

✓ ✓

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF LANGUAGE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

**INVESTIGATING STUDENTS' PREFERENCES AND USE OF
SPEAKING STRATEGIES WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO
YEKATIT 66 AND W/RO KELEMEWORK SECONDARY
SCHOOLS**

BY
HENOK ALEMU



May, 2012
ADDIS ABABA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRAGUATE STUDIES

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Henok Alemu entitled: *Investigating students' preferences and use of speaking strategies* and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.



Signed by the Examining Committee:

Examiner Haregewan Abate Signature [Signature] Date 25/06/2012

Examiner Melaku Wakuma Signature [Signature] Date 25/06/2012

Advisor Berhane Bogale Signature [Signature] Date 20/06/2012

Chair of Department or Graduate Program Coordinator

Abstract

The purpose of this study was identifying the extent of preferences and frequency of use of speaking strategies of grade 10 students of Yekatit 66 and W/ro Kelemework Secodary Schools. Moreover, it attempted to find out if there are significant differences between students' extent of preferences and frequency of use of speaking strategies and it also identified some of the major factors that inhibit learners from using their strategy preference as frequently as possible. A descriptive survey method was used. From the total population of 1547 students, 195 (98 male and 97 female) students, who were selected by using simple random sampling method, were involved in the study. In order to gather the necessary data, questionnaires, interview and classroom observations were employed. The questionnaires were used to gather data about the extent of preferences and the frequency of use of speaking strategies by students and to identify the major factors that affect the use of speaking strategies. The latter two tools were employed in order to triangulate the data gathered through the questionnaires. Accordingly, the following results have been found. The students showed high preferences towards all speaking strategies. However, students' preferences towards indirect strategies were greater than the direct one. In addition to this, none of the strategies were employed highly; rather students showed medium use towards all speaking strategies (affective, meta cognitive, compensation, memory, cognitive and social strategies). Another important result was that there was a difference between students' extent of preference and frequency of use of strategies. This means, students' attempt to use speaking strategies in relation to their extent of preferences were very weak. The major factors that inhibited students strategy use were lack of awareness of strategies, absence of conducive school environment, lack of EFL teachers help in teaching the strategies, the influence of culture, fear of making mistake, fear of students laughter and lack of experience of using strategies. Thus, it is recommended that all concerned bodies (teachers, school principals, students, etc.) should play a significant role in every way possible in order to make students use speaking strategies as frequently as possible.



Acknowledgements

First of all I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Berhanu Bogale, for his polite approach and unreserved help in every way possible by spending his valuable time from the beginning to the end of the study.

My genuine heartfelt thanks also goes to my parents specially my father Ato Alemu Abebe and my mother W/o Berke Abebe for sponsoring me (financial support) and eagerness to see my success and above all, for their affectionate unreserved support and encouragement in all aspects throughout my study.

I have no words to thank my brothers Efrem Alemu and Aweke Alemu for continues moral, material and financial support from the beginning to the end of the study. In addition, I am indebted to all my friends (Omer Aliyi, Tewodros Tayework, Haymanot samuel and Asfaw seyum) who helped me by giving a moral and material support.

My deepest appreciation also goes to my friend Berhanu Bogale who involved in the translation of the English version questionnaire into Amharic.

I am beholden to forward my thanks to my friend Abebe Urgessa for his financial and material support, above all for lending me his laptop for editing the paper without which I could have not finished and submitted this research paper within the given deadline.

Finally, my special recognition goes to the schools principals, teachers and students for their humble cooperation during the data gathering process.

Table of Contents

Table of contents.....	iii
List of tables.....	vi
List of abbreviations.....	viii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3 Objectives of the Study.....	4
1.3.1 General Objective	4
1.3.2 Specific Objectives	4
1.4 Theoretical Framework of the Study	4
1.5 Significance of the Study.....	4
1.6 Scope of the Study	5
1.7 Limitation of the Study	5
1.8 Organization of the Study.....	5
1.9 Operational Definitions.....	6
Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature	7
2.1 Theories of Speaking	7
2.2 Language Learning Strategies	8
2.2.1 Definition of Strategy	8
2.2.2 Speaking Strategies.....	8
2.2.3 Learners' Preferences	9
2.3 Classifications of Language Learning Strategy	10
2.3.1 Direct Strategies.....	11
2.3.1.1 Memory Strategies.....	11
2.3.1.2 Cognitive Strategies.....	12
2.3.1.3 Compensation Strategies.....	12
2.3.2 Indirect Strategies	12
2.3.2.1 Meta Cognitive Strategies.....	12
2.3.2.2 Affective Strategies.....	13
2.3.2.3 Social Strategies.....	13

2.4 Factors Affecting Students Learning Strategy Uses	13
2.4.1 Beliefs about Language Learning	14
2.4.2 Learners Levels of Language Proficiency	15
2.4.3 Motivation.....	15
2.4.4 Gender.....	16
2.4.5 Years of Language Learning.....	16
2.4.6 Influence of Culture and Context.....	17
2.4.7 Learning Styles and Other Personality- Related Variables	18
2.5 Studies on Speaking Strategies	19
2.5.1 International Researches'	19
2.5.2 Local Researches	20
Chapter Three: Research Design and Methodology	23
3.1 Research Design	23
3.2 The Setting.....	23
3.3 Sampling Population and Sampling Technique.....	23
3.3.1 Sampling Population.....	23
3.3.2 Sampling Technique	24
3.4 Instruments of Data Collection.....	24
3.4.1 Questionnaire	24
3.4.2 Observation.....	25
3.4.3 Interview	25
3.5 Data Collection Procedure	25
3.6 Data Organization and Analysis Procedure	26
Chapter Four: Analysis and Discussion	28
4.1 General Description of the Analysis.....	28
4.2 Speaking Strategy Preferences.....	29
4.3 Students' Frequency of Use of Speaking Strategies	38
4.4 Differences in Extent of Preferences and Frequency of Use of.....	49
Speaking Strategies.....	49
4.5 The Major Factors that Hinder Students in Speaking Strategy Use	59
4.6 Summary of the six strategies	61
4.7 Discussion of the Findings.....	62
Chapter Five: Conclusions and Recommendations.....	65
5.1 Conclusions.....	65

5.2 Recommendations.....	66
<i>References</i>	67
Appendix A: Students' Questionnaire (English Version).....	75
Appendix B: Students' Questionnaire (English Version).....	78
Appendix A1: Students' Questionnaire (Amharic Version).....	80
Appendix B1: Students' Questionnaire (Amharic Version).....	82
Appendix C: Students' Questionnaire.....	83
Appendix D: Classroom Observation Checklist.....	84
Appendix E: Students' Interview Checklist.....	85

List of Tables

Tables	Pages
Table 1: Results of students' extent of preferences of memory strategies	29
Table 2: Results of students' extent of preferences of cognitive strategies	31
Table 3: Results of students' extent of preferences of compensation strategies.....	32
Table 4: Results of students' extent of preferences of meta cognitive strategies.....	33
Table 5: Results of students' extent of preferences of affective strategies.....	35
Table 6: Results of students' extent of preferences of social strategies.....	36
Table 7: Results of students' frequency of use of memory strategies.....	38
Table 8: Results of students' frequency of use of cognitive strategies.....	40
Table 9: Results of students' frequency of use of compensation strategies.....	42
Table 10: Results of students' frequency of use of meta cognitive strategies.....	44
Table 11: Results of students' frequency of use of affective strategies.....	46
Table 12: Results of students' frequency of use of social strategies.....	47
Table 13: T-test for comparison between extents of preferences and frequency of use of memory strategy	49
Table 14: T-test for comparison between extents of preferences and frequency of use of cognitive strategy	51
Table 15: T-test for comparison between extents of preferences and frequency of use of compensation strategy.....	53
Table 16: T-test for comparison between extents of preferences and frequency of use of meta cognitive strategy	54
Table 17: T-test for comparison between extents of preferences and frequency of use of affective Strategy.....	56
Table 18: T-test for comparison between extents of preferences	

and frequency of use of social Strategy	58
Table 19: Ratings of the major factors that hindered students from using speaking strategies.....	60
Table 20: Summary of the six strategies for strategy preference	61
Table 21: Summary of the six strategies for strategy use	62

List of Abbreviations

L1_ Native Language

L2_ Foreign Language

EFL_ English as a Foreign Language

ESL_ English as a Second Language

IELTS_ International English Language Testing System

SILL_ Strategy Inventory for Language Learning

LLS_ Language Learning Strategies

10

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

Language researches have been continually showing an intense interest in investigating what makes some learners more successful in learning a target language than others. This has led them to examine the characteristics of ‘good language learners’ (Rubin, 1975). One of these characteristics is the use of language learning strategies. Oxford (1992) provides a specific and helpful definition of language learning strategies. Language learning strategies are specific actions, behaviors, steps or techniques that students (often intentionally) use to improve their progress in developing L2 skills. These strategies can facilitate the internalization, storage, retrieval and use of new language. Strategies are tools which are self directed involvement necessary for developing communication ability (Oxford, 1992:18).

Speaking skill being a part of L2 learning skills, speaking strategy is a crucial part of the whole language learning strategy. Speaking strategies are assumed to be used by foreign and second language learners to exercise their oral performance in the target language.

Different authorities’ emphasis that student’s language learning strategies play a significant role in second /foreign language learning. Breen (cited in Brown, 1984) reports that students are able to identify specific techniques adopted by the teacher that they prefer or believe helps them with understanding of the new language. It can, therefore, be argued that taking students’ preferences in to account has a paramount importance for it can enhance language learning and teaching. To do so, EFL teachers should be aware of students’ Preferences with every respect, for example, strategies preferences, activities, etc. Barkhuizen (1998) notes that by taking students’ preference in to account; teachers can plan and implement alternative strategies for their class.

In the process of language learning, while learners’ preferences are one side of the coin and the other side of the coin is teachers’ awareness of these preferences. It plays a considerable role in influencing their decision making processes and classroom behaviors (Spratt, 1999). Therefore, the identification of students’ preferences plays a vital role in teaching –learning processes.



1.2 Statement of the Problem

Speaking is one of the important skills that have to be mastered by students in foreign language learning. Indeed learners need to speak English and interact through it as it helps them in many respects.

However important speaking is, students face difficulties in using foreign language for communication. According to many findings, students' failure to achieve the desired outcome with regard to speaking skill can possibly be resulted from their failure to use as many speaking strategies as possible (Oxford, 1990). Nowadays, language learning strategies have been increasingly attracting the interest of contemporary educators as they have potential to enhance learning. Learning strategies are claimed to have the principal influence on the rate and level of second language acquisition (Ellis, 1994; Oxford, 1990). However, at present, as I have observed throughout my teaching experience in five years and as I heard from EFL teachers, students make a few attempts to use as many strategies as possible to improve their speaking skills. Accordingly, it has become common to hear teachers at different levels complaining that their students' command of English is very poor (below expectation) and the teaching-learning process is highly affected. Among the complaints, students inability to express themselves, their inability to ask questions through the medium of English, inability to discuss with their peers are some of the problems. Over the years, many abroad and local researchers have studied and examined the language learning strategies in general. These research works were discussed in the literature part of this study in detail (3 external and 8 local researches pp.19 – 22). However, to the extent of my knowledge, there are only two local research works that have been carried out on speaking strategies. These local researches are presented below.

Tsegaye (1995), investigated on speaking strategies employed by Kotebe Teachers College students. He found out that the number of strategies employed by students were inadequate which is limited to compensation type. There is also a research by Melkamu (2003), who carried out on perceived awareness, usefulness and frequency of use in the Micro Link Information Technology College students, found out that students are less aware of most of speaking strategies, perceive them as less useful, and less often employ a number of strategies identified by the researcher as useful. On the other hand, there are also researches on communication strategies which all of them restricted to the identification of strategies

employed by learners. Fossil (1992) has seen the communication strategies of students in high schools. Lee (1994) has seen the type and frequency of communication strategies of students. He found out that the type and frequency of communication strategies used by students are determined by the students' gender. Tiume (2005) has also researched on the verbal communication strategies of female and male students. However, most of the research subjects in these studies are students in different colleges and universities. As far as my knowledge is concerned, there is little in the literature that focuses on the speaking strategies use of students' learning English in high schools. In Ethiopia, high school is a very important stage in a person's life because the study in high school determines whether a person can go to have higher education or not and what kind of higher education a person can have.

Therefore, although some researchers have investigated on speaking (communication) strategy uses, to the extent of the researcher's knowledge, there isn't research work which has been investigated on the identification of students' extent of preferences and frequency of use of speaking strategies and on finding out if there are any significant differences between extent of preferences and frequency of use of speaking strategies. As a result, in order to provide more evidence for the research of speaking strategies, this study attempted to answer the following research questions.

1. What is students' speaking strategy preferences like?
2. How frequently do students use speaking strategies?
3. Is there a significant difference between extent of preferences and frequency of use of speaking strategies?
4. What are some of the factors that hinder students to use their speaking strategies preferences as frequently as possible?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General Objective

The main objective of the study was exploring students' extent of preferences and the frequency of use of speaking strategies.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study were to:

- Identify the students' preference of speaking strategies.
- Explore the students' frequency of use of speaking strategies.
- Find out if there are any significant difference between extent of preferences and frequency of use of speaking strategies.
- Identify some of the factors that hinder students' frequency of use of speaking strategies.

1.4 Theoretical Framework of the Study

The current study follows Oxford's (1990) strategy classification framework. The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), a strategy survey proposed by Oxford, was used to investigate learners' strategy preferences and use. Accordingly, the results of learners' strategy preferences and uses were analyzed using this system (classification).

1.5 Significance of the Study

The study is supposed to be significant for the following points:

1. This study provides feedback to the EFL teachers about the frequency of use of students' speaking strategies. As a result, teachers can assist their students by bridging the gaps in students strategy use.
2. It helps EFL teachers in providing them with awareness's about the reasons for students' less use of speaking strategies and awareness's about students' speaking strategies preferences. Consequently, they can teach them accordingly.
3. It may help material designers to use this paper as evidence for the importance of speaking strategies to include it in the students' text book.

4. It may help other interested researchers who are interested to conduct a research on the same or related topics as a reference.

1.6 Scope of the Study

This study was conducted in Addis Ababa, particularly at Yekatit 66 and W/ro Kelemework secondary schools. And, this study also delimited to investigating the students' speaking strategy preferences and use with particular reference to grade 10 students who are learning in the academic year 2004 E.C. The schools were selected for their proximity for the researcher and this helped the researcher in easing the data gathering processes.

1.7 Limitation of the Study

This study has got a limitation. Because of shortage of time and financial constraints, it was limited to only two schools. As a result of this, it could have an impact on the generalizability of the study.

1.8 Organization of the Study

This research is aimed at investigating the preferences and use of speaking strategies of Yekatit 66 and W/ro Kelemework secondary schools of grade 10 students. It is organized in to five chapters. The first chapter deals with the introduction which includes background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, objectives of the study, significance of the study, scope of the study, theoretical framework of the study, limitation of the study and operational definitions. The second chapter deals with review of related literatures. Under this chapter a detailed literature works were discussed.

The third chapter deals with research methodology which includes research design, research setting, sampling population and sampling technique, instruments of data collection, data collection procedures and data organization and analysis procedures. The fourth chapter is about data analysis and discussion. In this chapter a detailed analysis along with discussion of the findings were made. Finally, in the last chapter, conclusions and possible recommendations were drawn.

1.9 Operational Definitions

- ◆ **Speaking Strategy Preference** – the students' desire, need or wish towards speaking strategies to improve their progress in developing their speaking skill.
- ◆ **Speaking Strategy Use** - the actual practice /performance/ that students' make towards speaking strategies to improve their progress in developing speaking skill.
- ◆ **Speaking Strategies** - are specific actions, steps or techniques that students (often intentionally) use to improve their progress in developing L2 skills.

Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature

2.1 Theories of Speaking

Speaking a language is difficult for foreign language learners because effective oral communication requires the ability to use the language appropriately in social interactions. According to Richards and Renandya (2002), speaking is one of the elements of communication where communication is the output modality and learning is the input modality of language acquisition (Ibid, 210). According to Brown (1980:210), as a human being, we always need communication to express our idea to do everything. What's more as a students or learners, they have to speak with their teacher as long as in learning process to express their idea. Shumin as cited in Richards and Renandya (2002:208) also stated that:

“Communication in the classroom is embedded in focused meaning activity. This requires teachers to tailor their instruction carefully to the needs of learners and teach them how to listen to others, how to talk with others, and how to negotiate meaning in a shared context. Out of interaction, learners will learn how to communicate verbally and nonverbally as their language store and language skills develop. Consequently, they give and take exchanges of messages. It will enable them to create discourse that conveys their intention in real life communication”.

Therefore, in formal environment, teachers and students have to always interact to make communication because most of our daily communications remain interactional and language instructors should provide learners with opportunities for meaningful communicative behavior about relevant topic by using interaction as the key to teach language for communication because communication derives essentially from interaction. In other view, speaking is fundamental and instrumental act. Speakers talk in order to have some effect on their listeners. They assert things to change their state of knowledge. They ask them questions to get them to provide information. They request things to get them to do things for them. And they promise, warn, and exclaim to affect them in still other ways. The nature of the speech act should therefore play a control role in the process of speech production. Speakers begin with the intention of affecting their listeners in a particular way. They select and utter a sentence they will bring just this affect (Clark, 1997:223).

2.2 Language Learning Strategies

2.2.1 Definition of Strategy

The word strategy comes from the ancient Greek word *Strategia*, which means steps or actions taken for the purpose of winning a war known as military strategy (Wikipedia, 2009). Learning strategies are broadly defined as operations and procedures employed by learners to facilitate the process of acquisition, storage, retrieval, and use of information in their learning (Rigney, 1978). Learning strategies are "techniques, approaches, or deliberate actions that students take in order to facilitate the learning and recall of both linguistic and content area information" (Wenden, 1987:6). Oxford (1990) considers that "any specific action taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations" is a language learning strategy.

