arab Emirates University. *International Education Studies*, 6(9), 135-149. doi: 10.5539/ies.v6n9p135.

Itkonen, T. (2010). *Spoken language proficiency assessment: assessing speaking or evaluating acting?*(Unpublished Master's Thesis). University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland.

Kayi, H. (2006). Teaching speaking: Activity to promote speaking in a second language. *The Internet TESL Journal*. Retrieved from:  
[http://iteslj.org/Articles/Kayi-Teaching\\_Speaking.html](http://iteslj.org/Articles/Kayi-Teaching_Speaking.html)

Kazamia, V. (2010). Using the SILL to record the language learning strategy use: Suggestions for the Greek EFL population. *Advances in Research on Language Acquisition and Teaching: Selected Papers*,277-293. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.enl.auth.gr/gala/14th/Papers/English%20papers/Kazamia.pdf>

Lani, J. (2010). Conduct and Interpret a Spearman rank correlation. *Statistics Solution*. Retrieved from: <http://www.statisticssolutions.com/spearman-rank-correlation/a>

Lee, C., K. (2010). An overview of language learning strategies. *ARECLS*,7, 132-152. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/25889647.pdf>

Liddicoat, A., Papademetre, L., Scarino, A., & Kohler, M. (2003). Report on intercultural language learning. Canberra: DEST.

Luoma, S. (2008). *Assessing speaking*(4<sup>th</sup>ed.).Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



- Nahm, F., S. (2016). Nonparametric statistical tests for the continuous data: The basic concept and the practical use. *Korean Journal of Anesthesiology*.69(1), 8-14. doi: 6419-7563.
- Olusiji, L. (2016). The role of culture in second language learning: A critical view of regional medium of instruction schools in India. *An International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(1),43-54. doi: 2349-2147.
- Omar, Z. Y. (2014). *Perceptions of selected Libyan English as foreign language teachers regarding teaching of English in Libya*. (Unpublished PhD dissertation), University of Missouri–Columbia,USA.
- O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Kupper, L.& Russo R. P. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students.*Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, 35(1), 21-46. doi: 10.1111/j.1497.1770. 1985.tb01013.x
- O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Orafi, S. (2008). *Investigation of the teachers' practices and beliefs in relation to curriculum innovation in English language teaching in Libya*. Thesis (Unpublished PhD dissertation), University of Leeds. Leeds, The UK.
- Orafi, S. M. & Borg, S. (2009). Intentions and realities in implementing communicative curriculum reform. *Science Direct*. 37(2), 243-253. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2008.11.004

- Owada, Z. N. (2006). Language learning strategy use at the school of foreign languages of the Eastern Mediterranean University. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Near East University, Nicosia, Cyprus.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House/Harper & Row.
- Oxford, R. & Burry-Stock, J. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *Science Direct*, 23(1), 1-23. doi: 10.1016/0346-251X(94)00047-A
- Pei-Shi, W. (2012). The effect of learning styles on learning strategy use by EFL learners. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(2), 230-234. doi:1549-3652
- Rachmawati, Y. (2013). Language learning strategies used by learners in learning speaking (A descriptive study in an exemplary class in one of senior high schools in Cimahi). *Journal of English and Education*, 1(2), 124-131. Retrieved from <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/192055-EN-none.pdf>
- Rahnama, M., Fatehi Rad, N., & Bagheri, H. (2016). Developing EFL Learners' Speaking Ability, Accuracy, and Fluency *ELT Voices*, 6 (1), 1-7. Doi: 2230-9136
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Richards, J. (2008). *Teaching listening & speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C. & Renandya W.A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C., Platt J. & Platt H. (1992). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Essex: Longman.
- Riggenbach, H. (1998). Evaluating learner interactional skills: Conversation at the macro level. In R. Young & A. Weiyun He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency studies in bilingualism*, vol. 14. (pp. 53-67). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the “good language learner” can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(1), 41-51. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3586011>
- Rubin, J. (1987). Learner strategies: Theoretical assumptions, research history and typology. In: Wenden, A.L. & Rubin, J. (Eds). *Learner strategies in language learning*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 15-30.
- Rubin, J. & Thompson I. (1994). *How to be a more successful language learner* (2<sup>nd</sup>ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Šafranĵ, J. (2013). Strategies of learning English as a foreign language at faculty of technical sciences. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 775-782.  
doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.09.278

