

## THE INFLUENCE OF L1/L2 BASED STRATEGIES TOWARD STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY IN IKIP BUDI UTOMO MALANG

Ike Dian Puspita Sari<sup>1</sup>, Hernina Dewi Lestari<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> IKIP Budi Utomo Malang  
Email: dynike3@gmail.com

**Abstract.** *In speaking English, students should concern with vocabulary items, grammar, intonation, body language and so on. This research purposes to know the ability of students taught by using L1/L2 based strategies and students taught without L1/L2 based strategies, and also to know the influence of L1/L2 based strategies toward students' speaking ability. The research method was quasi-experimental which used two groups as Experimental Group (EG) and Control Group (CG). The research subjects were 90 students. The EG showed that there was difference before and after treatment although it was not significant. It also occurred for CG. However, by comparing the scores of both groups, this research found that sig. value is 0.000, in which the probability value (pvalue) < significant level ( $\alpha=0.05$ ). Hence, it is strengthen by tvalue 3.807 with df 44 (n-1) compared to ttable (2.015). Thus, it can be concluded that Ho is rejected. There is positive influence of L1/L2 based strategy towards speaking ability of students in IKIP Budi Utomo Malang.*

**Keywords:** *L1/L2 Based Strategies, Students' Speaking Ability.*

### INTRODUCTION

English skills include listening, reading, speaking, and writing. The main purpose of language learning is to communicate and use the language. Masmuh (2008) categorizes communication into spoken and written communication, verbal and non-verbal communication, vertical communication, horizontal communication, literal communication, formal and informal communication, and one way and two ways communication. Those categories was applied by speakers based on their communication purposes. However, the less of speaking ability

practice will cause some communication problems. When people cannot mention a word in English, they use their hand, imitate the sound, or use another word to explain, (Carventes&Rodriguez, 2012). Those ways are the communication strategy.

In English teaching and learning process, students face problem in communication, such as the less of language ability. Liao (2009) mentions some reasons which makes teaching and learning process is less effective, such as the method used was teacher-centered focusing on reading or writing, grammar and vocabulary memorizing. Another reason is students get

bored because of traditional modes. The accuracy is the most important thing than the fluency of the language. The most ineffective reason is the students' learning attitude and also the less communicative approach used by the teacher. Hence, they have to find a way, such as communication strategy. There are two type of communication strategies based on Fearch and Kasper (Wei, 2011: 13). Those are reduction strategies and achievement strategies. Students can use formal reduction and functional reduction including in reduction strategies. While in achievement strategies, they can use compensatory strategies and retrieval strategies.

In this research, L1/L2 based strategies are used in learning process, in order to know the influence towards students' speaking ability. L1 based strategies include code switching, foreignizing, and literal translation (Wei, 2011:13). He also mention that L2 based strategies include substitution, paraphrase, word coinage, and restructuring.

The willingness to communicate by using English significantly can be seen in Mesgarshahr and Abdollahzadeh research (2014). Communicative strategies he applied showed the higher significant result.

Mariani in Romero (2015) explains that the better consideration in teaching and learning process is not only applying theory, but also how to use real problem approach and also giving solution toward student's difficulties. L1 strategies used by native speaker and L2 strategies is suggested to be used in teaching process. Those strategies help students or speakers to avoid certain message or modify their message by using reduction strategies or achievement strategies.

Regarding to the communication ability, in which it is English communication, L1/L2 based strategies are applied in teaching and learning process in IKIP Budi Utomo Malang. This research is aimed to know the influence of L1/L2 based strategies toward students'

speaking ability. Thus, "The Influence of L1/L2 Based Strategies toward Students' Speaking Ability in IKIP Budi Utomo Malang" becomes the appropriate title for this research.

Considering the background of the study, the research problems are triggered to know the speaking ability of students taught by using L1/L2 based strategies in IKIP Budi Utomo Malang, and to know the speaking ability of students taught without using L1/L2 based strategies in IKIP Budi Utomo Malang. Another purpose is to measure the influence of L1/L2 based strategies toward English speaking ability in IKIP Budi Utomo Malang.

## METHOD

This research is quasi-experimental research. The researcher did not control the characteristic of research subjects. The research subjects used were 90 students of English Department in IKIP Budi Utomo Malang who take Intermediate Speaking Class. The researcher used 2 classes (A Class and B Class). Each class includes 45 students. A Class is Experimental Group (EG), which had treatment (L1/L2 based strategies), while B Class is Control Group (CG), which did not had any treatment. Both of groups got pretest in the beginning and also post test. Students are given certain topics for their speaking test.