2.2.2 Speaking Strategies

A theoretical assumption behind learning strategy, which is widely discussed in the literature, is that language learning is a cognitive process that learners promote their knowledge and approach to language learning. Griffiths and Parr (2001) comment that some students are more successful at learning a language than others, which is of course to do no more than state the obvious.

Language strategy theory postulates that, other things being equal, at least part of this differential success rate is attributable to the variety of strategy, which different learners bring to the task. So what speaking strategy do learners bring to the speaking task? Fairly enough account has been documented in this regard. In fact, what is referred to as speaking strategies in this study has been referred by different writers differently as: 'talking strategies', 'communicative strategy', 'production strategies', 'conversation strategies', etc. though all have come up with more or less a similar list of speaking strategies.

To start with, Naiman et al. (1978) identified the different strategy in light of the various language skills. They identified strategies used in facilitating speaking such as avoidance of fear of making mistakes, contact with native speakers, asking for correction, and memorizing dialogues. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) too identified certain L2 learning strategies concomitant with speaking. Some of them were rehearsing to carry out a forth coming speaking task (functional planning), checking the appropriateness of one's own oral

production while it is taking place or after (self –mentoring or self evaluation), imitating a language model (repetition) using previous linguistic knowledge or prior skills to assist production (transfer), making an oral summary of new information gained, translation, question for clarification, and working together with one or more peers to accomplish several learning activities (co-operation).

Likewise, Oxford (1990) identified and described strategies as applied to the four language skills. Some of the strategies identified in relation to the speaking skill were getting help, or by explicitly asking for clarification or verification and using physical motion such as mime or gesture in place of an expression during a conversation to indicate to meaning.

Some other studies on strategies used to accomplish talking in a foreign language have concentrated particularly on compensatory activities and on pragmatics learning to perform certain kinds of speech acts appropriately. Poulisse et al. (1987) analyzed communication breakdown and repair strategies in conversations between Dutch high school students and English native speakers to include a variety of common functional language situations (apologizing, complaining, responding, requesting) on role-play cards to elicit how learners would go about and interactional situations. Finally, a full account of the results has been given and the research has been discussed in Cohen (1998: 240-255) (under the general heading-test taking, for this role-play elicitation task is more analogous to communicative tests than to the chance encounters of real life) in terms of methodology, strategies revealed, focus of attention during processing, the language of thought, and individual differences of style.

2.2.3 Learners' Preferences

The literature on the views of the students regarding the teaching learning of an L2 shows that learners have explicit beliefs about how to learn the target language. These beliefs can influence their learning behavior, which is what learners do to help them; learn the target language. According to Nunan (1999:144), adult value their own experience as a resource for further learning, and that they learn best when they have personal investment in the program and the content is personally relevant. Furthermore, Nunan argue that learner should never be forced to engage in learning experiences to which they object (1988:46). He goes on to say that if this doesn't happen, then resistance may be expected. Such resistance may not be overt, but manifested itself in the form of passive resistance to the learning process.

Therefore, it is important to consider the views and preferences of the learners' and their implication for language learning. Learners' beliefs are important since they direct their attitudes and expectations towards methods (strategies) as well as classrooms activities. Thus, it is vital to guide them to their perception of their language teaching and learning. If learners use the strategies that they prefer intensively, they will be benefited in improving the target language and be useful for implementing a program. Learning is also more effective if methodology and study mode are geared around students preferences.

2.3 Classifications of Language Learning Strategy

Classification of language learning strategies has primarily followed the theory of cognition (Macaro, 2001). Cognition refers to how the brain works for information processing and retrieval. Strategies are used to retrieve and store new information in the brain till this information becomes 'automatic' and such strategies are classified into a system by researchers and educators. Classification of strategies has many advantages. Strategy subsets enable researchers to describe the correspondence between mental processes and strategic processes (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990). Strategy inventories may also serve as a valuable reference guide for educational instructors in the process Of promoting autonomy in the language learner. Regardless of its advantage, different researchers classified language learning strategies in different ways. O'Malley and Chamot (1990:99) have differentiated strategies in to three categories: cognitive, meta cognitive and social/affective. Cognitive strategies are specified as learning steps that learners take to transform new material, for instance, inference, contextual guessing and relating new information to other concepts from memory.

Meta cognitive strategies involve consciously directing one's own efforts into the learning task. Social/Affective strategies involve interaction with another person or taking control of one's own feelings on language learning. Oxford's (1990) strategy inventory for language learning (SILL) is another classification system linking groups through a series of self-report assessments and questionnaires. Oxford divides strategies into two major classes: direct and indirect. Direct strategies refer to subconscious tasks, which are inherently learnt while indirect strategies refer to more conscious strategies. These two classes are again subdivided into six sub-groups of memory, cognitive, compensation, social, affective and meta cognitive.

These subsets are interwoven with each other, creating an occasional overlap in the strategy groups. Oxford's inventory is attractive in number of ways. It is designed in a way to suit not

only students learning English as a second/foreign language (ESL/EFL) in America but also students of any country. The inventory has already been translated into many languages and used as an effective tool for measuring strategy preferences and developmental stages in strategy usage (Oxford and Burry-Stock, 1995). The inventory also has a well-understood underlying structure for strategy categorization and employs a wide range of strategies, all items of which are checked and rechecked for validity and reliability. Wenden and Rubin (1987) again classified learning strategies into two categories: Cognitive (steps used by learners to process linguistic and socio-linguistic contents) and self-management planning, monitoring and evaluating), on the basis of their learning functions. Macaro (2001) conceptualizes all language learning strategies as standing in a continuum without a clear line dividing the strategy types into particular areas.

Cognitive strategies lie at one end with their inherent, subconscious, automated tasks and Meta cognitive/Social/Affective at the other end with their conscious, evaluative strategies. Much of this classification research has been conducted in English as second/foreign language (ESL/EFL) settings. Regardless of how they are classified, the exact number of strategies available and how these strategies should be classified still remain open for discussion.

However, a classification reported so far supported the view that Oxford's classification of learning strategies encompasses all aspects of strategy use and is the most comprehensive classification to date (Ellis, 1994). It has further been validated by Oxford (1990) through factor analysis measures and has proved to be the most valid classification of language learning strategies. The strategy categories (i.e., cognitive, meta cognitive, affective, social, memory and compensation) in Oxford's classification will, therefore, form the framework based on which the LLS that will be reported by participants in this study will be categorized and analyzed. Each strategy type is described as follows:

2.3.1 Direct Strategies

2.3.1.1 Memory Strategies

Memory strategies help learners' link one L2 item or concept with another but do not necessarily involve deep understanding. Various Memory related strategies enable learners to learn and retrieve information in an orderly string (e.g., acronyms), while other techniques create learning and retrieval via sounds (e.g., rhyming), images (e.g., a mental picture of the

word itself or the meaning of the word), a combination of sounds and images (e.g., the keyword method), body movement (e.g., total physical response), mechanical means (e.g., flashcards), or location (e.g., on a page or blackboard) (see Oxford, 1990 for details and multiple examples).

Memory strategies are often used for memorizing vocabulary and structures in initial stages of language learning, but that learners need such strategies much less when their arsenal of vocabulary and structures has become larger. (Ibid)

2.3.1.2 Cognitive Strategies

Cognitive strategies enable the learner to manipulate the language material in direct ways, e.g., through reasoning, analysis, note-taking, summarizing, synthesizing, outlining, reorganizing information to develop stronger schemas (knowledge structures), practicing in naturalistic settings, and practicing structures and sounds formally. Cognitive strategies were significantly related to L2 proficiency in studies by, Oxford (1990) and Park (1994), among others. All three were specifically in EFL settings.

2.3.1.3 Compensation Strategies

Compensation strategies (e.g., guessing from the context in listening and reading; using synonyms and “talking around” the missing word to aid speaking and writing; and strictly for speaking, using gestures or pause words) help the learner make up for missing knowledge. Cohen (1998) asserted that compensation strategies that are used for speaking and writing (often known as a form of communication strategies) are intended only for language use and must not be considered to be language learning strategies. However, Oxford (1990) contends that compensation strategies of any kind, even though they might be used for language use, nevertheless, aid in language learning as well. After all, each instance of L2 use is an opportunity for more L2 learning. Oxford and Ehrman (1995) demonstrated that compensation strategies are significantly related to L2 proficiency in their study of native-English-speaking learners of foreign languages.

2.3.2 Indirect Strategies

2.3.2.1 Meta Cognitive Strategies

Meta cognitive strategies (e.g., identifying one’s own learning style preferences and needs, planning for an L2 task, gathering and organizing materials, arranging a study space and a

schedule, monitoring mistakes, and evaluating task success, and evaluating the success of any type of learning strategy) are employed for managing the learning process overall. Among native English speakers learning foreign languages, Purpura (1999:61) found that Meta cognitive strategies had "a significant, positive, direct effect on cognitive strategy use, providing clear evidence that Meta cognitive strategy use has an executive function over cognitive strategy use in task completion".

2.3.2.2 Affective Strategies

Affective strategies, such as identifying one's mood and anxiety level, talking about feelings, rewarding oneself for good performance, and using deep breathing or positive self talk, have been shown to be significantly related to L2 proficiency in research by Oxford and Ehrman (1995) among native English speakers learning foreign languages. However, in other studies, such as that of Mullins (1992) with EFL learners in Thailand, Affective strategies showed a negative link with some measures of L2 proficiency. One reason might be that as some students progress toward proficiency, they no longer need Affective strategies as much as before. Perhaps because learners' use of cognitive, meta cognitive, and social strategies is related to greater L2 proficiency and self-efficacy, over time there might be less need for affective strategies as learners' progress to higher proficiency.

2.3.2.3 Social Strategies

Social strategies (e.g., asking questions to get verification, asking for clarification of a confusing point, asking for help in doing a language task, talking with a native-speaking conversation partner, and exploring cultural and social norms) help the learner work with others and understand the target culture as well as the language. Social strategies were significantly associated with L2 proficiency in the investigation of native-English-speaking foreign language learners by Oxford and Ehrman (1995).

2.4 Factors Affecting Students Learning Strategy Uses

The vast literature on language learning strategies points to a number of factors believed to correlate with learners' use of language learning strategies either in ESL or EFL contexts with a rather high exposure to the foreign language. Among these, beliefs about language learning, learners' level of language proficiency, motivation, learning style and other personality related variable, gender, years of language learning and influence of culture and context have been shown to have a strong effect on learners' use of different types of strategies.

2.4.1 Beliefs about Language Learning

Wenden (1986b) found that learners could discuss different aspects of their language learning. Among others, those aspects included beliefs about the best ways to learn a second language, the language itself, and the selection of strategies.

Researchers (Horwitz, 1987; Wenden, 1986a) proposed a relationship between students' beliefs about language learning and their strategies use. They argued that learners' beliefs about language learning provide an explanation for their choice to use certain language learning strategies. Learners' beliefs about language itself and how it is learned seem to influence their use of strategies.

In a study on the relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategies, Yang (1999: 518) found that learners who had strong self-efficacy beliefs used several types of strategies. Yang (1999: 530) also found that students' "beliefs about the value and nature of spoken English" are significantly correlated with "more frequent use of formal oral practice strategies".

Riley (1996: 155) asserts that beliefs about a language and how it is learned may shape or at least affect learners' attitudes, motivation or behaviors in the process of learning that language. McDonough (1995: 9) pointed out that our beliefs "forms the basis for our personal decisions as to how to proceed". Wen and Johnson (1997: 40) found that belief variables were very influential and consistent on strategies variables, which made them, suggest that teachers and materials writers have to take into consideration the learners' preconceived knowledge about learning a language.

Evidence suggests that language learners have certain beliefs about how languages are learned (Wenden and Rubin, 1987) and that learners can have a conscious knowledge of their mental processes (O'Malley and Chamot, 1989).

Researchers have differentiated between Meta cognitive knowledge and beliefs (Alexander and Dochy, 1995). They argue that beliefs are idiosyncratic, subjective and value related. Wenden (1998: 517) argued that there are certain properties which characterize both Meta cognitive knowledge and beliefs, but she agrees with Alexander and Dochy (1995) by suggesting that beliefs are distinct from meta cognitive knowledge because they are value related, idiosyncratic, and they "tend to be held more tenaciously than knowledge".

In this study, Wenden's (1998) view is accepted as a definition of beliefs about language learning.

2.4.2 Learners Levels of Language Proficiency

A high level of proficiency has been associated with an increased use of both direct and indirect strategies (Green and Oxford, 1995), more specifically; Cognitive and Meta cognitive strategies show high correlations with high language proficiency levels (Peacock and Ho, 2003). O'Malley et al. (1985b), for example, studied the range, type and frequency of language learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate high school L2 learners. Their results revealed that while both groups used more cognitive than Meta cognitive strategies, intermediate students used more Meta cognitive strategies than the beginners. On the other hand, a translation strategy was used more by beginners, whereas contextualization was used more by the intermediate level students. Chen (1990), too, in a study on the relationship between communication strategies and the proficiency level of L2 learners found that low-proficiency students employed more communication strategies than high-proficiency ones. The results indicated that high-proficiency learners mainly employed linguistic-based communication strategies (such as using synonyms) more frequently than low-proficiency learners, while the latter mainly made use of knowledge-based strategies. Park (1997) examined the relationship between the use of LLS'S and the proficiency level of 332 Korean students learning English as a foreign language. The results of his study showed a linear correlation between LLS's use and language proficiency. Furthermore, all six categories of LLS's as well as the overall strategy use were significantly correlated with the test of English as a foreign language (TOEFL) scores used to gauge their proficiency level.

2.4.3 Motivation

Another variable widely examined with respect to its relationship with LLS's use is motivation. Oxford and Nyikos (1989), who studied the effect of a number of factors on strategy use, including motivation, found the latter as the single most important factor influencing strategy use. McIntyre and Noels (1996) examined the relationship between LLS's and motivational level among undergraduate foreign language learners. They reported that, compared with less motivated learners, those who were substantially motivated, tended to adopt more learning strategies and used them more frequently. Tamada (1996) scrutinized the effect of instrumental and integrative motivation on the strategy use of 24 Japanese ESL

college students in England. The findings of the study showed that both integrative and instrumental motivation had a significant effect on learners' choice of LLS's. Chang and Huang (1999), too, studied the relationship between instrumental and integrative motivation on the LLS's use of 48 Taiwanese graduate and undergraduate students at a public university in the US. The results of the study showed that the total number of learning strategies were associated with motivational level. Conversely, social strategies were the least frequently used strategies by the participants and the only ones associated with extrinsic motivation. Yang (1999) studied the relationship between the learners' self-perceived motivation and their use of LLS's (as assessed by the SILL). The results showed a positive correlation between the level of motivation and the use of LLS's. Finally, Macleod (2002) found that strategy use was not affected by the participants' particular motivational orientation (whether instrumental or integrative), but, rather, by motivational level.

2.4.4 Gender

The effect of gender on strategy use has been thoroughly investigated along with other variables (Ehrman and Oxford, 1989). In the majority of these studies, females have consistently been reported as using LLS's more frequently than males (Wharton, 2000).

2.4.5 Years of Language Learning

The relationship between the years of language learning and the use of language learning strategies has also been investigated, though not as widely as other factors. Ramirez (1986) showed that the years of language learning affected the use of nine (out of 50) strategies indicated in the inventory. In a different type of study, Ok (2003) investigated the effect of school years on LLS use but found no evidence that learners' LLS use in all six categories increased during a certain school year. Third-year students had higher mean scores than first-year students in two strategy groups, namely, compensation and memory. In contrast, the mean scores of first-year students were higher in the other four strategy groups, i.e., meta cognitive, cognitive, affective and social strategies.

In brief, research in the area of LLS's has resulted in a wealth of information with respect to the type and nature of strategy use by learners belonging to different proficiency levels, motivation categories, age groups, cultural backgrounds, educational contexts, gender and learning styles. However, as previously mentioned, a majority of these studies have been conducted in Persian ESL learners' contexts where the quality and quantity of the learners'

access to the target language greatly differs from those in EFL contexts (Brown, 1994). Even the few studies done on EFL learners have taken place in contexts such as Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore where EFL learners' exposure to the target language, be it in the form of contact with native speakers or media, is much greater than that of learners in EFL contexts like Iran. Such contextual limitations could not only result in differences in EFL learners' patterns of strategy use but also affect the degree and nature of the impact such variables as proficiency level and motivation exert on their LLS use.

2.4.6 Influence of Culture and Context

As discussed above, the learner's goals, the context of the learning situation, and the cultural values of the learner's society can be expected to have a strong influence on choice and acceptability of language learning strategies. For example, in a culture that prizes individual competition and has organized its educational system around competitive tasks, successful language learners may prefer strategies that allow them to work alone rather than social strategies that call for collaboration with others.

Two SILL studies illustrate some of the learning strategy preferences reported by students in different cultural contexts. A study of ethnically Chinese, bilingual Singaporean university students studying a foreign language (French or Japanese) found that students reported a preference for social strategies as well as a disinclination to use affective strategies (Wharton, 2000). Another study looked at the language learning strategies of students in a university advanced Spanish writing class and compared achievement on a writing sample between those students speaking Spanish as a first or heritage language and those learning Spanish as a foreign language (Olivares-Cuhat, 2002).

As could be expected, students with a Spanish language background were graded higher on their writing samples than the other students, but they also showed a greater preference for affective and memory strategies and these latter were highly correlated with writing achievement.

Preliminary findings of a current study of learning strategies used by university students of less commonly taught languages indicate that both heritage speakers of Arabic and students of Arabic as a foreign language share many of the same challenges and consequent learning strategies for learning modern standard Arabic, but also demonstrate differences (Chamot, et

al.1987). For instance, heritage speakers reported using Meta cognitive strategies to overcome interference from their Arabic dialects when they attempted to speak modern standard Arabic, but, unlike the foreign language students had no difficulty in discriminating Arabic sounds and hence did not report any learning strategies for listening comprehension.