- Saputra, E. & Subekti, N. (2017). A study of the speaking learning strategies used by English education department students. *Journal of English Language and Language Teaching (JELLT)*, 1(1), doi: 2579-6046.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Setiyadi, A.B., Sukirlan, M. & Mahpul. (2016). How successful learners employ learning strategies in an EFL setting in the Indonesian context. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 28-38. doi: 10.5539/elt.v9n8p28
- Shofia, A. O. (2016). *Learning strategies to develop speaking skill: A case study of good oral competent students of Madrasah Aliyah Negeri Karanggede*. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Muhammadiyah Surakarta University, Madrasah, Indonesia.
- Shi, H. (2017). Learning strategies and classification in education. *Institute for Learning Styles Journal*, 1, 24-36. Retrieved from: <https://www.auburn.edu/academic/education/ilsrj/Journal%20Volumes/Fall%202017%20Vol%201%20PDFs/Learning%20Strategies%20Hong%20Shi.pdf>
- Siddiqui, M. H. (2008). *Research in teaching of literature*. New Delhi, India: S. B. Nangia.
- Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Terry, R. M. (1986). Testing the productive skills: A creative focus for hybrid achievement tests. *Foreign Language Annals*, 19(6), 521-528.

- Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. London: Pearson.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wahyuni, S. (2013). *L2 speaking strategies employed by Indonesian EFL tertiary students across proficiency and gender*. (Unpublished PhD. thesis). University of Canberra, Australia.
- Wagner, A. (n.d ). Designing speaking tests for freshman English classes: looking to the commercial sector for inspiration. *Asia University*. Retrieved from: <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwisjbuB2KvnAhXEy6QKHeScDXQQFjAAegQIARAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fasia->
- Wilkins, D. A. (1972). *Linguistics in Language Teaching*. Australia: Edward Arnold.
- Wirawan, W. (2017). *Analysis of learning strategies in speaking class the second grade students' at senior high school*. (Unpublished MA thesis). Lampung University. Bandar Lampung, Indonesia.
- Yunus, N. M. (2013). The use of indirect strategies in speaking: Scanning the MDAB students. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Science*, 1(23), 204-214. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1416
- Zare, P. (2012). Language learning strategies among EFL/ESL learners: A review of literature. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(5), 162-169. doi: 10.30845/ijhss

Zhang, Y. (2009). Reading to speak: Integrating oral communication skills. *English Teaching Forum*, 47(1), 32-34. doi: 1559-663X

## APPENDIX A

### THE SPEAKING TEST

There are two different questions. Each question written on a card that sent on the Messenger Application, students will be asked to choose one card to answer. As they will be given a minute to write note if they wish. The answering time is from 2 to 3 minutes.

1. Describe a useful website you have visited recently.
  - What it is
  - What useful information it provides
  - Why you think it is useful
  