In order to draw a conclusion of the hypothesis, there are some steps in analyzing data. Firstly, the research analyze pretest and post test of each group (EG and CG). Secondly, the normality data was counted to determine whether the next step used parametric or nonparametric counting. Thirdly, the significant value was analyzed by considering  $\alpha=0.05$ . Hence, the conclusion can be drawn.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The data taken for this research in six meetings. Those meetings include pre-test, treatment, and post test. In the first meeting,

pretest was given to measure initial ability of students in speaking English. Students discuss their holiday planning as the topic. Every students had five minutes to tell their holiday planning. Pretest was done in two meetings, in which EG and CG has the same pretest. After the pretest was done, the researcher gave treatment by applying L1/L2 based strategies, which spent 2 meetings. The last step was giving post test for EG and CG. They had 5 minutes to tell their holiday planning. This post test was used to measure their speaking ability. After all steps of data collection were done, the researcher analyze the research.

The analysis of pre-test score and post test score of EG result that the mean score of pretest was 66.98 and the post test mean score was 73.24.

**Table 1 Correlation table of Experimental group**

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pretest & Posttest	45	.943	.000

Correlation value of two variables resulted 0.943. Based on the value, it can be considered that the relation between two of them was strong and positive. The significant value also showed 0.000 from  $\alpha=0.05$ . This table below showed the result after treatment.

**Table 2 Experimental Group's  $z_{test}$**

Mean	Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
			Lower	Upper				
Pre-test - Post-test	-6.267	3.683	.549	-7.373	-5.160	-11.414	44	.000

The difference mean of pretest and post test was 6.267. Because the mean score was

negative, it meant that there was increasing tendency of English speaking ability in post test which was about 6.267. The significant value was 0.000, in which the probability ( $p_{value}$ ) < significant level ( $\alpha=0.05$ ). From the  $p_{value}$ , it can be concluded that there was difference before and after treatment done. However, analyzing of  $t_{value}$  which was -11.414 with df 44 (n-1), the  $t_{table}$  was (2.015), thus the  $t_{value} < t_{table}$ . It means that pretest score and post test score was not significant.

Regarding to Control Group (CG) pretest score and post test score analysis, the researcher count the mean score. The pretest score was 63.51 and the post test score was 67.16.

**Table 3 Correlation test of Control Group**

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pretest & Posttest	45	.964	.000

From the Table 3.3, the correlation value was 0.964 which meant the correlation was strong and positive. The significant level was 0.000 for  $\alpha=0.05$ . In order to draw a conclusion for group who was not applied L1/L2 based strategies,  $z_{test}$  was done.

**Table 4 Control Group's  $z_{test}$**

Mean	Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
			Lower	Upper				
Pretest - Post-test	-3.644	3.365	.502	-4.655	-2.633	-7.265	44	.000

From the table of  $z_{test}$ , the mean score was negative (-3.644) which meant there was increasing tendency for speaking ability in post test (3.644). This improvement was not very significant compared to experimental group, which was about 6.267. The significant

value was 0.000, in which the probability value ( $p_{value}$ ) < significant level ( $\alpha=0.05$ ). Regarding to  $p_{value}$ , it can be concluded that there was difference in pretest and post test. However,  $t_{value}$  was -7.265 with df 44 (n-1) and  $t_{table}$  2.015. Thus,  $t_{value} < t_{table}$ , which means that pretest and post test was not significant.

After analyzing pretest and post test of each group. The researcher analyzed posttest score of Experimental Group (EG) and Control Group (CG).

**Table 5 Correlation Test of Experimental Group and Control Group**

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 PosttestA & PosttestB	45	.551	.000

In the correlation test, significant value was 0.000 although the correlation value showed 0.551, which meant moderate and positive. After doing the correlation test,  $z_{test}$  was done to draw conclusion.

Table 3.6  $z_{test}$  of Post Test of EG and CG

Paired Samples Test								
Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
			Lower	Upper				
			Post-testA - Post-testB	6.089				10.728

The positive mean (6.089) in the table 3.6 showed positive influence. Significant value was 0.000, in which the probability value ( $p_{value}$ ) < significant level ( $\alpha=0.05$ ). There was difference between EG and CG. It also strengthened by  $t_{value}$  (3.807) with df 44 (n-1) and  $t_{table}$  (2.015). Hence, it can be seen that  $t_{value} > t_{table}$ . Thus, the result of pretest and post test was significant. In other words,  $H_0$  was accepted while  $H_a$  was rejected. It can be

concluded that there was positive influence of L1/L2 based strategies toward students' speaking ability in IKIP Budi Utomo Malang.