The implications for teaching are that language teachers need to find out what learning strategies students are already using for the different tasks they undertake in the language classroom. An open discussion of reasons why students use the strategies they identify can help teachers understand cultural and contextual factors that may be influencing their students. This can lead to clarification of the task's demands where there is a mismatch with students' current learning strategies. By understanding the task more clearly, students will likely be more motivated to try new strategies to complete it.

2.4.7 Learning Styles and Other Personality- Related Variables

The seventh and final problematic issue involves what is perceived by some as an inadequate linking of learning strategies and learning styles in the language learning field. Learning strategies do not operate by themselves, but rather are directly tied to the learner's underlying learning styles (i.e., general approaches to learning) and other personality-related variables (such as anxiety and self-concept) in the learner (Brown, 1994). They are also related to demographic factors like sex, age, and ethnic differences (Oxford 1989). Schmeck (1988) underscores the need to understand learning strategies in the context of learning styles, which he defines as the expression of personality specifically in the learning situation. Schmeck also exhorts researchers to view learning styles and learning strategies in the context of general personality factors such as the following introversion /extroversion, reflectiveness/ impulsiveness, field independence/ dependence, self-confidence, self-concept, self-efficacy, creativity, anxiety, and motivation (intrinsic/extrinsic) (Oxford and Cohen, 1992). According to Schmeck (1988: 179) a learning strategy disembodied from personality-related factors is "only a short-term prop for learning".

Studies on strategy use point to the fact that an individual's learning style preferences influence the type of LLS they use (Ehrman and Oxford, 1990). Extroverts, for example, show a strong preference for social strategies, while introverts use meta cognitive strategies more frequently

(Ehrman and Oxford, 1990); learners who favor group study are shown to use social and interactive strategies, such as working with peers or requesting clarification (Rossi-le, 1995).

There are also many other language learning strategy studies over the last decade that have looked at cognitive and meta-cognitive strategy use but have failed to gather, analyze, or report personality-related, social, and demographic information about the subjects. Factors such as motivation, beliefs, attitudes, anxiety, learning style, world knowledge, sex, and ethnicity have received lesser emphasis (Oxford and Cohen 1992).

2.5 Studies on Speaking Strategies

2.5.1 International Researches'

The first study that I will present was carried out by Issitt (2008) in a UK university during a ten-week pre-semester program of English for academic purposes, which prepared students for the speaking test of the International English language testing system (IELTS). This preparation consisted of three aspects: 1) developing students' confidence with an emphasis on reducing exam anxiety and on offering exam practice, 2) providing students with the IELTS regulations so as to better inform the students as to what the speaking test was about, and 3) making students aware of the marking of the IELTS exam criteria and helping them to adjust their speaking performance to match these criteria. In this course 35 students participated; however, only 13 took the IELTS exam because the other 22 had already entered their respective university departments. The results showed that the training of these students in strategic performance aided them in passing the test with the required scores for university entrance. Although the sample was small, the preparation of students in the use of strategies made them better prepared to tackle tasks in foreign language learning. According to Issitt (2008: 136), "encouraging students to use a variety of perspectives may also help motivate them to study independently and to consider different theoretical positions". This aspect of learner training is important, because one of the desired goals of education is to help learners to think critically so that they are in charge of their learning process. Learner training allows students to transfer these strategies to other aspects of the learning process.

The second study analyzed was carried out by Mugford (2007), who interviewed 84 EFL (English as a foreign language) users in Mexico in order to identify impolite interactional situations experienced by Mexican students and teachers.

Mugford (2007) argues that rudeness is a part of everyday language usage and should be included in language classes in order to prepare learners to interact in impolite situations. Due to the results of the study, Mugford argues for the inclusion of activities to prepare students to deal with this type of communicative exchange. Although he does not specifically refer to these practices as speaking strategies, he does advocate strategy training as a tool to better prepare learners for real life speaking exchanges.

The third study was conducted by Gallagher-Brett (2007), who applied a questionnaire to elicit information concerning learners' beliefs about speaking a foreign language. The students surveyed were in their final year at a secondary school in south east England, and were learning German. The questionnaire consisted of statements with a rating scale from one to five (one is 'strongly disagree' and five is 'strongly agree'). Students had to identify to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the statements. Students were also asked to answer open-ended questions in order to find out the strategies used while speaking in the foreign language. According to Gallagher-Brett (2007), the three strategies used most by students were practicing, revising, and repetition at home after revision. Although the results were from a very small number of participants, they reveal that the participants used strategies when speaking a foreign language. An interesting feature of the findings was the acknowledgement by students of failure due to individual factors related to their actions, efforts and feelings. This refers to the participants' awareness of themselves as learners and of their responsibility for their own learning actions and outcomes. The two main themes emerging from this study are: awareness of strategy use by students, and the role of affective factors such as confidence, mood and anxiety when speaking a foreign language. The students stated that practice and revision are the most important activities conducive to successful speaking of a foreign language. These two strategies are met cognitive and although they are important, my main argument in this article is the need to train students in the use of speaking strategies to help them better their performance when interacting in English.

2.5.2 Local Researches

The first study was conducted by Tsegay (1995), who made an attempt to investigate and describe the current speaking strategies used by first year students majoring English at the Kotebe College of Teacher Education. Twenty five students were involved. The result revealed that the majority of the students involved in this study were found to be strategic and generally

to utilize various speaking strategies believed by researcher to facilitate successful speaking. According to the results, although the subjects appeared to be generally promising and with remarkable interest to develop their speaking skill, there were certain strategies which were either rarely or never used by them. Some known strategies appeared to be used less frequently and were less developed because the students had lack of awareness and experience.

The second study was carried out by Melkamu (2003) who made an attempt to investigate perceived awareness, usefulness, and frequency of use of speaking among 311 students at Micro Link Information Technology College in Addis Ababa – Ethiopia, based on a 40 item self-report questionnaire. The subjects were asked to rate each strategy on a 5 point scale. The ratings of awareness and usefulness have been used to predict the frequency of use of 40 speaking strategies. The student- rating of usefulness has been compared with teachers' perceptions of usefulness of the strategies to see the (mis)match in their perception of strategy usefulness.

Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviation) and multiple regressions have been used in analyzing the data. The results of the analyses indicate that most of the speaking strategies believed likely to assist in developing better speaking proficiency have received low rating of awareness, usefulness and frequency of use by the majority of the students in this study. Further analyses reveal that awareness and usefulness play a role in overall strategy use and the use of certain types of strategies. It indicates that 88 percent of the variability in the frequency of strategy use is accounted for strategy awareness and perceived strategy usefulness. Overall, the use of four out of five (80 percent) strategies is predicted by a combination of awareness and usefulness.

There were also other researches' that have been investigated on the communication strategies. Tesfaye (2007) had conducted a study on communication strategies utilized by Omo TTI Trainee Teachers' in oral production of English. His subjects were Gamo and Amharic departments' students. Finally, he concluded that Amharic trainees were better than Gamo trainees in employing the strategies. On the other hand, female trainees of Amharic department were as effective as the male counter parts in the same department. Almaz (2007) has conducted a study on communication strategies used by male and female students in class room interaction: Kotebe College of Teachers Education first year language of students in focus. At the end she concluded that, though there was significance gender difference in

frequency of some of the strategies (that is male students used the strategies in a better frequency than female) there was no gender difference in types of communication strategies used by male and female students of Ketebe College of Teachers' Education.

Tiume (2005) also has identified communication strategies used by male and female students at Unity University in different task types. He concluded that females using communication strategies frequently than males in some task.

Fasil (1992) has concluded a study on communication strategy employed by senior high school students in oral production of English. Finally, he found out that achievements on the type of task students were provided. Moreover, proficiency level and the task types determine selection of specific strategies.

Kumelachew (2011) also investigated on communication strategies used by under graduate fourth year English majors at Addis Ababa University. He found out that students were using any twelve types of communication strategies. However, they didn't know the term communication strategy as referred to those techniques' they always use to solve their language difficulties.

Tibebu (2011) also conducted on communication strategies used by English third year students of Debre Markos University. He found out that students frequently use time gaining, asking for help, substitution, function, and form avoidance, literal translation and description strategies. On the other hand, message abandonment, language switching, over generalization and word coinage was the least frequently used strategies.

The above research works were helpful directly or indirectly to the researcher to see the gap and do accordingly.

Chapter Three: Research Design and Methodology

3.1 Research Design

Descriptive survey method was employed by using both qualitative and quantitative approach. This method was used recognizing that all methods have limitations; researchers felt that biases inherent in any single method could neutralize or cancel the biases of other methods. The type of mixed method which was applied in this research is concurrent triangulation. Triangulating data sources (a means for seeking convergence across qualitative and quantitative methods) is important (Jick, 1979 as cited in Creswell, 2007). This was because; it was helpful to the overall strength of the study than using either quantitative or qualitative research (Creswell, 2007). For this very fact, the researcher used this mixed method) to explore the students' speaking strategy preferences and use of speaking strategies and the factors that hinders students to use their speaking strategy preferences as effectively as possible.

3.2 The Setting

The study was carried out at Yekatit 66 and W/ro Kelemework secondary schools which are found in Arada Sub city, Addis Ababa. These schools were purposefully selected based on two major considerations. Firstly, there are teachers I personally know who can cooperate in facilitating the data gathering processes to have as reliable information as possible. Secondly, the school is close to the researcher.

3.3 Sampling Population and Sampling Technique

This section provides a clear picture about the sampling population from whom the samples were selected. In addition to this, it also provides details on the techniques that have been employed in order to select the best representative sample of the study.

3.3.1 Sampling Population

The sampling population of this study was grade 10 Yekatit 66 and W/ro Kelemework secondary schools students who are learning in the academic year 2004. Accordingly, the total populations of the study in the two schools were 1547. Grade ten students were selected because it was supposed that they would have better understanding of the subject (concept) of the study, so that this resulted in the success of the study.

3.3.2 Sampling Technique

There were 11 and 20 sections of grade 10 students at Yekatit 66 and W/ro kelemework secondary schools respectively. Each section has a students' ranging from 45 - 55. W/ro Kelemework school has 1007 students (476 male and 531 female) and Yekatit 66 has 540 students (322 male and 218 female). Accordingly, 14 % -141 students (71 male and 70 female) and 10 % - 54 students (27 male and 27 female) of the total population from W/ro kelemework and Yekatit 66 grade 10 students were selected using simple random sampling technique. The reason for selecting 14 and 10 percent of the total population was that Singh (2007) stated that a descriptive type of research needs greater amount of participants to generalize for the total population and 10 to 20 percent is the range for selecting the sample of the population. These samples were selected from each section by taking 10-15 percent of the students using simple random sampling technique in order to obtain best representative sample of a population for it gives an equal and independent chance of being selected for each and every population.

3.4 Instruments of Data Collection

In order to gather the necessary data, three instruments were employed. These were questionnaires, interview and classroom observation. Each of the tools was discussed as follow:

3.4.1 Questionnaire

The questionnaire designed for this paper was based on the survey designed by Oxford (1990). The survey in this paper was based on students' responses to a list of thirty statements about speaking strategies. These statements were grouped according to six strategy types. Items 1–5 were memory strategies, Items 6–10 were cognitive strategies, Items 11–15 were compensation strategies, Items 16–20 were meta cognitive strategies, Items 21–25 were affective strategies, and Items 26–30 were social strategies.

The SILL is a Likert-scale measurement that presents a set of strategies for language learning across skills. However, for the sake of the present study, only those strategies that are related to speaking strategy were selected from all strategy types. The SILL was used for two purposes. Firstly, students were asked to show the extent of their speaking strategy preferences with the rating from 1 'Never' to 5 'Very great extent'. Secondly, they were also asked to express the frequency of use of speaking strategy with the statements from 1 'Never true of me' to 5

'Always true for me'. In addition to this, another questionnaire was also employed in order to gather data on the levels of seriousness of the major factors that hindered students to use speaking strategies as frequently as possible in order to improve their speaking skills.

In this study, the SILL as well as the other questionnaire was presented in Amharic to the participants to ensure that possible failure to understand the instructions or questions would not affect the responses.

3.4.2 Observation

In the students' observation, the students were looked at to obtain data on the six strategy types identified by Oxford. Since it was difficult to observe all the sections, the researcher observed 5 sections from W/ro Kelemewok and 4 sections from Yekatit 66 School. Each section was observed twice for 10 to 15 minutes. The sections were selected randomly. The students were observed in order to triangulate the data gained through the questionnaire by noticing the students' actual use of speaking strategies. However, Observation of students cannot reliably identify all these strategies. It was particularly useful for some.

3.4.3 Interview

Structured interview were designed to elicit the students' types of strategies they used in facilitating their speaking skill or proficiency. Such structured interview was found to be useful in obtaining information pertinent to the research problem. Hence, eight structured questions were included assuming that they would represent the various categories used in the questionnaire. It was administered as a follow up to the questionnaire.

Since it was difficult to interview all the subjects, of the one hundred ninety five students who filled the questionnaire, 10 percent (20 students) in which 6 students from Yekatit 66 and 14 students from W/ro Kelemework School who were selected randomly were interviewed. The interview was more reliable and productive in eliciting a deeper insight than the observation in this research. This was because some students' behaviors related to mental activity were not detected through observation

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

The data were collected having self administered questionnaire, interview and observation. The questionnaires were prepared in English. The Amharic version was distributed to the students to ease their understanding of the various sub strategies. It was piloted and reviewed by

different people before it was administered. Then, in order to ease the data collection process, the researcher gave each teacher a copy of the questionnaires in charge of the class by giving them an orientation on how to administer. He told them that at the beginning of the data collection process, they have to explain the Purpose of the study and the data collection procedures to the students. Accordingly, for the 11 sections in Yekatit 66 and 20 sections in Kelemework, 11 and 20 course teachers administered the questionnaire to students in their classes respectively. The researcher was moving through the classes to avoid misunderstanding when created. The questionnaires were administered in the last period by taking some regular class time because the school administrator (Director) informed the researcher that it was difficult to organize the students to administer in one place. After the questionnaires' data collection process was over, interview was carried out by the researcher for the total of twenty students in the two schools so as to triangulate the data gained through the questionnaire. Finally, following the interview, classroom observation was carried out by the researcher in order to make sure that all the data gained through the questionnaires and interview holds true.

3.6 Data Organization and Analysis Procedure

The data were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively since the approach of the study was mixed. Data from the questionnaire was analyzed quantitatively. It was presented in tables in which the students were asked to indicate the extent of preference and frequency of use. The students' responses under each item were tabulated under five rating scales that range from 'always (5) to 'never' (1) for strategy use and 'very extent' (5) to 'never' (1) for strategy preference. The organized data were calculated in to percentages and mean values. The analysis was made for each single item based on the sample students. The analysis of the data followed the classification scheme developed by Oxford (1990). Then, based on their mean values the six strategies were put in their rank order. And, for the sake of analysis the five point Likert scales were warped into three parts. These were: 1.00 _ 2.49= low, 2.5 _ 3.49= medium and 3.50 _ 5.00= high. Data collected through the other instruments were qualitatively analyzed. To do so different steps were followed. First, the data was organized to check for their completeness and quality. Then, the data organized was described and interpreted qualitatively along with the questionnaire because their purpose was triangulation.

The t-test was also used to see if the differences between the mean scores for extent of preference and frequency of use were statically significant or not. This was carried out in the

following ways. The table value for sample size 120 is 1.96 at 95% confidence interval. Hence, if the calculated t-value is greater than 1.96 for degree of freedom (df) = 388 and $p < 0.05$, there is significant differences and vice versa.

Finally, based on the analysis made, the data was discussed and conclusions were drawn and recommendations were made.

Chapter Four: Analysis and Discussion

This study was conducted in order to investigate the students' preferences and use of 30 speaking strategies of Grade 10 Yekatit 66 and W/ro Kelemework secondary schools students in Addis Ababa. Moreover, it attempted to find out if there are any significant differences between extent of preference and frequency of use of speaking strategies. It also aimed at exploring the major factors that hindered students' to use their strategy preferences as effectively as possible.

4.1 General Description of the Analysis

A strategy inventory for language learning /SILL/ set by Oxford (1990) containing 30 speaking strategies was used for 195 grade 10 students to investigate students' preference and use of speaking strategy on a five point scale. And, to triangulate the data gained from strategy use questionnaire, observation and interview were used. In addition to this, in order to explore some of the factors that hinder students from using their strategy preferences, another questionnaire was employed. The result was addressed in three stages. First, the percentage and mean rating of the extent to which students prefer speaking strategies given to each of the speaking strategies was reported. Then, the mean and percentage score of students' frequency of use were reported in line with the data gained through interview and observation. Finally, on the basis of the mean scores of strategy preferences and use, t-test was used in order to compare and find out if there are any differences between extent of preferences and frequency of use. Finally, data gained through the questionnaire in order to explore some of the factors that hinder students' strategy use was analyzed.

4.2 Speaking Strategy Preferences

Below an attempt was made to over view what the students' speaking strategies preferences look like. This helped to find out if there are any differences between extent of preferences and frequency of use of speaking strategies. Accordingly, the analysis was made based on Oxfords' classifications of strategies.