2. Talk about a person you admire.
  - Who it is
  - How you get to know this person
  - Why you admire this person

## APPENDIX B

### NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY: DEPARTMENTS of ELL& ELT& TRN SPEAKING CRITERIA

<b>Fluency</b>		
5	<i>Very Good:</i>	Confident, smooth speech with very natural delivery.
4	<i>Good</i>	Generally natural delivery, only occasional halting when searching for appropriate words/expressions.
3	<i>Adequate</i>	The student has a rather halting delivery, but can maintain a flow of speech
2	<i>Poor</i>	Speech is slow, halting and fragmented. The student avoids longer sentence structures and phrases.
1	<i>Inadequate</i>	The student speaks so little that no 'fluent' speech can be said to occur.
<b>Pronunciation</b>		
5	<i>Very Good:</i>	Few errors of pronunciation and consistent use of rhythm and intonation. Although foreign accent is evident, the utterances are easily understood
4	<i>Good</i>	Occasional errors of pronunciation but comprehension is not impeded; some consistencies of rhythm and intonation are still evident (i.e. marked foreign accent).
3	<i>Adequate</i>	Rhythm, intonation and pronunciation require more careful listening; errors of pronunciation may occasionally lead to incomprehension
2	<i>Poor</i>	Comprehension suffers due to rhythm and intonation and frequent repetition is required.
1	<i>Inadequate</i>	Content is unintelligible with little attention paid to intonation, rhythm and pronunciation.
<b>Vocabulary</b>		
5	<i>Very Good:</i>	Good: Sophisticated and extensive range of vocabulary for the level allows for full discussion.
4	<i>Good</i>	Range of vocabulary is demonstrated in non-general topics. Occasional inaccuracies in use of sophisticated words.
3	<i>Adequate</i>	Range of vocabulary is adequate for everyday topics. Some lexical inaccuracies may limit the range of discussion.
2	<i>Poor</i>	Range of vocabulary is simple and limited. Frequent lexical inaccuracies and repetitions are evident.
1	<i>Inadequate</i>	Inappropriate and inadequate vocabulary for even the simplest topic.
<b>Grammatical accuracy</b>		
5	<i>Very Good:</i>	Sophisticated and accurate use of widerange sentence structures, mastery of the grammatical rules at the level being tested is evident.
4	<i>Good</i>	Wide range of sentence structures with few grammatical errors evident.
3	<i>Adequate</i>	Accurate use of simple sentence structures and grammatical forms where occasional errorsdonotinterferewithcomprehension;frequenterrorsareevident inmoreComplex sentence structures.
2	<i>Poor</i>	Speech is broken and distorted by frequent errors in basic structures
1	<i>Inadequate</i>	Unable to construct a comprehensible sentence.
<b>Communicative strategies</b>		
5	<i>Very Good:</i>	Wholly effective at communicating both actively and receptively; in everyday contexts and in the expression of ideas and opinions.
4	<i>Good</i>	Communicates effectively in turn-taking, responds appropriately and can develop the interaction in most contexts.
3	<i>Adequate</i>	Communicates adequately in everyday contexts by responding appropriately. Is sensitive to turn-taking but experiences some difficulty in developing the interaction.



2	<i>Poor</i>	Interaction ineffective. Can seldom develop an interaction.
1	<i>Inadequate</i>	Understanding and communication minimal.
<b>Organization of speech</b>		
5	<i>Very Good:</i>	Well-structured with clear introduction, development and conclusion.
4	<i>Good</i>	Overall structure is clear. Satisfactory introduction, development and conclusion, however, the transition between stages may not always be clear.
3	<i>Adequate</i>	An overall structure is apparent.
2	<i>Poor</i>	Very little organization of content. Underlying structure not sufficiently apparent.
1	<i>Inadequate</i>	No apparent organization of content.
<b>Relevance and adequacy of content</b>		
5	<i>Very Good:</i>	Relevant and adequate response to the task set
4	<i>Good</i>	Relevant to the task but occasional inadequate responses.
3	<i>Adequate</i>	Response for the most part relevant to the task set, though there may be some gaps or redundancy.
2	<i>Poor</i>	Response of limited relevance to the task set; possible major gaps and/or point less repetition.
1	<i>Inadequate</i>	Response irrelevant to the task set: totally inadequate response.

## APPENDIX C

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning SILL  
Version for Speakers of Other Languages Learning English  
Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL) © R. Oxford, 1990

### Directions

This form of the STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING (SILL) is for students of English as a second or foreign language. For each of the following statements, indicate your response by selecting the appropriate number in the box (1, 2, 3, 4 or 5) that tells HOW TRUE OF YOU THE STATEMENT IS.

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE OF ME means that the statement is very rarely true of you.

USUALLY NOT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true less than half the time. SOMEWHAT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you about half the time. USUALLY TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true more than half the time. ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you almost always.

Answer in terms of how well the statement describes YOU. Do not answer how you think you should be, or what other people do. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Please make no marks on the items and do not mark more than one response per question. Work as quickly as you can without being careless. This usually takes about 20-30 minutes to complete. If you have any questions, let the teacher know immediately.

### EXAMPLE

1. Never or almost never true of me.
2. Usually not true of me.
3. Somewhat true of me.
4. Usually true of me.
5. Always or almost always true of me.