In Experimental Group (EG), pretest was given before treatment and post test was given after treatment. However, the score of both pretest and post test was not significant. It also occurred in Control Group (CG). However, by analyzing post test score between EG and CG, there was a difference. EG post test score which was given treatment (L1/L2 based strategies) and CG post test score was significant. It was similar with previous research done by Mesgarshahr dan Abdollahzadeh (2014), in which the communication strategy gives positive effect toward the willingness of English speaking. Besides, the use of L1/L2 based strategies can help students to solve their communication problems, thus they can deliver their ideas effectively (Carvantes and Rodriguez, 2012).

English learning which is especially related to speaking skill does not only focus on accuracy, but also it should be focus on fluency. According to Harmer (2007: 46), when people speaking, they will concept word, phrase, sound, intonation, and pitch to deliver their different ideas. Therefore, the vocabulary items' choice and grammatical accuracy do not always become a consideration in some case that the ideas or messages were delivered.

There are some ways that can be done in teaching speaking according to Brown (2007: 327). Those are: a) imitative, students practice intonation and sound utterance of certain vocals and consonants, b) intensive, students practice phonology and grammar, c) responsive which related to dialogue to answer the questions shortly and give opinion to friends or teacher, d) transactional which is similar with responsive, students demand to deliver their ideas to change information, e) interpersonal which focus on social relationship rather than delivering information and fact, and f) extensive or monologue is

report, summary, or speech done in spoken. From those six ways, L1/L2 based strategies was applied as communication strategy to help students deliver their ideas or messages effectively.

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The significant value of pretest score and post test score of Experimental group was 0.000, in which the probability ( $p_{\text{value}}$ ) < significant level ( $\alpha=0.05$ ). From the  $p_{\text{value}}$ , it can be seen that there was difference before and after treatment done. However, the  $t_{\text{value}} < t_{\text{table}}$  which means that pretest score and post test score was not significant. Similar with Experimental Group, Control Group has  $t_{\text{value}}$  (-7.265) with df 44 (n-1) and  $t_{\text{table}}$  2.015. Thus,  $t_{\text{value}} < t_{\text{table}}$ , which also means that pretest and post test was not significant. However, when post test scores of both EG and CG were analyzed, it showed different result. There was difference between EG and CG. It also strengthen by  $t_{\text{value}}$  (3.807) with df 44 (n-1) and  $t_{\text{table}}$  (2.015). Hence, it can be seen that  $t_{\text{value}} > t_{\text{table}}$ . Thus, the result of pretest and post test was significant. In other words,  $H_a$  was accepted while  $H_o$  was rejected. It can be concluded that there was positive influence of L1/L2 based strategies toward students' speaking ability in IKIP Budi Utomo Malang.

Regarding to the subjectivity, further research can be done to see the result of applying L1/L2 based strategies in teaching speaking. The students' ability of both experimental and control group should be equal by giving English proficiency test. The control characteristics may be done to generalize the result.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

found some difficulties to complete this research. It is pleasure to express highest regard and thanks to all people who support me to complete this research. Indeed, I thank to

all people and students who can be mentioned, in which they inspire me while doing this research in IKIP Budi Utomo Malang.

## REFERENCES

- Brown, H Douglas. 2007. *Principles of Language Teaching and Learning*. New York: Pearson Education Inc.
- Cervantes & Rodriguez, R.R. 2012. "The Use of Communication Strategies in the Beginner EFL Classroom". *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*, 6: 111-128.
- Harmer, J. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching: 4th Edition*. London: Longman.
- Liao, G. 2009. "Improvement of Speaking Ability through Interrelated Skills". *English Language Teaching* 2 (3) September 2009.
- Masmuh, Abdullah. 2008. *Komunikasi Organisasi Dalam Perspektif Teori dan Praktek*. Malang: UMM Press.
- Mesgarshahr, A., & Abdollahzadeh, E. 2014. "The Impact of Teaching Communication Strategies on EFL Learners' Willingness to Communicate". *SLLT* 4 (1): 51-76.
- Romero, B. N. 2015. *Improving Speaking Skills*. Research Gate Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44045670>
- Wei, Lin. (2011). *Communicative Strategies in Second Language Acquisition: A Study of Chinese English Learners' Attitude and Reported Frequency of Communicative Strategies*. D-essay in English Didactics, English IV, Spring 2011.