4.2.1 Results of Memory Strategies Preferences

As shown in table 1, out of 30 speaking strategies, five of them deal with the kinds of memory strategies the participants prefer and these strategies were provided to the participants of this study to assess their extent of preferences towards each of the five memory strategies mentioned below. Accordingly, the results of the students' response along with their analysis are presented as follows:

Table 1: Results of students' extent of preferences of memory strategies

No	Strategies	Responses														Mean	Total	
		High				Medium				Low								
		Very great extent		Great extent		Total		Some extent		Little extent		Never		Total				
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
1	I try to associate what I already know and new language information in order to remember them.	111	56.9	48	24.6	159	82	6	3.1	3	1.5	27	14	30	15	4.09	195	100
2	I remember anew English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	101	51.8	52	26.7	153	79	9	4.6	3	1.5	30	15	33	17	4	195	100
3	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their localation on the page or on the board.	110	56.4	49	25.1	159	82	9	4.6	2	1.1	25	128	27	14	4.11	195	100
4	I try to remember language items by practicing repeatedly.	114	58.5	45	23.1	159	82	6	3.1	3	1.5	27	14	30	15	4.11	195	100
5	I connect the sound of anew English words and an image or picture of the words to help me remember the word.	47	24.1	67	34.4	114	59	12	6.2	9	4.6	60	31	69	35	3.16	195	100

As shown in the above table, a significant number of respondents /76.4% - 49.7% very great extent and 26.7% great extent/ highly preferred memory strategy with a mean value of 3.89. However, as compared to the other speaking strategies, it was the last strategy which the respondents preferred.

When we analyze memory sub strategies item by item, it looks as follows. The extent of preferences which the respondents showed towards memory sub-strategies varies. Accordingly, a remarkable number of students highly preferred using localation on the page or on the board /81.5% - 56.4% very great extent and 25.1 % great extent/, practicing language items repeatedly /81.5% - 58.5% very great extent and 23.1% great extent/, making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used /78.5% - 51.6% very great extent and 26.7% great extent/, and associating what they already know and new language information in order to remember them /81.5% - 56.9% very extent and 24.6% great extent/. As a result of this, the mean values of the above sub-strategies were high which were 4.11, 4.11, 4.09 and 4.00 respectively. On the other hand, subjects tended to show medium preference for connecting the sound of a new English words so as to remember a new English item with relative to others /58.5% - 24.1 % very great extent and 34.4% great extent/.

From the above analysis, it can be said that in order to remember new English items, the respondents, on average, tended to show a high preference towards all memory sub-strategies.

4.2.2 Results of Cognitive Strategies Preferences

This strategy is designed to investigate students' extent of preferences towards practicing the language material in naturalistic settings and practicing the structures and sounds formally. Accordingly, table 2 below provided the results of respondents' response about their extent of preferences towards the five cognitive strategies mentioned below. And, it is presented along with its analysis in detail.

Table 2: Results of students' extent of preferences of cognitive strategies

No	Strategies	Responses														Mean	Total	
		High						Medium				Low						
		Very great extent		Great extent		Total		Some extent		Little extent		Never		Total				
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
6	I say orally in order to practice new expression in the language.	142	72.8	35	17.9	177	91	3	1.5	3	1.5	12	6.2	15	7.7	4.5	195	100
7	I imitate the way native/proficient speakers talk in the language	25	12.8	71	36.4	96	49	12	6.2	9	4.6	78	40	87	45	2.77	195	100
8	I practice the sounds of English.	112	57.4	47	24.1	159	82	6	3.1	3	1.5	27	14	30	15	4.09	195	100
9	While speaking, I transfer the knowledge of words, concepts or structures from L1 /native language/toL2/English language/.	127	65.1	42	21.5	169	87	5	2.6	2	1.1	19	9.7	21	11	4.31	195	100
10	I use English outside the classrooms.	123	63.1	45	23.1	168	86	3	1.5	3	1.5	21	11	24	12	4.26	195	100

The students' responses showed that they preferred all cognitive sub-strategies with almost different extent of preferences. Of the five cognitive sub strategies, four of them were highly preferred by a significant number of respondents. These strategies were, saying orally in order to practice new expression in the language /90.8% - 72.8% very great extent and 17.9% great extent/, transferring the knowledge of words, concepts or structures from L1 /native language/ to L2 /target language/ which accounts for 86.7% /65.1% very great extent and 21.5% great extent/, using English outside the class rooms /86.2% - 63.1% very great extent and 23.1% great extent/ and practicing the sounds of English /81.5% - 57.4% very great extent and 24.1% great extent/. As a result of this, the mean values of the strategies were high which were 4.5, 4.31, 4.26 and 4.09 respectively. Contrarily, a significant number of students /44.6% - 4.6% very great extent and 40% great extent/ showed medium use towards imitating the way native /proficient/ speakers talk in the language. Consequently, it had the medium mean value which was 2.77.

From the above analysis it can be said that students had an internal curiosity to practice in naturalistic settings. Moreover, they have a strong desire to practice structures and sounds formally.

4.2.3 Results of Compensation Strategies Preferences

The third category of speaking strategy is compensation strategy. According to Oxford (1990) this strategy helps learners to overcome knowledge gaps to continue the communication. As a result, respondents were provided with five statements to show their extent of preferences towards each of the sub-strategies of compensation given below. Accordingly, the results of the respondents' response along with its analysis are given as follow.

Table 3: Results of students' extent of preferences of compensation strategies

No	Strategies	Responses														Mean	Total	
		High				Medium				Low								
		Very great extent		Great extent		Total		Some extent		Little extent		Never		Total				
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
11	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	99	50.8	53	27.2	152	78	9	4.6	6	3.1	28	14	34	17	3.97	195	100
12	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use body movements.	67	34.4	62	31.8	129	66	12	6.2	6	3.1	48	25	54	28	3.48	195	100
13	I ask my teacher or classmates to tell me the right expressions when I don't seem to get the right one.	124	63.6	41	21.1	165	85	6	3.1	3	1.5	21	11	24	12	4.25	195	100
14	When I forget or fail to remember a word or an expression, I keep on repeating the previous word for some time until I can recall or get a word.	115	59	49	25.1	164	84	4	2.1	3	1.5	24	12	27	14	4.17	195	100
15	When I fail to remember a word while speaking, I use L1.	86	44.1	58	29.7	144	74	9	4.6	6	3.1	36	19	42	22	3.78	195	100

In this strategy type, the results signified that items 11, 13, 14 and 15 in the questionnaire were the most preferred ones with large number of students, while the strategy in item 12 was also preferred but with a limited number of students as compared to others in the category. As a result of this, a very large number of students highly preferred asking their teachers or classmates to tell them the right expressions when they don't seem to get the right one /84.6% - 63.5% very great extent and 21.1% great extent/, repeating the previous word for some time until they recall or get a word /84.1% - 59% very great extent and 25.1% great extent/, using synonyms when they can't think of an English word while speaking /77.9% - 50.7% very great

extent and 27.2% great extent/ and using their L1 when they fail to remember an English word /73.8% - 44.1% very great extent and 29.7% great extent/ in order to compensate for the missing knowledge. Contrary to this, a reasonable percentage of the respondents /27.7% - 3.1% little extent and 24.6% never/ didn't prefer to use their body movements. As a result of this, they tended to show medium preference with a mean value of 3.48.

From this it is possible to say that students have an interest towards compensating for missing knowledge in order to learn and improve their speaking proficiency.

4.2.4 Results of Meta Cognitive Strategies Preferences

This strategy is designed to investigate students' extent of preferences towards arranging a study space, planning for L₂ task, evaluating task success, monitoring mistake and evaluating the success of any type of learning strategy. The results of the respondents' response are presented in table 4 below.

Table 4: Results of students' extent of preferences of meta cognitive strategies

No	Strategies	Responses														Mean	Total	
		High				Medium				Low								
		Very great extent		Great extent		Total		Some extent		Little extent		Never		Total				
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
16	I choose a topic, or initiate conversation to get more practice.	132	67.7	39	20	171	88	6	3.1	2	1.1	16	8.2	18	9.2	4.38	195	100
17	I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	147	75.4	45	23.1	192	99	3	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.74	195	100
18	I look for people talk to in English.	94	48.2	53	27.2	147	75	9	4.6	6	3.1	33	17	39	20	3.86	195	100
19	I arrange my schedule to study and practice the new language consistently, not just when there is a pressure of a test.	101	51.8	51	26.2	152	78	7	3.6	4	2.1	32	16	36	19	3.95	195	100
20	I talk and share idea about learning language problems and effective speaking strategies with my teacher.	80	41	61	31.3	141	72	9	4.6	6	3.1	39	20	45	23	3.7	195	100

In order to identify the different meta cognitive sub strategies the students preferred, they were asked to indicate their extent of preference towards organizing and evaluating their learning.

Accordingly, the majority of respondents /82.1% - 56.5% very great extent and 25.6% great extent/ reported that they highly preferred meta cognitive sub-strategies.

When we analyze the subjects' response item by item, which were included under meta cognitive strategy, the following results were found. The majority of the respondents /98.5% - 75.4% very great extent and 23.1% great extent/ showed that they have a great inquisitiveness towards using their English mistakes as a major tool to help them do better which ranks first in the meta cognitive sub strategy category. Moreover, choosing a topic or initiating a conversation to get more practice, practicing the new language consistently by arranging a schedule, looking for people to talk to in English and sharing ideas about learning language problems and effective speaking strategies with their teacher were also meta cognitive sub strategies which the majority of the respondents 87.7%, 77.9%, 75.4% and 72.3% preferred respectively. As result of this, all meta cognitive sub strategies have got the highest mean values which were 4.74, 4.38, 3.95, 3.86 and 3.7 respectively.

From this it can be said that students have a great interest for planning for an L2 task, gathering and organizing materials, arranging a study space and a schedule, monitoring mistakes, and evaluating task success, and evaluating the success of any type of learning strategy in order to improve their speaking skill.

4.2.5 Results of Affective Strategies Preferences

Five affective strategies were designed to assess the students' extent of preferences. The respondents showed their preferences for encouraging one self, giving a reward, listening to music, relaxing oneself and talking to someone else. Accordingly, the results of the respondents' responses are clearly presented as follow.

Table 5: Results of students' extent of preferences of affective strategies

No	Strategies	Responses														Mean	Total	
		High						Medium				Low						
		Very great extent		Great extent		Total		Some extent		Little extent		Never		Total				
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
21	I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	134	68.7	37	19	171	88	6	3.1	3	1.5	15	7.7	18	9.2	4.39	195	100
22	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	61	31.3	65	33.3	126	65	12	6.2	6	3.1	51	26	57	29	3.41	195	100
23	I listen to music to develop more positive mood for speaking.	92	47.2	55	28.2	147	75	9	4.6	9	4.6	30	15	39	20	3.87	195	100
24	I try to relax myself whenever I feel afraid of using English.	148	75.9	41	21	189	97	3	1.5	-	-	3	1.5	3	1.5	4.7	195	100
25	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	91	46.6	56	28.7	147	75	9	4.6	6	3.1	33	17	39	20	3.85	195	100

As in other strategies, students responded on a five point scale to show their extent of preference towards affective strategy. Accordingly, the majority of the respondents /80% - 53.8% very great extent and 26.2% great extent/, following meta cognitive strategy, preferred it to improve their language proficiency in developing their speaking skills.

In order to make a further description to individual affective sub strategies, the following analysis were made. The results suggested that, of the five affective strategies, relaxing oneself whenever they feel afraid of using English and encouraging oneself to speak English even when they are afraid of making a mistake to manage their emotions were the sub strategies which almost all subjects preferred /96% - 75.9% very great extent and 21% great extent/ and /87.7% - 68.7% very great extent and 19% great extent/ respectively. Accordingly, they have got the highest mean values which were 4.7 and 4.38 respectively.

In addition to this, the other two sub strategies which were listening to music to develop more positive mood for speaking and talking to someone else about how they feel when they are learning English were also preferred with a significant number of students /75.4% - 47.2% very great extent and 28.2% great extent/ and /75.4% - 46.6% very great extent and 28.7% great extent/ respectively. Therefore, they have got a remarkable mean values which were 3.87 and

3.85 respectively. On the other hand, students indicated medium use towards using a reward or treat when they do well in English. This was confirmed by the mean value which is 3.41.

From the above analysis it can be said that students have a great demand towards identifying one's mood and anxiety level, encouraging oneself to speak English, talking about feelings, relaxing oneself and rewarding oneself in order to be a proficient speaker of English.

4.2.6 Results of Social Strategies Preferences

According to Oxford (1990) social strategies help learners to learn from others. And, students were given five statements of social strategies to show their extent of preferences towards each of the strategies. Accordingly, the results are given in table 6 below.

Table 6: Results of students' extent of preferences of social strategies

No	Strategies	Responses														Mean	Total	
		High				Medium				Low								
		Very great extent		Great extent		Total		Some extent		Little extent		Never		Total				
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
26	I cooperate with my friends to practice and share information in learning the language.	75	38.5	60	30.8	135	69	12	6.2	6	3.1	42	22	48	25	3.62	195	100
27	I ask my teacher or classmates for correction of errors.	141	72.3	36	18.5	177	91	4	2.1	2	1.1	12	6.2	14	7.2	4.5	195	100
28	I comment, suggest and give opinions in class discussions.	115	59	47	24.1	162	83	6	3.1	1	0.5	26	13	27	14	4.15	195	100
29	I ask questions for verifications and more explanations in class.	126	64.6	43	22.1	169	87	5	2.6	3	1.5	18	9.2	21	11	4.31	195	100
30	I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	85	43.6	59	30.3	144	74	9	4.6	6	3.1	36	19	42	22	3.77	195	100

As the result indicated in the table 2, a significant number of students /80.5%/ showed a great curiosity towards working with others. All social sub strategies were highly preferred by a significant number of students with slight variations in the extent of preferences they showed. Accordingly, asking their teachers or classmates for correction of errors /90.8% - 72.3% very great extent and 18.5% great extent/, asking questions for verifications and more explanations /86.7% - 64.6% very great extent and 22.1% great extent and commenting, suggesting and giving opinions in class discussions /83.1% - 59% very great extent and 24.1% great extent/

were the first three sub strategies which large number of students highly preferred. In addition to this, a remarkable number of students had also a preferences towards asking English speakers to correct them when they talk /73.8% - 43.5% very great extent and 30.3% great extent/ and cooperating with friends to practice and share information in learning the language /69.2% - 38.4% very great extent and 30.8% great extent/. This means students have a great interest in order to work with others and understand the target culture as well as the language.

4.3 Students' Frequency of Use of Speaking Strategies

Students were provided with 30 speaking strategies to show their frequency of use of speaking strategies. These strategies were classified into six categories in which each category of strategy was provided with five sub strategies. The analysis was made based on Oxford's (1990) classifications of strategies. An attempt was made to identify students' frequency of use of speaking strategies. It was given as follows.

4.3.1 Results of Memory Strategies Use

This strategy was designed to investigate the students' frequency of use of memory strategies for remembering new language items. Respondents were provided with five statements to indicate their frequency of use. Accordingly, the results are given in table 7 below.

Table 7: Results of students' frequency of use of memory strategies

No	Strategies	Responses														Mean	Total	
		Frequently						Someti mes		Seldom/Rarely				Total			No	%
		Always		Usually		Total		No	%	Rarely		Never		No	%			
		No	%	No	%	No	%			No	%	No	%				No	%
1	I try to associate what I already know and new language information in order to remember them.	15	7.7	33	16.9	48	25	81	42	30	15.4	36	19	66	34	2.8	195	100
2	I remember anew English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	24	12.3	30	15.4	54	28	72	37	45	23.1	24	12	69	35	2.92	195	100
3	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page or on the board.	63	32.3	48	24.6	111	57	27	14	30	15.4	27	14	57	29	3.46	195	100
4	I try to remember language items by practicing repeatedly.	48	24.6	48	24.6	96	49	51	26	18	9.2	30	15	48	25	3.34	195	100
5	I connect the sound of anew English words and an image or picture of the words to help me remember the word.	27	13.9	24	12.3	51	26	60	31	21	10.8	63	32	90	42	2.65	195	100

In this strategy, the answers showed that the subjects applied all the strategies at different levels of frequency to remember more effectively. The numbers of students who use the strategy frequently and the numbers of students who do not use it were almost equal. 36.9% of the respondents use the strategy as frequently as possible where as 33.3% /14.9 rarely and

18.4% never/ of the respondents almost didn't use the strategy regardless of the 29.7% of the subjects who use the strategy sometimes which accounts for the largest percentage share.

When we examine memory sub strategies item by item, the majority of the students /56.9% - 32.3% always and 24.6% usually/ frequently use location on the page or on the board and a reasonable number of students /49.2% - 24.6% always and 24.6% usually/ also often practice repeatedly new language items so as to remember them. Accordingly, these strategies have 3.46 and 3.34 mean values respectively. This means that students showed medium use of the strategies.

On the other hand, a reasonable percentage of the subjects /42.1% -10.8% rarely and 32.3% never/ claimed that they seldom employed to connect the sound of new English words and an image or picture of the words; and they also seldom use /33.8% - 15.4% rarely and 18.5% never/ to associate what they already know and new language information. A remarkable number of students /35.4% - 23.1% rarely and 12.3% never/ also seldom use mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used. As a result of this, they have got 2.65, 2.8 and 2.92 mean values respectively.

On a further data gathered through interview to confirm students' use of memory sub strategies, they reported that they used a number of memory sub strategies regardless of the fact that some students do not realize their use of the strategies. As a result of this, the researcher asked them whether they use memory strategy or not and they explained that all memory strategies were used with different degrees of frequency.

It is obvious that memory strategy is abstract and a mental process, which is not observable through any means. Because of this very fact, the researcher didn't get ways of measuring students' mental process through class room observation.

From this we can say that students showed medium use towards different memory sub strategies so as to remember new language items.

4.3.2 Results of Cognitive Strategies Use

The second category of speaking strategies is cognitive strategy which requires learners to manipulate the language material in direct ways through practicing in naturalistic ways and practicing structure and sounds formally. Students were provided with five statements of

cognitive strategy to show their frequency of use towards each of the strategies. Accordingly, the result of respondents' response is clearly presented as follow.