Read the item, and choose a response (1 through 5, as above), and write it in the space after the item.

I actively seek out opportunities to talk with native speakers of English. .... You have just completed the example item. Answer the rest of the items on the Worksheet.

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning  
Version for Speakers of Other Languages Learning English  
Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL) © R. L. Oxford, 1990

1. Never or almost never true of me.
2. Usually not true of me.
3. Somewhat true of me.
4. Usually true of me.
5. Always or almost always true of me. (Write Answers on worksheet)

1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.
2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.
3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help remember the word.
4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.
5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.
6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.
7. I physically act out new English words.
8. I review English lessons often.
9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.

Part: B

10. I say or write new English words several times.
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.
12. I practice the sounds of English.
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.
14. I start conversations in English.
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.
16. I read for pleasure in English.
17. I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.
20. I try to find patterns in English.
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.
22. I try not to translate word-for-word.
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.

## Part: C

24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.
25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.
26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.
27. I read English without looking up every new word.
28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.
29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.

## Part: D

30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.
38. I think about my progress in learning English.

## Part: E

39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.
40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.
41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.
42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.
43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.
44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.

## Part: F

45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.
46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.
47. I practice English with other students.
48. I ask for help from English speakers.
49. I ask questions in English.
50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.

### Worksheet for Answering and Scoring the (SILL)

1. The blanks (\_\_\_\_\_) are numbered for each item on the SILL.
2. Write the response to each item (that is, write 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) in each of the blanks.
3. Add up each column. Put the result on the line marked SUM.
4. Divide by the number under SUM to get the average for each column. Round this average off to the nearest tenth. As in the following Key.
5. Figure out the overall average. To do this, add up all the SUMS for the different parts of the SILL. Then divide by 50.

SILL Worksheet (Continued)  
Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL)  
© R. Oxford, 1990

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Part A	Part B	Part C	Part D	Part E	Part F	Whole SILL
1. _____	10. _____	24. _____	30. _____	39. _____	45. _____	SUM A
2. _____	11. _____	25. _____	31. _____	40. _____	46. _____	SUM B
3. _____	12. _____	26. _____	32. _____	41. _____	47. _____	SUM C
4. _____	13. _____	27. _____	33. _____	42. _____	48. _____	SUM D
5. _____	14. _____	28. _____	34. _____	43. _____	49. _____	SUM E
6. _____	15. _____	29. _____	35. _____	44. _____	50. _____	SUM F
7. _____	16. _____		36. _____			
8. _____	17. _____		37. _____			
9. _____	18. _____		38. _____			
	19. _____					
	20. _____					
	21. _____					
	22. _____					
	23. _____					
SUM	SUM	SUM	SUM	SUM	SUM	SUM
÷9= _____	÷14= _____	÷6= _____	÷9= _____	÷6= _____	÷6= _____	÷50= _____
(Overall average)						

## **Appendix D**

### **LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES AND SPEAKING SKILLS: A DESCRIPTIVE CORRELATIONAL STUDY**

#### **Participant Information Sheet and Informed Consent Form**

Dear Participant,

This inventory is part of a research study that we are carrying out in order to identify the learning strategies used students to improve their speaking skill, as well as to identify the differences of using these learning strategies between the students in English language department. The data collected through this inventory will be used to understand what the learning strategies used by students in the English Language Department that contribute in improve their speaking skill. By filling in the following the inventory, you agree to participate in this study. We will also arrange online speaking test using the Messenger App. During that test, you will be given two optional question cards to answer one of them in a determined time. All interviews will be video-recorded to observe you while speaking and to clarifying any ambiguity while filling the inventory, and these video recordings will be turned into audio-recordings and then as soon as the test done. These audio data will be kept by the research team for 1 year after the completion of the study, after which they will be deleted from all of our databases. All video recording will be deleted completely after they are turned to audio-recordings. However, I would like to draw your attention to any potential technological risks that I cannot protect your information from cyber users who may take actions using the M-Turk and Qualtrics services.