Table 8: Results of students' frequency of use of cognitive strategies

No	Strategies	Responses														Mean	Total	
		Frequently						Sometim es		Seldom/Rarely				Total				
		Always		Usually		Total				Rarely		Never						
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
6	I say orally in order to practice new expression in the language.	36	16.5	42	21.6	78	40	48	25	39	20	30	15	69	35	3.07	195	100
7	I imitate the way native/ proficient speakers talk in the language	21	10.8	24	12.3	45	23	27	14	18	9.2	105	54	123	63	2.17	195	100
8	I practice the sounds of English.	39	20	42	21.6	81	42	48	25	36	18.5	30	15	66	34	3.12	195	100
9	While speaking, I transfer the knowledge of words, concepts or strictures from L1 /native language/toL2/English language/.	30	15.4	27	13.9	57	29	54	28	39	20	45	23	84	43	2.78	195	100
10	I use English outside the classrooms.	42	21.6	42	21.6	84	43	57	29	18	9.2	36	19	54	28	3.28	195	100

As the result in table 2 depicts, the number of students who seldom use /40.5% - 15.4% rarely and 25.1% never/ cognitive strategies were greater than those who frequently use /35.4% - 17.4% always and 17.9% usually/. Consequently, this strategy had the lowest mean value /2.87/ as compared to others.

The majority of the respondents /43.2% - 21.6% always and 21.6% usually/ revealed that they often made use of English outside the class rooms than the other sub strategies in the category. As the result of this, it has got a mean value of 3.28. Moreover, a reasonable number of students /41.5% - 20% always and 21.6% usually/ and 40.1% - 18.5% always and 21.6% usually/ also practiced the sounds of new English words with an image or picture of the words to help them remember the word and say orally in order to practice new expressions in the language respectively. As the result of this, they had 3.12 and 3.07 mean values respectively. These strategies were the first three strategies which the respondents showed medium use. On the other hand, a reasonable number of the students /47.7% - 20% rarely and 27.7% never/ failed to use L1/native language/ knowledge of words, concepts or structures to transfer to L2

/target language/ with a mean value of 2.71. Furthermore, over half percent of the subjects /63.1%_ 9.2% rarely and 53.9% never/ hardly ever use to imitate the way native /proficient/ speakers talk in the language. Consequently, this strategy had the lowest mean value 2.17.

In the interview, the respondents confirmed their use of cognitive strategy reported through the questionnaire. They reported that they practiced the sounds of English, use English outside the classrooms, imitate the way native speakers talk and start conversations in English. But, these sub strategies were used with different degrees of frequencies.

During the class room observations, the students were noticed employing certain sub strategies in developing their speaking skills. These were participating in whole class discussion and in saying new vocabularies orally to practice new expressions in the language. In such a way, they were observed pronouncing words like native speakers by practicing the sounds of English. However, some cognitive sub strategies /for example: using English outside the classrooms, transferring the knowledge of words, concepts or structures from L1 to L2 were not detected during the successive observations.

From the above analysis it can be said that although students showed less use towards some sub strategies, they were generally showed medium use of cognitive strategy in order to understand and produce new language items with a mean value of 2.87.

4.3.3 Results of Compensation Strategies Use

Five compensation strategies were provided to the respondents to assess their extent of preferences towards each of the sub-strategies mentioned in table 9 below. Accordingly, the results along with its analysis are presented as follow.

Table 9: Results of students' frequency of use of compensation strategies

No	Strategies	Responses														Mean	Total	
		Frequently						Sometim es		Seldom/Rarely								
		Always		Usually		Total				Rarely		Never		Total				
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
11	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	57	29.2	36	18.5	93	48	42	22	24	12.3	36	19	60	31	3.28	195	100
12	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use body movements.	33	16.9	24	12.3	57	29	45	23	39	20	54	28	93	48	2.71	195	100
13	I ask my teacher or classmates to tell me the right expressions when I don't seem to get the right one.	66	33.9	33	16.9	99	51	33	17	18	9.2	45	23	63	32	3.29	195	100
14	When I forget or fail to remember a word or an expression, I keep on repeating the previous word for some time until I can recall or get a word.	48	24.6	36	18.5	84	43	42	22	36	18.5	33	17	69	35	3.15	195	100
15	When I fail to remember a word while speaking, I use LI.	30	15.4	39	20	69	35	30	15	36	18.5	60	31	96	49	2.71	195	100

This strategy was the third most employed strategy as it is indicated in the above table with a grand mean value of 3.04. The majority of the students /41.5% - 24.1% always and 17.4% usually/ used the strategy frequently regardless of the fact that 39% of the respondents hardly ever use it.

Like any other strategies, the subjects' response indicated that they use compensation sub strategies with different levels of frequency to compensate for missing knowledge. They often applied synonyms (a word or phrase that means the same thing) /47.7% - 29.2% always and 18.5% usually/, ask their teachers or classmates to tell them the right expressions when they don't seem to get the right one /50.8% - 33.9% always and 16.9% usually/ and keep repeating the previous word for some time until they can recall or get a word /43.1% - 24.6% always; 18.5% usually/ as a major compensation strategies with a mean values of 3.29, 3.28 and 3.15 respectively. This indicates medium use of the strategies. On the other hand, a reasonable number of the respondents /47.7% - 20% rarely and 27.7% never/ and /49.2% - 18.5 rarely and 30.8 never/ occasionally use body movements during a conversation in English and seldom use

their L1 /native language/ when they fail to remember a word to compensate. As a result, they have mean values of 2.71 and 2.78 respectively. Although the mean values of these strategies is lower than the above three strategies, it also indicates medium use.

The follow up interview were carried out to triangulate the data gathered through the questionnaire. It definitely helped the researcher in confirming the data. The respondents replied that they made use of different compensation sub strategies. All interviewees told the researcher that they use their L1 /native language/ when they fail to remember a word. They also use synonyms, body movements, asking a teacher or classmates to tell them the right expression when they don't seem to get the right one and repeating a previous word for some time until they can recall or get a word were used by the respondents.

To make sure that whether the data gathered through questionnaire and interview with regard to compensation strategies were realistic, I tried to observe these sub strategies in my eighteen observation sessions. The students were noticed while using all sub strategies in the class rooms. They were observed while using gesture, using L1 and repetition of the previous word until they remember the forgotten word most predominantly in filling gaps of knowledge while speaking. Moreover, they were also observed while using synonyms and asking their teachers to tell them the right expressions when they don't seem to get the right one, but with limited use.

From the above analysis we can say that students were good at using as many compensation strategies as possible with different levels of frequencies in order to compensate for the missing knowledge while speaking regardless of some limitations. In other words, students generally indicated medium use towards compensation strategies although they showed low use to some sub strategies.

4.3.4 Results of Meta Cognitive Strategies use

Respondents were provided with five statements to investigate their frequency of use of each of the five meta cognitive strategies given to them. As a result, the results of the respondents' responses along with its analysis are presented below.

Table 10: Results of students' frequency of use of meta cognitive strategies

No	Strategies	Responses														Mean	Total	
		Frequently						Someti mes		Seldom/Rarely								
		Always		Usually		Total				Rarely		Never		Total				
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
16	I choose a topic, or initiate conversation to get more practice.	33	16.9	45	23.1	78	40	45	23	33	16.9	39	20	72	37	3	195	100
17	I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	105	53.9	51	26.2	146	80	33	17	6	3.1	-	-	6	3.1	4.49	195	100
18	I look for people talk to in English.	6	4.6	42	21.5	48	25	69	35	12	6.2	63	32	75	39	2.52	195	100
19	I arrange my schedule to study and practice the new language consistently, not just when there is a pressure of a test.	30	15.4	51	26.2	81	42	42	22	21	10.8	51	26	72	37	2.94	195	100
20	I talk and share idea about learning language problems and effective speaking strategies with my teacher.	18	9.2	39	20	57	29	39	20	33	16.9	66	34	99	51	2.54	195	100

The results of the subjects showed that meta cognitive strategy was the second which frequently employed by the students with a mean value of 3.06. The large number of respondents /43.1% - 19.5% always and 23.6% usually/ often applied the strategy to organize and evaluate their learning. In contrary, 33.4% /10.8% rarely and 22.6% never/ of the students hardly ever use it.

As depicted in the above table, meta cognitive strategy was among the medium frequently employed strategy by the respondents. The majority of the respondents /80.1% - 53.9% always and 26.2% usually/ frequently utilized their English mistakes and use that information to help them do better as a primary sub strategy to evaluate their task success. Thus, it had the highest mean value which was 4.48. In addition to this, 40% /16.9% always and 23.1% usually/ of them arrange their schedule to study and practice the new language consistently, not just when there is a pressure of a test. Contrary to this, a reasonable number of students /38.5% - 6.2% rarely and 32.3% never/ hardly ever look for people to talk to in English and a remarkable number of the students /50.8% - 16.9% rarely and 33.9% never/ were also weak at talking and

sharing ideas about learning language problems and effective speaking strategies with their teacher.

The researcher confirmed their use of meta cognitive strategy through the interview. They made use of sharing ideas about language problems with their teachers, arrange a schedule to study consistently, look for people to talk to in English, learn from their mistakes and choose a topic to get more practice. But, their frequencies of use of these sub strategies were by far different. Learning from once mistake and studying consistently by arranging schedule were the first two meta cognitive sub strategies which the subjects often use.

During the classroom observations, I noticed some meta cognitive sub strategies. This was because, most meta cognitive sub strategies seem to be practiced either individually (choosing a topic to get more practice, arranging a schedule to study, etc.) or in groups (for example; looking for people talk to in English, etc.); however, I observed while students learning from their mistakes.

Generally speaking, it can be said that although students showed low use towards looking for people to talk to in English and at talking and sharing ideas about learning language problems and effective speaking strategies with their teacher, meta cognitive strategy was generally employed with a medium frequency by the respondents in order to organize and evaluate their learning success.

4.3.5 Results of Affective Strategies Use

Affective strategy is another category of speaking strategy which helps learners to avoid their anxiety level by using as many affective strategies as possible. Therefore, students were provided with five statements to show their frequency of use towards each of the strategies given to them. Accordingly, the result of the subjects' responses is presented as follow.

Table 11: Results of students' frequency of use of affective strategies

No	Strategies	Responses														Mean	Total	
		Frequently						Someti mes		Seldom/Rarely								
		Always		Usually		Total				Rarely		Never		Total				
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
21	I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	54	27.7	48	24.6	102	52	30	15	18	9.2	45	23	63	32	3.25	195	100
22	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	27	13.9	12	6.2	39	20	42	22	24	12.3	90	46	114	59	2.29	195	100
23	I listen to music to develop more positive mood for speaking.	63	32.3	42	21.6	105	54	21	11	30	15.4	39	20	69	35	3.31	195	100
24	I try to relax myself whenever I feel afraid of using English.	78	40	39	20	117	60	36	19	27	13.9	15	7.7	42	22	3.71	195	100
25	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	36	18.5	36	18.5	72	37	39	20	42	21.6	42	22	84	43	2.91	195	100

As shown in the above table, affective strategy as one of indirect strategy ranked first in which large number of students, on average, use this strategy as frequently as possible. The majority of the students /44.6% - 26.7% always and 17.9% usually/ employed the strategy regardless of the fact that 37.9% /14.4% rarely and 23.6% never/ of the sample seldom use it. As a result, it has got 3.1 mean values.

Students made use of different affective sub strategies with different levels of frequency to manage their emotions. The majority of the subjects /60% - 40% always and 20% usually/ try to relax or themselves when they are afraid of using English. In addition to this, a reasonable number of them try to listen to music to develop more positive mood for speaking /53.3% - 27.3% always and 24.6% usually/, tell someone else ones feeling when learning English /36.9% - 18.5% always and 18.5% usually/ and encourage themselves to speak English even when they are afraid of making a mistake /52.3% - 27.3% always and 24.6% usually/. Thus, their mean values were 3.31, 2.91 and 3.25 respectively. This indicates that the students employ the strategies at medium frequency. Contrarily, a reasonable number of students /58.5% - 12.3% rarely and 46.2% never/ less often use giving a reward or treat when they do well in English. As a result of this, these sub strategies have a mean value of 2.29. This shows that these strategies employed at lowest frequency by the students.

In the follow up interview, I asked respondents to confirm whether they use affective sub strategies or not. Accordingly, although all the respondents' /interviewees/ reported as they didn't reward themselves when they do well in English; they used all affective sub strategies regardless of the degrees of frequency they use. They relax and encourage themselves, listen to music and talk to someone else about how they feel when they are learning English.

During the follow up observation, I tried to notice some affective sub strategies. The students were observed while using laughter as a mechanism to relax themselves and speaking in the class discussion without anxiety though not used by all the subjects. The other affective sub strategies /rewarding one self, talking their feeling to someone else/ were not able to be detected through observation. In addition to this, listening to music was also not noticed since this activity is done outside the class rooms.

4.3.6 Results of Social Strategies Use

This strategy is designed to investigate the students' frequency of use towards learning with others. And, students provided with five statements of social strategies to show their frequency of use for each of the strategies. Accordingly, the result of the respondents' response is presented as follow.

Table 12: Results of students' frequency of use of social strategies

No	Strategies	Responses														Mean	Total	
		Frequently						Someti mes		Seldom/Rarely								
		Always		Usually		Total		No	%	Rarely		Never		Total				
No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
26	I cooperate with my friends to practice and share information in learning the language.	21	10.8	36	18.5	57	29	45	23	24	12.3	69	35	93	48	2.57	195	100
27	I ask my teacher or classmates for correction of errors.	60	30.8	39	20	99	51	33	17	30	15.4	33	17	63	32	3.32	195	100
28	I comment, suggest and give opinions in class discussions.	36	18.5	45	23.1	81	42	42	22	18	9.2	54	28	72	37	2.95	195	100
29	I ask questions for verifications and more explanations in class.	39	20	69	35.4	108	55	27	14	18	9.2	42	22	60	31	3.23	195	100
30	I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	21	10.8	21	10.8	42	22	45	23	33	16.9	75	39	108	55	2.38	195	100

The respondents portrayed that social strategy is one of the indirect strategy applicable by the students. Its mean value is 2.88. In this strategy, the number of respondents who seldom use /44.1% - 12.8% rarely and 28.2% never/ is greater than who frequently use /39.4% - 17.9% always and 21.5% usually/. This overtly depicted the fact that respondents less often use the strategy than the other strategies.

When we examine social sub strategies item by item, the majority of the respondents /55.4% - 20% always and 35.4% usually/ ask questions for verifications and more explanations and 50.8% /30.8% always and 20% usually/ of them ask their teacher or classmates for corrections of errors. Accordingly, these strategies had 3.23 and 3.32 mean values respectively. This indicates medium use of the strategies. Furthermore, they also indicated medium use of commenting, suggesting and giving opinions in class discussions /41.5% - 18.5% always and 23.1% usually/ and cooperating with their friends to practice and share information in learning the language /47.7% - 12.3% rarely and 35.4% never/. As a result, they have got 3.01 and 2.57 mean values respectively. Contrarily, they made less effort to ask English speakers to correct them when they talk /55.4% - 16.9% rarely and 38.5% never/. For this reason, it had 2.38 mean values. This means that students tended to show low use towards this strategy.

The data from the follow up interview showed that some interviewee made use of all social sub strategies regardless of some exceptions. They reported that they didn't ask English speakers to correct them when they talk because they didn't have access to them. The rest social sub strategies which were mentioned in the questionnaire were used by the students although there were some variations in their frequency of use.

In the observation sessions, the researcher observed when students ask questions, comments, suggestions and gives opinions in class discussions, ask teachers for correction of errors and cooperate with their friends to practice some activities.

Generally speaking, from the overall analysis of speaking strategies use it can be said that none of speaking strategies were employed with the highest frequency. However, the students generally show medium use towards all strategies (affective, meta cognitive, compensation, memory, cognitive and social strategies) with mean values of 3.1, 3.06, 3.04, 3.03, 2.77 and 2.87 respectively. This showed that students have almost the same tendency to the aforementioned strategies.

4.4 Differences in Extent of Preferences and Frequency of Use of Speaking Strategies

An attempt was made to find out whether there are differences between strategy preferences and use with regard to speaking strategies. Accordingly, the students' responses of the six strategies with their analysis were presented below from Table 13-18.

Table 13: T-test for comparison between extent of preferences and frequency of use of memory strategy

No	Items	V	Response value										Mean	t-Value	p-value
			A/VGE		U/GE		S/SE		R/LE		N				
			No	%	No	%	No	%	N	%	No	%			
1	I try to associate what I already know and new language information in order to remember them.	Use	15	7.7	33	16.9	81	41.5	30	15.4	36	18.5	2.8	-10.018	0.000
		preference	111	56.9	48	24.6	6	3.1	3	1.5	27	13.8	4.09		
2	I remember anew English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	Use	24	12.3	30	15.4	72	36.9	45	23.1	24	12.3	2.92	-8.012	0.000
		preference	101	51.8	52	26.7	9	4.6	3	1.5	30	15.4	3.98		
3	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page or on the board.	Use	63	32.3	48	24.6	27	13.8	30	15.4	27	13.8	3.46	-4.638	0.000
		Preference	110	56.4	49	25.1	9	4.6	2	1	25	12.8	4.11		
4	I try to remember language items by practicing repeatedly.	Use	48	24.6	48	24.6	51	26.2	18	9.2	30	12.4	3.34	-5.544	0.000
		Preference	114	58.5	45	23.1	6	3.1	3	1.5	27	13.8	4.11		
5	I connect the sound of anew English words and an image or picture of the words to help me remember the word.	Use	27	13.8	24	12.3	60	30.8	21	10.8	63	32.3	2.65	-3.397	0.001
		Preference	47	24.1	67	34.4	12	6.2	9	4.6	60	30.8	3.16		

If table value for T-test is >1.96 at $p < 0.05$ significant level (2-tailed) with $df = 388$, there is significant differences and vice versa. V= variables, A/VGE= always /very great extent; U/GE=usually/great extent; S/SE= sometimes/some extent; R/LE= rarely/ little extent; N= never, for strategy use and preference respectively.

As shown in Table 13, there is a difference between the mean scores for use and preference with regard to associating what they already know and new language information in order to remember them (Item 1). The calculated mean values for frequency use and extent of preferences are 2.80 and 4.09 respectively. This means, even though students use this strategy, they are not using as frequently as possible in relation to their extent of preference.

Accordingly, the calculated t-test value and p-value ($t= 10.018$; $p<0.05$) indicates that the difference is statistically significant.

Item 2 asked students to rate their preference and use of mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used. The mean scores for use and preference are 2.92 and 3.98, respectively. This indicates that there is great difference between use and preference. As the t-test value ($t=8.012$; $p<0.05$) indicates, the difference is significant. This shows that students infrequently use the strategy in relation to their preference.

In Item 3, students were asked to indicate the degree of preference and frequency of use with regard to localation on the page or on the board to remember new language items. The calculated mean value for frequency use (3.46) is less than extent of preference (4.11). As it was seen from the t- test value and p-value ($t=4.638$; $p<0.05$), the difference is statistically significant. Therefore, it can be said that the students are infrequent in the use of the strategy in relation to their preference.

Item 4 was designed to find out the students' use and preference towards practicing repeatedly. Accordingly, there is a difference (3.34 and 4.11) in the mean values for use and preference respectively. The calculated t-value and p-value ($t=5.544$; $p<0.05$) also shows that the difference is statistically significant. This indicates that although students use the strategy at some frequency, it is not as frequent as expected in relation to their preference.

With regard to the use and preference towards connecting the sounds of new English words with an image or picture of the words to help them remember the word (Item 5), there is a difference in the mean score (2.65 and 3.16) for frequency of use and extent of preference respectively. The calculated t-test value also shows this difference, t-value of 3.397 with $p<0.05$. Therefore, it can be said that students use the strategy at less frequency in relation to their preference.

Table 14: T-test for comparison between extent of preferences and frequency of use of cognitive strategy

No.	Items	V	Response value										Mean	t-Value	P-value
			A/VGE		U/GE		S/SE		R/LE		N				
			No	%	No	%	No	%	N	%	No	%			
6	I say orally in order to practice new expression in the language.	Use	36	18.5	42	21.5	48	24.6	39	20	30	15.4	3.08	-11.669	0.000
		preference	142	72.8	35	17.9	3	1.5	3	1.5	12	6.2	4.5		
7	I imitate the way native/ proficient speakers talk in the language	Use	21	10.8	24	12.3	27	13.8	18	9.2	105	53.8	2.17	-3.938	0.000
		preference	25	12.8	71	36.4	12	6.2	9	4.6	78	40	2.77		
8	I practice the sounds of English.	Use	39	20	42	21.5	48	24.6	36	18.5	30	15.4	3.12	-7.052	0.000
		preference	112	57.4	47	24.1	6	3.1	3	1.5	27	13.8	4.1		
9	While speaking, I transfer the knowledge of words, concepts or structures from L1 /native language/toL2/English language/.	Use	30	15.4	26	13.3	55	28.2	39	20	45	23.1	2.75	-11.721	0.000
		preference	127	65.1	42	21.5	5	2.6	2	1	19	9.7	4.31		
10	I use English outside the classrooms.	Use	42	21.5	42	21.5	57	29.2	18	9.2	36	18.5	3.13	-8.038	0.000
		preference	123	63.1	45	23.1	3	1.5	3	1.5	21	10.8	4.26		

If table value for T-test is >1.96 at $p < 0.05$ significant level (2-tailed) with $df = 388$, there is significant differences and vice versa. V= variables, A/VGE= always /very great extent; U/GE=usually/great extent; S/SE= sometimes/some extent; R/LE= rarely/ little extent; N= never, for strategy use and preference respectively.

In Item 6 of table 14, students were asked to express their preference and frequency of use towards saying orally in order to practice new expression in the language. There is a big difference in the mean value (3.08 and 4.50) for use and preference respectively. The calculated t-value and p-value ($t = 11.669$; $p < 0.05$) also indicates that the difference is significant. This means, students didn't use the strategy frequently at the extent of their preference.

Item 7 also shows a significant difference between use and preference with regard to imitating the way native speakers talk in the language. Accordingly, the mean scores for use and preference are 2.17 and 2.77, respectively. The calculated t-value and p-value ($t = 11.669$;

$p < 0.05$) also reveals this big difference. This means students are not frequent in their use of the mentioned strategy in relation to their preference.

Item 8 was designed to find out the students' use and preferences with regard to practicing the sounds of English. There is a difference in the mean scores of use and preference of students towards the strategy which is 3.12 and 4.10, respectively. Accordingly, the results of the calculated t-value and p-value ($t = 7.052$; $p < 0.05$) indicates students are infrequently use the strategy in relation to their preferences, so the difference is statistically significant.

Item 9 asked students to indicate their frequency use and extent of preference towards transferring the knowledge of words, concepts and structures from L1 to L2 while speaking. There is a big difference between students frequency use and extent of preference with respect to this item as it is seen from the mean values (2.78 for use and 4.31 for preference). The calculated t-test value and p-value ($t = 11.721$; $p < 0.05$) confirms that the difference is statistically significant. Hence, it can be said that students infrequently use the strategy in their attempt to improve their speaking skills.

In Item 10 of table 14, students were asked to rate their use and preference towards using English outside the class room. The mean scores for use and preference are 3.18 and 4.26, respectively. The calculated t-test and p-value ($t = 8.038$; $p < 0.05$) proves that the difference is significant. This shows that there is a difference between students' frequency of use and extent of preference towards the strategy. Therefore, it can be said that students were infrequently use the strategy in relation to their preference.

Table 15: T-test for comparison between extent of preferences and frequency of use of compensation strategy

No.	Items	V	Response value										Mean	t-Value	p-value
			A/VGE		U/GE		S/SE		R/LE		N				
			No	%	No	%	No	%	N	%	No	%			
11	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	Use	57	29.2	36	10.5	42	21.5	24	12.3	36	18.5	3.28	-4.758	0.000
		Preference	99	50.8	53	27.2	9	4.6	6	3.1	28	14.4	3.97		
12	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use body movements.	Use	33	16.9	23	11.8	46	23.6	39	20	54	27.7	27.17	-5.124	0.000
		Preference	67	34.4	62	31.8	12	6.2	6	3.1	48	24.6	3.48		
13	I ask my teacher or classmates to tell me the right expressions when I don't seem to get the right one.	Use	66	33.8	33	16.9	33	16.9	18	9.2	45	23.1	3.29	-6.607	0.000
		Preference	124	63.6	41	20	6	3.1	3	1.5	21	10.8	4.25		
14	When I forget or fail to remember a word or an expression, I keep on repeating the previous word for some time until I can recall or get a word.	Use	48	24.6	3.6	18.5	42	21.5	36	18.5	33	16.9	3.15	-7.296	0.000
		Preference	115	59	49	25.1	4	2.1	3	1.5	24	12.3	4.17		
15	When I fail to remember a word while speaking, I use L1.	Use	30	15.4	39	20	30	15.4	36	18.5	60	30.8	2.71	-7.142	0.000
		Preference	86	44.1	58	29.7	9	4.6	6	3.1	36	18.5	3.78		

If table value for T-test is >1.96 at $p < 0.05$ significant level (2-tailed) with $df = 388$, there is significant differences and vice versa. V= variables, A/VGE= always /very great extent; U/GE=usually/great extent; S/SE= sometimes/some extent; R/LE= rarely/ little extent; N= never, for strategy use and preference respectively.

With regard to the use and preferences towards using synonyms when they can't think of an English word (Item 11), there is a difference between the mean values for use (3.28) and preference (3.97). This is confirmed by the calculated t-test value and p-value ($t=4.758$; $p < 0.05$) which showed as the difference between use and preference is significant. This means students infrequently use the strategy in relation to their preference.

Item 12 Table 15 above deals with the use and preference towards using body movements when they can't think of an English word. The results of the mean scores show a difference between frequency of use (2.17) and extent of preference (3.48). This is confirmed by the results of the t-test and p-value ($t= 5.124$; $p < 0.05$). Therefore, this reveals that students were infrequently use the strategy in relation to their preference.

Item 13 shows a difference in the mean values calculated for frequency of use /3.29/ and extent of preference /4.25/. The calculated t-test value and p-value is 6.607; $p < 0.05$. These indicate that there is statistically significant difference between the strategy use and preference. From this it can be implied that students infrequently employed asking their teachers or classmates to tell them the right expressions when they don't seem to get the right one in relation to their preference.

Item 14 was designed to find out the use and preference towards repeating the previous word for some time until they recall or get a word. Accordingly, there existed a difference in the mean values for use (3.15) and preference (4.17), respectively. The t-test value ($t= 1.850$) proved that the difference is statistically significant. Hence, it is possible to say that students infrequently use the strategy although they have a great inquisitiveness towards it.

In Item 15 students were asked to indicate the use and preference towards using their L1 when they fail to remember a word while speaking. The mean score for use and preference is 2.71 and 3.78 respectively. The calculated t-test value and p-value is 7.142; $p < 0.05$. This indicates that there is a great difference in students' frequency of use and extent of preference. In another word, students infrequently use the strategy in relation to their preference. This means though students use their first language when they fail to remember a word while speaking, they were not using it as frequently as possible in relation to their preference.

Table 16: T-test for comparison between extent of preferences and frequency of use of meta cognitive strategy

No.	Items	v	Response value										Mean	t-Value	p-value
			A/VGE		U/GE		S/SE		R/LE		N				
			No	%	No	%	No	%	N	%	No	%			
16	I choose a topic, or initiate conversation to get more practice.	Use	33	16.9	45	23.1	45	23.1	33	16.9	39	20	3	-10707	0.000
		preference	132	67.7	39	20	6	3.1	2	1	16	8.2	4.38		
17	I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	Use	105	53.8	51	26.2	33	16.9	6	3.1	-	-	4.31	-6.124	0.000
		preference	147	75.4	45	23.1	3	1.5	-	-	-	-	4.74		
18	I look for people talk to in English.	Use	9	4.6	42	21.5	69	35.4	12	6.2	63	32.3	2.6	-9.11	0.000
		preference	94	48.2	53	27.2	9	4.6	6	3.1	33	16.9	3.87		
19	I arrange my schedule to study and practice the new language consistently, not just when there is a pressure of a test.	Use	30	15.4	51	26.2	42	21.5	21	10.8	51	26.2	2.94	-6.918	0.000
		preference	101	51.8	51	26.2	7	3.6	4	2.1	32	16.4	3.95		
20	I talk and share idea about learning language problems and effective speaking strategies with my teacher.	Use	18	9.2	39	20	39	20	33	16.9	66	33.8	2.54	-7.94	0.000
		preference	80	41	61	31.3	9	4.6	6	3.1	39	20	3.7		

If table value for T-test is >1.96 at $p < 0.05$ significant level (2-tailed) with $df = 388$, there is significant differences and vice versa. V= variables, A/VGE= always /very great extent; U/GE=usually/great extent; S/SE= sometimes/some extent; R/LE= rarely/ little extent; N= never, for strategy use and preference respectively.

Item 16 deals with choosing a topic or initiate conversation to get more practice. The calculated mean values for frequency of use and extent of preference are 3.00 and 4.38, respectively. The calculated t-test value and p-value is ($t=10.707$; $p < 0.05$). This reveals that there is statistically significant difference between use and preference. In another words, students infrequently use choosing a topic or initiate conversation to get more practice although they have high preference.

Item 17 asked students' use and preference to wards noticing their English mistakes and use that information to help them do better. There existed a difference between the mean value of use (4.31) and preference (4.74). The calculated t-test value and p-value ($t= 6.124$; $p < 0.05$) also confirmed this fact. It indicates that there is significant difference between students' frequency of use and extent of preference to wards noticing their English mistakes and use that information to help them do better. This is to mean that students infrequently use the strategy although they have high preference.

In Item 18, students were asked to rate their frequency of use and extent of preference to wards looking for people to talk to in English. The calculated mean values for use and preference are 2.60 and 3.87, respectively. The t-test and p-value is ($t=9.110$; $p < 0.05$). This means there is significant difference between the use and preference. In another word, students infrequently use looking for people to talk to in English although they have high preference.

Item 19 was designed to find out if there is a difference between frequency of use and extent of preference towards arranging a schedule to study and practice the new language consistently, not just when there is a pressure of a test. Accordingly, the mean score for use (2.94) is less than for preference (3.95). And, t-value and p-value are ($t=6.918$; $p < 0.05$). This clearly indicates that the difference is statistically significant. This means students infrequently use the strategy although they have high preference.

Item 20 asked students to indicate the level of preference and use with regard to talking and sharing ideas about learning language problems and effective speaking strategies with their

teachers. The mean score for use is 2.54 and for preference is 3.70. This shows a difference between the two variables. This confirmed by the calculated t-value and p-value ($t=7.940$; $p<0.05$) as the difference is statistically significant. This indicates that although students have high preferences towards talking and sharing ideas about learning language problems and effective speaking strategies with their teachers, they infrequently use it.

Finally, based on table 16 above, it is possible to say that that there is a big difference between students meta cognitive strategy use and preference. Although students use the strategy at some frequency level, it is insufficient to the extent that brings students to the higher level of proficiency.

Table 17: T-test for comparison between extent of preferences and frequency of use of affective strategy

No.	Items	V	Response value										Mean	t-Value	p-value
			A/VGE		U/GE		S/SE		R/LE		N				
			No	%	No	%	No	%	N	%	No	%			
21	I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	Use	54	27.7	48	24.6	30	15.4	18	9.2	45	23.1	3.25	-8.404	0.000
		preference	134	68.7	37	19	6	3.1	3	1.5	15	7.7	4.39		
22	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	Use	27	13.8	12	6.2	42	21.5	24	12.3	90	46.2	2.29	-7.242	0.000
		preference	61	31.3	65	33.3	12	6.2	6	3.1	51	26.2	3.41		
23	I listen to music to develop more positive mood for speaking.	Use	63	32.3	42	21.5	21	10.8	30	15.4	39	20	3.31	-3.73	0.000
		preference	92	47.2	55	28.2	9	4.6	9	4.6	30	15.4	3.87		
24	I try to relax myself whenever I feel afraid of using English.	Use	78	40	39	20	36	18.5	27	13.8	15	7.7	3.71	-9.355	0.000
		preference	148	75.9	41	21	3	1.5	-	-	3	1.5	4.69		
25	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	Use	36	18.5	36	18.5	39	20	42	21.5	42	21.5	2.91	-6.468	0.000
		preference	91	46.7	56	28.7	9	4.6	6	3.1	33	16.9	3.85		

If table value for T-test is >1.96 at $p< 0.05$ significant level (2-tailed) with $df = 388$, there is significant differences and vice versa. V= variables, A/VGE= always /very great extent; U/GE=usually/great extent; S/SE= sometimes/some extent; R/LE= rarely/ little extent; N= never, for strategy use and preference respectively.

In Table 17 above of Item 21, students were asked to rate their use and preference with regard to encouraging themselves to speak English when they are afraid of making a mistake. The mean score for use is 3.25 and for preference is 4.39. The mean value for preference is greater than for use. And, the calculated t-value and p-value are ($t= 8.404$; $p<0.05$). This indicates that the difference is statistically significant. In another words, although students have high

preferences towards encouraging themselves to speak English when they are afraid of making a mistake, they tended to use it infrequently.

Item 22 was designed to find out the students' use and preference with regard to giving them a reward or treat when they do well in English. There is a difference between the mean score for use (2.29) and for preference (3.41) with regard to this item. Accordingly, the t-value and p-value ($t=7.242$; $p<0.05$) shows that the difference between the students' use and preference is statistically significant. This means students infrequently use the act of giving a reward or treat to themselves when they do well in English although they have high preference.

Item 23 deals with listening to music to develop more positive mood for speaking. Students were asked to rate their use and preferences. The mean value for use is 3.31 and for preference is 3.87. And, the calculated t-test result and p-value is ($t=3.730$; $p<0.05$). This depicts that the difference is statistically significant. This means that although students use listening to music to develop more positive mood for speaking at some frequency, it is not sufficient in relation to their preference.

In Item 24, students were asked to indicate the degree of preference and frequency of use with regard to relaxing them whenever they feel afraid of using English. There is a difference between the mean scores for preference (4.69) and use (3.71). The t-test result and p-value ($t=9.355$; $p<0.05$) reveals that there is significant difference in the strategy preference and frequency of use. This indicates that although students use relaxing them whenever they feel afraid of using English at some frequency, they weren't using it as frequently as possible in relation to their preferences.

Item 25 was designed to see if there is a difference between use and preference with regard to talking to someone else about how they feel when they are learning English. The mean values for use and preference are 2.91 and 3.85, respectively. The calculated t-test result ($t=6.468$; $p<0.05$) portrays that there is statistically significant difference between students' frequency use and extent of preference. In another word, although students use talking to someone else about how they feel when they are learning English at some degree, they didn't use it as expected in relation to their preference.

Table 18: T-test for comparison between extent of preferences and frequency of use of social strategy

No	Items	V	Response value										Mean	t-Value	p-value
			A/VGE		U/GE		S/SE		R/LE		N				
			No	%	No	%	No	%	N	%	No	%			
26	I cooperate with my friends to practice and share information in learning the language.	Use	21	10.8	36	18.5	45	23.1	24	12.3	69	35.4	2.57	-7.004	0.000
		preference	75	38.5	60	30.8	12	6.2	6	3.1	42	21.5	3.62		
27	I ask my teacher or classmates for correction of errors.	Use	60	30.8	39	20	33	16.9	30	15.4	33	16.9	3.32	-9.076	0.000
		preference	141	72.3	36	18.5	4	2.1	2	1	12	6.2	4.49		
28	I comment, suggest and give opinions in class discussions.	Use	46	23.6	35	17.9	42	21.5	18	9.2	54	27.7	3.01	-7.827	0.000
		preference	115	59	47	24.1	6	3.1	1	0.5	26	13.3	4.15		
29	I ask questions for verifications and more explanations in class.	Use	39	20	69	35.4	27	13.8	18	9.2	42	21.5	3.23	-8.032	0.000
		preference	126	64.6	43	22.1	5	2.6	3	1.5	18	9.2	4.31		
30	I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	Use	21	10.8	21	10.8	45	23.1	33	16.9	75	38.5	2.38	-9.579	0.000
		preference	85	43.6	59	30.3	9	4.6	6	3.1	36	18.5	3.77		

If table value for T-test is >1.96 at $p < 0.05$ significant level (2-tailed) with $df = 388$, there is significant differences and vice versa. V= variables, A/VGE= always /very great extent; U/GE=usually/great extent; S/SE= sometimes/some extent; R/LE= rarely/ little extent; N= never, for strategy use and preference respectively.