Please note that your participation in the study is voluntary and whether you agree to participate or not will have no impact on your grades for the courses you are/were enrolled in. Your identity will not be revealed in any case to third parties. The data collected during the course of this study will be used for academic research purposes only and may be presented at national/international academic meetings

and/or publications. You may quit participating in this study at any time by contacting us. If you opt out of the study, your data will be deleted from our database and will not be included in any further steps of the study. In case you have any questions or concerns, please contact us using the information below.

Researcher name: Eyman Mohammed.  
English Language Department, Near East  
University.  
Tel: 00905488253899  
Email: [EymanMohammed@outlook.com](mailto:EymanMohammed@outlook.com)

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çise Çavuşoğlu  
Vice Chair, Department of English Language  
Teaching  
Near East University  
Email: [cise.cavusoglu@neu.edu.tr](mailto:cise.cavusoglu@neu.edu.tr)



## APPENDIX E

## THE PERMISSION OF AL MARJ UNIVERSITY

University Of Benghazi  
Faculty Of Education  
Elmarj - Libya



جامعة بنغازي  
كلية التربية  
المرج - ليبيا

الرقم الإشاري: .....

التاريخ: .....

الموافق: .....

Mr.AbdulraheemFarajHaroun  
El-Marj City , Libya  
E. Mail : Adulrahim \_ Haroun@ yahoo.com  
Mobile +218925572161

**To Whom It May Concern**

This letter to inform you that the M.Astudent Eyman Mohammed is permitted to collect data from the English Language Department at Al marj Faculty of Education of Benghazi University .

Faithfully ,  Abdulraheem Faraj Haroun  
The Head of English Language Department

Hamed Elmabrouk Saleh  
The Dean of Faculty of Education



المرج - ليبيا 067 762 3460 067 762 3348 مكتب عميد الكلية

## APPENDIX F



BİLİMSEL ARAŞTIRMALAR ETİK KURULU

04.11.2019

Dear Eyman Mohammed

Your application titled “**Identifying Language Learning Strategies used by English Department Students for Improving their Speaking Skill at Al Marj University**” with the application number YDÜ/EB/2019/370 has been evaluated by the Scientific Research Ethics Committee and granted approval. You can start your research on the condition that you will abide by the information provided in your application form.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Direnç Kanol  
Rapporteur of the Scientific Research Ethics Committee

**Note:** If you need to provide an official letter to an institution with the signature of the Head of NEU Scientific Research Ethics Committee, please apply to the secretariat of the ethics committee by showing this document.

## APPENDIX G

### The Permission of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning(SILL)

Rebecca Oxford

Inbox - Outlook 12 June 2019 at 4:06 pm

RO

Re: Ask for permission to use SILL

To: EymanMohammed



Dear Eyman,

You have have my permission to use the SILL for your study.

All best wishes,

Dr. Oxford

On Wed, Jun 12, 2019, 8:31 AM eyman mohammed <[EymanMohammed@outlook.com](mailto:EymanMohammed@outlook.com)> wrote:

Dear Dr. Rebecca Oxford

I am Eyman Mohammed, MA student from the Near East University. Currently, I am preparing to write my thesis. I would like to have your permission to use the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning(SILL), version 7,0.

I am looking forward to hearing from you.

My regards,  
EymanMohammed

## APPENDIX H

## Turnitin Similarity Report

## Thesis

## ORIGINALITY REPORT

**22%**

SIMILARITY INDEX

**16%**

INTERNET SOURCES

**9%**

PUBLICATIONS

**19%**

STUDENT PAPERS

## PRIMARY SOURCES

<b>1</b>	<b>Hanoi University</b> Publication	<b>1%</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>University of Tennessee, Knoxville</b> Publication	<b>1%</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Submitted to University of Edinburgh</b> Student Paper	<b>1%</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Submitted to Mahidol University</b> Student Paper	<b>1%</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>repository.bilkent.edu.tr</b> Internet Source	<b>1%</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>mjltn.org</b> Internet Source	<b>1%</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Submitted to Universiti Putra Malaysia</b> Student Paper	<b>&lt;1%</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Submitted to University of Northumbria at Newcastle</b> Student Paper	<b>&lt;1%</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Submitted to Thammasat University</b>	