Item 26 was designed to find out the students preference and use towards cooperating with their friends to practice and share information in learning the language. Accordingly, the mean value for strategy use and preference are 2.57 and 3.62 respectively. The calculated t-value and p-value ($t = 7.004$; $p < 0.05$) reveals that there is a significant difference between the mean scores for strategy use and preference. This means students didn't use the strategy for cooperating with their friends to practice and share information in learning the language although they have high preferences. Therefore, it can be said that students are infrequent in the use of the strategy.

Item 27 deals with the students' use and preference towards asking their teachers or classmates for correction of errors. There is a difference between the mean scores for use (3.32) and preference (4.49). The calculated t-value and p-value ($t = 9.076$; $p < 0.05$) shows that the difference is significant. This means students infrequently use asking their teachers or classmates for correction of errors in relation to their preferences.

Item 28 was designed to find out the students' preference and use towards commenting, suggesting and giving opinions in class discussions. There is a great difference between preference and use of the strategy. The mean score for strategy use is 3.01 and for strategy preference is 4.15. The t-test result and p-value ($t = 7.827$; $p < 0.05$) shows significant difference between the mean values for strategy preference and strategy use. This means students

infrequently use commenting, suggesting and giving opinions in class discussions although they have high preference.

In item 29 students were asked to indicate their strategy use and preference towards asking questions for verifications and more explanations in classroom. Accordingly, the mean values for preference and use are 4.31 and 3.23, respectively. The t-test result and p-value ($t= 8.032$; $p<0.05$) depicts that there is a big difference between the two variables. This means students infrequently use asking questions for verifications and more explanations in class in relation to their preferences.

Item 30 deals with asking English speakers to correct students when they talk. Accordingly, the mean scores for strategy preference and use are 3.77 and 2.38, respectively. The t-test result is 9.579. From this it can be understood that there is statistically significant difference between the strategy preference and use of this strategy. In other words, students infrequently employ asking English speakers to correct them when they talk in relation to their preference.

Generally Table 18 portrays that the mean scores for strategy preferences are greater than the mean scores for strategy use in all strategies. From this, it can be implied that students infrequently employ social strategy in relation to their preference towards it.

4.5 The Major Factors that Hinder Students in Speaking Strategy Use

As we understand from the above two analysis, students weren't in a position to use speaking strategies as frequently as possible in relation to the extent of preferences they showed towards speaking strategies. As a result of this, the students were asked to indicate the major factors that hindered them to use speaking strategies as frequently as possible.

Table 19: Ratings of the major factors that hindered students from using speaking strategies

No	Factors	Responses										Total	
		Very serious				Total		Moderate		Not serious			
		Very serious		Serious				Fairly serious		Not at all			
		No	%	No	%	No	%	N	%	No	%	N	%
1	Lack of awareness of speaking strategies	171	87.7	13	6.6	184	94.4	11	5.6	-	-	195	100
2	Lack of self encouragement to improve speaking skill	15	7.7	6	3.1	21	10.8	9	4.6	165	84.6	195	100
3	Lack of EFL teachers support in teaching the strategies.	179	91.8	8	4.1	187	95.9	4	2.05	3	1.5	195	100
4	Negative attitude towards English language	12	6.2	10	5.1	22	11.3	66	33.8	107	54.8	195	100
5	Fear of making mistakes.	94	48.2	86	44.1	180	92.3	14	7.2	1	0.5	195	100
6	Fear of students' laughter at students who attempt to use English.	41	21	58	29.7	99	50.8	27	13.8	69	35.4	195	100
7	Negative attitude of the students towards students who use English.	56	28.7	18	9.2	74	38	40	20.5	71	36.4	195	100
8	Lack of motivation	4	2.05	2	1.02	6	3.1	13	6.6	177	90.8	195	100
9	Lack of experience of using strategies	59	30.3	88	45.1	147	75.4	17	8.7	31	15.9	195	100
10	The influence of culture	82	42.1	98	50.3	180	92.3	10	5.1	5	2.5	195	100
11	Absence of conducive school environment	97	49.7	77	39.5	174	89.2	15	7.7	6	3.1	195	100

As clearly portrayed in the above table, a significant number of students reported that lack of awareness towards speaking strategies /94.4%/, lack of EFL teachers help in teaching the strategies /95.9%/, fear of making mistakes /92.3%/, the influence of culture /92.3%/ and absence of conducive school environment /89.2%/ were found to be the serious factors that hindered students from frequent use of speaking strategies. In addition to this, a remarkable number of students also didn't deny the fact that lack of experience of using strategies /75.4%/, fear of students laughter at students who attempt to use English /50.8%/ and negative attitude of the students towards those who use English /38%/ were also another serious factors that hindered them from using the strategies that they preferred as frequently as possible.

Contrarily, as the majority of the students reported, negative attitude towards English /54.8%/, lack of self encouragement to improve speaking skill /84.6%/ and lack of motivation /90.8%/ weren't totally taken as a hindering factors for infrequent use of speaking strategies.

From the above analysis it can be said that regardless of the degrees of seriousness, all the above mentioned factors except those three analyzed later, responsible for infrequent use of speaking strategies by the students.

4.6 Summary of the six strategies

Based on the mean values, the six strategies were compared and contrasted for extent of preference and frequency of use of speaking strategies. Accordingly, table 20 presents the strategies mean values, extent of preference and their rank for strategy preference and table 20 presents the mean values, frequency of use and rank for strategy use.

Table 20: Summary of the six strategies for strategy preference

No	Strategies	Mean	Extent of preferences	Rank
1	Memory	3.89	High	6
2	Cognitive	3.99	High	4
3	Compensation	3.93	High	5
4	Meta Cognitive	4.12	High	1
5	Affective	4.05	High	3
6	Social	4.06	High	2

As shown in the above table, all strategies are highly preferred by the students with a mean value that range from 3.89 - 4.12. As compared to the direct strategies, indirect strategies were highly preferred by the respondents. As a result, meta cognitive, social, affective, cognitive, compensation and memory strategies ranked from the first to the sixth according to their mean values which are 4.12, 4.06, 4.05, 3.99, 3.93 and 3.89 respectively.

This implies students' readiness to practically use all the strategies and it also implies the students' internal inquisitiveness towards developing their ability to the highest level of language proficiency. This is because, Mullins (1992) found out that student preference towards meta cognitive, cognitive and social strategies are getting greater and greater as learners progress to higher proficiency level.

Table 21: Summary of the six strategies for strategy use

No	Strategies	Mean	Frequency of Use	Rank
1	Memory	3.03	Medium	4
2	Cognitive	2.87	Medium	6
3	Compensation	3.04	Medium	3
4	Meta Cognitive	3.06	Medium	2
5	Affective	3.1	Medium	1
6	Social	2.88	Medium	5

As indicated in the above table, students showed medium use towards all speaking strategies regardless of the fact that there is a difference in the mean values among strategies. This resulted in a difference in the strategies' rank order. Accordingly, affective, meta cognitive, compensation, memory, social and cognitive strategies ranked from the first to the sixth with a mean values of 3.1, 3.06, 3.04, 3.03, 2.88 and 2.87 respectively.

This clearly portrays the fact that none of the strategies adequately utilized by the respondents' in order to develop their progress by improving their speaking skills. However, there was a good attempt among respondents to use as many speaking strategies as possible. Therefore, if students are supported with teachers by providing them with strategy training, they will effectively use all the strategies and better perform in learning the language.

4.7 Discussion of the Findings

As mentioned in the very beginning, the main objective of this study was to see students' preferences and identify the frequency of use of speaking strategies with particular reference to Yekatit 66 and W/ro Kelemework secondary schools' students. The specific questions which is going to be answered by the study was identifying strategy preferences and use, examining if there is a difference between extent of preferences and use and exploring some major factors that hinder them from using strategy preferences. Therefore, in this part the result of the inquiry is going to be interpreted. And, the findings under each theme from the three tools were presented for the sake of triangulation.

The result of the questionnaire indicates that students who are learning in Grade 10 at Yekatit and W/ro Kelemework secondary schools were generally had high preference towards all speaking strategies. However, when we rank these strategies in terms of the students' extent of

preferences they showed as indicated in the Analysis part of this chapter, meta cognitive, social, affective, cognitive, compensation and memory strategies were ranked from the highest to the lowest. Generally speaking, in the attempt made to see students' preferences, it is proved that grade 10 Yekatit 66 and W/ro Kelemework students have a great desire to use all speaking strategies. This clearly shows that students have a great internal inquisitiveness to use as different strategies as possible to improve their speaking skill.

Regarding the students frequency of use of speaking strategies, a number of results have been found. As compared to direct strategies, indirect strategies were frequently used by the students. However, the participants of the study showed medium /2.77+/ use towards all (affective, met cognitive, compensation, memory, cognitive and social) strategies.

The result of the questionnaire which was later confirmed by interview and observation also revealed that affective strategy was frequently employed by the students as compared to the other speaking strategies. Above all, of the affective sub strategies, students' frequently employed relaxing themselves whenever they feel afraid of using English, listening to music to develop more positive mood for speaking and encouraging themselves to speak English even when they are afraid of making a mistake as compared to the other sub strategies subsumed under it. Moreover, meta cognitive strategy was also frequently employed by the students following affective strategy to organize and evaluate their learning. When examining sub strategies subsumed under meta cognitive strategy, noticing their English mistakes to help them do better and choosing a topic or initiating a conversation to get more practice were the most commonly employed sub strategies.

They also used social strategies. Asking their teacher or classmates for correction of errors and asking questions for verification or more explanations in class were among the frequently employed social strategies. The findings in the direct strategies were also remarkable in that students were using a substantial numbers of sub strategies subsumed under it in their attempt to become proficient speakers of English.

When we look at the individual category, we found out that memory strategy ranked first in relation to others in the category. It appeared to be one of the most popular strategies for students although with limited use.

In addition, when we examine the individual sub strategies included under memory strategy, using localation on the page or on the board, and practicing repeatedly were the commonly employed sub strategies in this category.

Regarding compensation strategy, the students employed it almost with the same frequency with memory strategy. As in memory strategy /3.03/, compensation strategy /3.04/ appeared to be one of the most commonly employed strategy by the students in their effort to fill for the missing knowledge while speaking.

Another significant result in this study was related to the differences or similarities between extent of preferences and frequency of use of speaking strategies. In both direct and indirect strategies, the students' frequency of use of speaking strategies was totally different from the students' extent of preferences. This means that they didn't use as frequently as possible in relation to their extent of preferences for each and every speaking strategies. This was proved by examining the t-values and p-value results of the two variables for each and every sub strategies subsumed under each category.

The major hindering factors which were responsible for students' infrequent use of speaking strategies were absence of conducive school environment (lack of English Language club and language laboratory), lack of awareness towards speaking strategies, lack of EFL teachers' support in teaching the strategies, fear of making mistakes and the influence of culture. In addition to this, lack of experience of using strategies, fear of students laughter at students who attempt to use English and negative attitude of the students towards those who use English were also another serious factors that hindered them from using the strategies that they preferred as frequently as possible.

Chapter Five: Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

Based on the findings, an overall evaluation of the preferences and use of six groups of strategies and the differences or similarity between the students extent of preferences and frequency of use of the strategies have been made. Moreover, some of the factors that hindered the students from using the preferred strategies as frequently as possible have also been made.

The answer of the participants revealed that they have generally showed high preferences towards all speaking strategies although the mean values of direct strategies were greater than direct one.

The students showed medium use towards all speaking strategies. However, when we rank them in the mean value scores, affective, meta cognitive, compensation, memory, cognitive and social strategies comes from first to last.

As it was intended to find out if there are some differences between extent of preferences and frequency of use, there existed a great difference between students' extent of preference and frequency of use. This means they are not using speaking strategies as frequently as possible in relation to their extent of preferences.

Finally, some serious factors were responsible for students' infrequently use in relation to their extent of preferences. One of the major serious factors was that the majority of the students didn't have awareness for the majority of the speaking strategies. In addition to this, absence of conducive school environment, fear of making mistakes, lack of EFL teachers help in teaching the strategies, lack of experience, the influence of culture in which the student grew up and fear of students laughter were also another serious factors that hindered the students to use speaking strategies as frequently as possible in relation to their extent of preference.

5.2 Recommendations

In the lights of the findings, the following recommendations can be made in order to improve the students' frequency of use of speaking strategies.

1. The speaking strategy in general should be thought to language learners so that they can better exploit them while they are learning the skill.
2. As the result depicted the students relatively showed high preference towards all speaking strategies regardless of some variation. However, the students should have shown an equal preference towards all speaking strategies to better improve their speaking skills. To do so, EFL teachers should play a significant role in advising, encouraging and telling the students about the importance of all speaking strategies.
3. Language laboratory should be built and EFL teachers should allow learners to use it. So that, the students can has the opportunity to practice the language.
4. By giving training about speaking strategies to students, it is possible to create awareness about it. As a result of this, they can better use all speaking strategies as frequently as possible regardless of some factors.
5. English language club should be formed in the school in order to create conducive environment by allowing the students to practice the language and changing the negative attitude of the students towards those who attempt to use English. These help the learners to develop more positive mood and confidence by avoiding frightens and making mistakes.
6. EFL teachers should identify their students' speaking strategies preferences and teach them accordingly. As a result, the students can have better opportunities to employ their strategy preferences as frequently as possible.
7. Material designers are recommended to add the necessary speaking strategies in the text book to be taught in a regular class time. Consequently, the students may develop awareness of the strategies and better exploit them in every way possible.

References

- Alexander and Doky. (1995). Meta Cognitive Awareness and Second Language Listeners. On Language Teaching: *ELT Journal*, 51, 4.
- Almaz, G. (2007). Communicative Strategies Used by Male and Female Students at Class room Interaction: Students at Kotebe College of Teacher Education. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Barkhuizen, E.P. (1998). Discovering Language Perceptions of ESL Class room Teaching /Learning Activities in a South African Context. *Tesol Quarterly*, 32/85-108.
- Brown, G. (1984). *Teaching Tack*. Cambridge: Cup.
- Brown, D. (1980). *Principle of Language Learning And Teaching*, (New York: Prentice Hall, P.210)
- Chamot, A.U. et al. (1987). 'The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach: A Bridge to the main Stream'. *Tesol Quarterly*, 21/2,227-249. *aches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
- Chang, L. and Huang, J. (1999). A Study of Language Learning Strategies Used By College EFL Learners in Taiwan. *Ming Dao Journal of General Education*, 2, 235-261.
- Clark. (1997). "Teachers Though Process Hand Book of Research on Teaching."(3rd ed.). New York: American Education Research Association.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research Design. Second Edition*. USA: Sage publication, Inc.
- Cohen, A.D. (1998). *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language*. Essex, U.K.: Longman.
- Chen, S. Q. (1990). A Study of Communication Strategies in Inter language Production by Chinese EFL Learners. *Language Learning*, 40, 155-187.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ehrman, M. and Oxford, R. (1989). Effects of Sex Differences, Career Choice, and Psychological Type on Adults' Language Learning Strategies. *Modern Language Journal*, 73(1), 1-13.
- Ehrman, M. and Oxford, R. L. (1990). Adult Language Learning Styles and Strategies in an Intensive Training Setting. *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 74: 311-327. Doctoral Dissertation, United States International University, San Diego, CA.
- Fassil, D. (1992). *Communication Strategies Employed by Senior High School Students in Oral Production of English*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Gallagher-Brett, A. (2007). What Do Learners' Beliefs about Speaking Reveal about their Awareness of Learning Strategies? *Language Learning Journal* 35(1), 37-49.
- Green, J. and Oxford, R. L. (1995). A Closer Look at Learning Strategies, L2 Proficiency, and Gender . *Tesol Quarterly*, 29, 261-297.

- Griffiths, C. and J. M. Parr. (2001). Language-Learning Strategies Theory and Perception. *ELT Journal*, 55, 3.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The Beliefs about Language Learning of Beginning University Foreign Students. *Modern Language Journal* 72, Pp. 283-294.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1987). Surveying Student Beliefs about Language Learning. In Wenden, A. L., Rubin, J. (Eds.), *Learner /Strategies in Language Learning*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Pp. 119-129.
- Herbert H. Clark and Eve H. Clark, (1997). *Psychology and Language*. (USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc. P.223)
- Issitt, S. (2008). Improving Scores in the IELTS Speaking Test. *ELT Journal* 62(2), 131-138.
- Kumelachew, H. (2011). *Communication Strategies Used by Undergraduate Fourth Year English Majors*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Lee, W. (1995). Authenticity Revised: Text Authenticity and Learner Authenticity. *ELT Journal*, 49/4, 323-328.
- Macaro, S. (2001). *Communicative Competence: An Experimental in Foreign Language Teaching*. Philadelphia; The center for Curriculum Development, Inc.
- Melakneh, M. (2006). *Pre-College English (3rd edition)*. Addis Ababa University printing Press.
- Macleod, L. (2002). TESL and Creative Drama. *TESL Reporter*. Vol. 5 No. 2, 22-23.
- MacIntyre, P.O. and K.A. Neols (1996). Using Social Psychological Variables to predict the use of Language Learning Strategies. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 3.
- Melkamu, Y. (2003). *Perceived Awareness, Usefulness, and Frequency of use of speaking Strategies among Micro Link Information Technology College*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Mullins, P. (1992). *Successful English Language Learning Strategies of Students Enrolled In speaking Activities*. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Mugford, G. (2007). How Rude! Teaching Impoliteness in the Second-Language Classroom. *ELT Journal*, 62(4), 374-384.
- McDonough, S. H. (1995). *Strategy and Skill in Learning a Foreign Language*. London: Edward Arnold. Manuscript, University Of Texas, Austin, Texas, USA.
- Olivares- Cuhat. (2002). Language Strategies Application with Students of English as A Second Language. *Tesol Quarterly*, 19(3), 557 – 584.
- Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Boston: Heinle

- and Heine.
- Oxford, R.L., and Ehrman, M.E. (1995). Adults' Language Learning Strategies in an Intensive Foreign Language Program in the United States. *System*, 23, 359-386.
- Oxford, R. L., and Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables Affecting Choice of Language Learning Strategies by University Students. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 291-300.
- Oxford, R. L., and Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). Assessing the Use of Language Learning Strategies Worldwide With ESL/EFL Version of the Strategies Inventory for Language Learning. *System*, 23, 153-175.
- Oxford, R. L. (1989). Use of Language Learning Strategies: A Synthesis of Studies with Implications for Strategy Training. *System*, Vol. 17/2: 235-247.
- Oxford, R. L. and Cohen, A. D. (1992). Language Learning Strategies: Crucial Issues of Concept and Classification. *Applied Language Learning*, Vol. 3/1-2: 1-35.
- Oxford, R. (1992). Language Learning Strategies in a Nutshell: Update and ESL Suggestions. *Tesol Journal*, 2(2), 18-22.
- O'Malley et al. (1985). "Learning strategy Applications with Students of English as a second Language." *Tesol Quarterly*, Vol. 19/3:557-584.
- Ok, F. (2003). "Attitude and value, Acquiring" In international Encyclopedia of Education. Vol. I, 377-380. Oliveres-Cuhat, H. (2002). "Attitude Measurement." In Social and Behavioral Encyclopedia. VOL.II, PP. 905-908.
- O'Malley, J. M. and Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge, U.K: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley, J. M. and Chamot, A. (1989). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Purpura, J. (1999). Learner Characteristics and L2 Test Performance. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language Learning Strategies in The Context of Autonomy, Synthesis of Findings From the International Invitational Conference on Learning Strategy Research* (Pp. 61-63), Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, Nye.
- Park, G. (1994). *Language Learning Strategies: Why Do Adults Need Them?* Unpublished Manuscript, University Of Texas, Austin, Texas, Us.
- Peacock, M. and Ho, A. (2001). Language Learning Strategies and EAP Proficiency: Teachers views, Student Views and Test Results. In J. Flower dew and M. Peacock (eds). *Research Perspectives on EAP*. Cambridge: Cup.
- Park, G. (1997). Language Learning Strategies and English Proficiency in Korean University Students. *Foreign Language Annuals*, 30, 211-221.

- Poulisse, N. (1990). *The Use of Compensatory Strategies by Dutch Learners of English*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Rossi-Ie, B. (1995). *Promoting Active Learning Strategies in the College Classroom*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Ramirez, L. (1986). Authentic Language and Authentic Conversation Texts. *Foreign Language Annals* 19, 203-208.
- Richards C. and Renaldy. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching*, (USA: Cambridge University Press P. 204)
- Rubin, E. (1975). *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, (Pp. 85-102), New York: Prentice Hall.
- Riley, P. (1996). "Bats and Balls": Beliefs about Talk and Beliefs about Language Learning. *Proceedings of the International Conference Autonomy 2000: The Development of Learning Independence in Language Learning*, Bangkok, November, Pp. 151-168.
- Rigney, J. W. (1978). *Learning Strategies: A Theoretical Perspective*. In H.F. O'neil, Jr. (Ed.), *Learning Strategies*, Pp164-205. New York: Academic Press.
- Schmeck, R. (1988). Individual Differences and Learning Strategies. In C. Weinstein, E.Goetz, and P. Alexander (Eds.), *Learning and Study Strategies*. N.Y.: Academic Press, 171-191.
- Singh, Y.K. (2007). *Research Methodology*. New Delhi: APH publishing Corporation.
- Spratt, M. (1999). How Good are We at Knowing What Learners Like? *System*. 27/ 141-155.
- Tamada, T. (1996). 'Teaching Oral Communication in College Classes.' *Research Bulletin of Aichi Women's Junior College. General Education and Interdisciplinary Research*. 26: 83-92.
- Thegay, T. (1995). *Speaking Strategies Employed by First Year Students at the Kotebe College of Teacher Education*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Tiume, L. (2005). *Communication Strategies Used by Male and Female Students at Unity University College*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Tesfaye, A. (2007). *Oral Communication Strategies used by Omo TTI Students*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Tibebu, A. (2007). *Communication Strategies Used by English Major Third Year Students: Debre Markos University in Focus*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Wikipedia. (2009). [Online] Available: [Http://En.Wikipedia.Org/Wiki/Wiki_educator](http://En.Wikipedia.Org/Wiki/Wiki_educator). (April9, 2009)
- Wharton, G. (2000). Language Learning Strategy Use of Bilingual Foreign Language Learners in Singapore. *Language Learning*, 50, 203-243.
- Wenden, A. L. and J. Rubin (1987) (Eds.). *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

- Wenden, A. L. (1998). Meta cognitive Knowledge and Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics* 19/4. Pp. 515-537.
- Wenden, A. L. (1986a). Helping Language Learners Think about Learning. *English Language Journal* 40, Pp. 3-12.
- Wenden, A. (1987). Conceptual Background and Utility. In A. Wenden and J. Rubin (Eds), *Learning Strategies in Language Learning* (Pp. 3-13). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenden A. L. (1986b). What Do Second Language Learners Know About their Language Learning? A Second Look at Retrospective Accounts. *Applied Linguistics* 7, Pp. 186-201.
- Wen, Q. And Johnson, R. K. (1997). L2 Learner Variables and English Achievement: A Study of Tertiary-Level English Majors in China. *Applied Linguistics* 18 (1), Pp. 27-48. The Faculty Of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand. Unpublished
- Yang, (1999). The Relationship between EFL Learners' Beliefs and Learning Strategies Use. *System*, 27, Pp. 515-535.

Appendices

Appendix- A

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate studies
Faculty of language studies
Department of English

Dear Respondents,

This questionnaire is designed to gather information about the extent of your strategy preferences. There is no right and wrong answers since different learners have different preferred way of learning a language. The responses you give will be kept confidential. Therefore, feel free, be frank and objective in responding the questions provided.

This questionnaire has two parts. The first part deals with your personal details. The second part gives you a list of 30 speaking strategies. Therefore, please read each statement carefully and put a tick mark (✓) in the box corresponding to your choice that fits you in terms of the extent of preference that you have for each and every speaking strategies using the following scales..

No	I prefer this strategy	Ratings	Scales
1	Very great extent	VGE	5
2	Great extent	GE	4
3	Some extent	SE	3
4	Little extent	LE	2
5	Never	N	1

Part 1: Personal information

- ❖ Name of the school _____
- ❖ Sex- M__ F__
- ❖ Age- _____

Part 2: Speaking Strategy Inventory

No	Strategies	Extent of preference				
		VGE	GE	SE	LE	N
1	I try to associate what I already know and new language information in order to remember them.					
2	I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.					
3	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their localation on the page or on the board.					
4	I try to remember language items by practicing repeatedly.					
5	I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the words to help me remember the word.					
6	I say orally in order to practice new expression in the language.					
7	I imitate the way native/ proficient speakers talk in the language					
8	I practice the sounds of English.					
9	While speaking, I transfer the knowledge of words, concepts / structures from L1 /native language/toL2/English language/.					
10	I use English outside the classrooms.					
11	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.					
12	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use body movements.					
13	I ask my teacher or classmates to tell me the right expressions when I don't seem to get the right one.					
14	When I forget or fail to remember a word or an expression, I keep on repeating the previous word for some time until I can recall or get a word.					

15	When I fail to remember a word while speaking, I use L1.						
16	I choose a topic, or initiate conversation to get more practice.						
17	I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.						
18	I look for people talk to in English.						
19	I arrange my schedule to study and practice the new language consistently, not just when there is a pressure of a test.						
20	I talk and share idea about learning language problems and effective speaking strategies with my teacher.						
21	I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.						
22	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.						
23	I listen to music to develop more positive mood for speaking.						
24	I try to relax myself whenever I feel afraid of using English.						
25	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.						
26	I cooperate with my friends to practice and share information in learning the language.						
27	I ask my teacher or classmates for correction of errors.						
28	I comment, suggest and give opinions in class discussions.						
29	I ask questions for verifications and more explanations in class.						
30	I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.						

Appendix- B

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate studies
Faculty of language studies
Department of English

Dear Respondents,

This questionnaire is designed to gather information about the frequency of use of speaking strategies. There is no right and wrong answers since different learners learn a language in different ways. The responses you give will be kept confidential. Therefore, feel free, be frank and objective in responding the questions provided.

This questionnaire has two parts. The first part deals with your personal details. The second part gives you a list of 30 speaking strategies. Therefore, please read each statement carefully and put a tick mark (✓) in the box corresponding to your choice that fits you in terms of the frequency of use of speaking strategies that you have for each and every speaking strategies using the following scales..

No	I use this strategy	Ratings	Scales
1	Always	A	5
2	Usually	U	4
3	Sometimes	S	3
4	Rarely	R	2
5	Never	N	1

Part 1: Personal information

- ❖ Name of the school _____
- ❖ Sex- M__ F__
- ❖ Age- _____

Part 2: Speaking Strategy Inventory

No	Strategies	Frequency of Use				
		A	U	S	R	N
1	I try to associate what I already know and new language information in order to remember them.					
2	I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.					
3	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their localation on the page or on the board.					
4	I try to remember language items by practicing repeatedly.					
5	I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the words to help me remember the word.					
6	I say orally in order to practice new expression in the language.					
7	I imitate the way native/ proficient speakers talk in the language					
8	I practice the sounds of English.					
9	While speaking, I transfer the knowledge of words, concepts /structures from L1 /native language/toL2/English language/.					
10	I use English outside the classrooms.					
11	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.					
12	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use body movements.					
13	I ask my teacher or classmates to tell me the right expressions when I don't seem to get the right one.					
14	When I forget or fail to remember a word or an expression, I keep on repeating the previous word for some time until I can recall or get a word.					
15	When I fail to remember a word while speaking, I use L1.					

16	I choose a topic, or initiate conversation to get more practice.					
17	I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.					
18	I look for people talk to in English.					
19	I arrange my schedule to study and practice the new language consistently, not just when there is a pressure of a test.					
20	I talk and share idea about learning language problems and effective speaking strategies with my teacher.					
21	I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.					
22	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.					
23	I listen to music to develop more positive mood for speaking.					
24	I try to relax myself whenever I feel afraid of using English.					
25	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.					
26	I cooperate with my friends to practice and share information in learning the language.					
27	I ask my teacher or classmates for correction of errors.					
28	I comment, suggest and give opinions in class discussions.					
29	I ask questions for verifications and more explanations in class.					
30	I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.					

Appendix- A1

አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ
ድህረ ምረቃ ትምህርት ቤት
የቋንቋዎች ትምህርት ክፍል
በተማሪዎች የሚሞላ መጠይቅ

የተከበራችሁ ተማሪዎች፣

ይህ መጠይቅ ለእያንዳንዱ የእንግሊዘኛ ማሻሻያ ዘዴ / speaking strategies / የፍላጎትዎን ደረጃ የሚጠይቅ ነው። መጠይቁ ያስፈለገው ለጥናትና ምርምር ብቻ ነው። በመሆኑም ለጥናትና ምርምሩ ወጤታማነትና ታላማነት የርስዎ አስተዋጽኦ በጣም ከፍተኛ በመሆኑ እያንዳንዱን የእንግሊዘኛ መማሪያ ዘዴ በጥንቃቄ በማንበብና በመረዳት ለእያንዳንዱ ጥያቄ ተስማሚ ነው ብለህ/ሽ/ ያመንክበት/ሽን/ መልስ ከተሰጡት አማራጮች አንዱን በጥያቄው ትይዩ ባሉት ሳጥኖች ውስጥ የሚመለከት በማድረግ ይምረጡ። ክፍል አንድ፡ ለሚከተሉት ጥያቄዎች መልሱን በመጻፍ ይመረጡ

1. የ ት/ት ቤቱ ስም -----
2. የታ ወንድ----- ሴት-----

ክፍል ሁለት፡ የእንግሊዘኛ ማሻሻያ ዘዴ መጠይቆች

ተ.ቁ	የፍላጎት ደረጃ መለኪያ	የፍላጎት ደረጃ መለኪያ				
		እጅግ በጣም ከፍተኛ	በጣም ከፍተኛ	መሀከለኛ	በጣም በጥቂቱ	አልፏል
1	አዲስ የእንግሊዘኛ ቃልን ወይም ንግግርን ለማስታወስ በፊት ከማውቀው ቃል ወይም ንግግር ጋር በማዛመድ ለማስታወስ እሞክራለሁ					
2	አንድ አዲስ የእንግሊዘኛ ቃልን ለማስታወስ ቃሉን የምጠቀምበትን ሁኔታ ወይም ቦታ ስዕላዊ በሆነ መልኩ ጭንቅላቴ ውስጥ በመቅረፅ ለማስታወስ እሞክራለሁ					
3	አዲስ የእንግሊዘኛ ቃል ወይም ሐረግ በደብተር ወይም በጥቁር ስሌዳ ላይ የተጻፈበትን ቦታ ትኩረት በመስጠት ለማስታወስ እሞክራለሁ					
4	በተደጋጋሚ ጊዜ ልምምድን በማድረግ የተማርኩትን ለማስታወስ እሞክራለሁ					
5	አዲስ የእንግሊዘኛ ቃልን ድምፅ ከራሱ ስዕል ጋር በማገናኘት/በማዛመድ/ ለማስታወስ እሞክራለሁ					
6	በቃላት በመናገር አዳዲስ የእንግሊዘኛ ንግግርን አለማመዳለሁ					
7	እንግሊዘኛ የመጀመሪያ ቋንቋቸው የሆኑ ሰዎችን አነጋገር ዘዴ እከተላለሁ					
8	የእንግሊዘኛ ቋንቋ ድምፆችን በመለማመድ ቋንቋ ለማሻሻል እሞክራለሁ					
9	በንግግር ወቅት የመጀመሪያ ቋንቋ ቃላቶች፣ ሐረጎች ወይም ሰዎችን አገባቦች እውቀቴን ወደ እንግሊዘኛ ቋንቋ በመተርጎም ለመናገር እሞክራለሁ					
10	እንግሊዘኛ ቋንቋን ከመማሪያ ክፍል ውጪ በመጠቀም ለማሻሻል እሞክራለሁ					
11	በንግግር ወቅት የእንግሊዘኛ ቃል ወይም ሐረግ ከጠፋብኝ ተመሳሳይ ትርጉም ያለው ቃል ወይም ሐረግን እጠቀማለሁ					
12	በንግግር ወቅት የእንግሊዘኛ ቃል ወይም ሐረግ ከጠፋብኝ					

	የሰውነት እንቅስቃሴ ማለትም የእጅ፣ የሬት ወዘተ..በመጠቀም ሐሳቤን ለመግለፅ እሞክራለሁ				
13	ትክክለኛ የእንግሊዝኛ ቃል፣ ሐረግ ወዘተ.. ከጠፋብኝ መምህራን ወይም የክፍል ጓደኞቼን ትክክለኛውን ቃል፣ ሐረግ ወዘተ.. እንዲነግሩኝ እጠይቃለሁ				
14	በንግግር ወቅት አንድ የእግሊዝኛ ቃል ከጠፋብኝ ቀደም ብዬ የተጠቀምኩትን ቃል ለተወሰነ ጊዜ በመደጋገም የጠፋብኝን ለማስታወስ እሞክራለሁ።				
15	በንግግር ወቅት አንድ ቃል ከጠፋብኝ የመጀመሪያ ቋንቋዬን ተመሳሳይ ትርጉም ያለውን ቃል እጠቀማለሁ				
16	የተለያዩ ርዕሰ ጉዳዮችን በመምረጥ እንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋዬን ለማሻሻል ብዙ ልምምድ አደርጋለሁ				
17	የምፈፀማቸውን ስህተቶች በመውሰድ ከስህተቶቼ ለመማር ጥረት አደርጋለሁ				
18	እንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋን የሚጠቀሙ ሰዎችን በመፈለግ ከነሱ ጋር ንግግር ለማድረግ እሞክራለሁ				
19	ለፈተና ብዬ ብቻ ሳይሆን ፕሮግራም በማውጣት በተከታታይ እንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋን አጠናለሁ /አለማመዳለሁ/				
20	ስለ እንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ መማር ችግሮችና ስለ ውጤታማ የንግግር ማሻሻያ ዘዴዎች ከመምህራ ጋር በማውራት ሐሳብ አለዋወጣለሁ				
21	ስህተት አሰራለሁ ብዬ ባስብም እራሴን በማበረታታት በእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ ለመናገር እጥራለሁ				
22	በቋንቋው በአጥጋቢ ሁኔታ መልእክቴን ካስተላለፈኩ ወይም በደንብ ከተናገርኩ ለእራሴ ሽልማት እሸልማለሁ				
23	ጥሩ የሆነ የእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ ንግግር መንፈስ እንዲኖረኝ የእንግሊዝኛ ሙዚቃዎችን አዳምጣለሁ				
24	እንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋን ለመጠቀም በምፈራበት ወቅት በተቻለ መጠን እራሴን ከጭንቀት ነፃ ለማድረግ እሞክራለሁ				
25	እንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ ስማር ያለኝን ስሜት ለሌለው ሰው አካፍላለሁ/ እነግራለሁ				
26	ከጓደኞቼ ጋር በመሆን ቋንቋውን በመጠቀም በአንዳንድ ርዕሰ ጉዳዮች ላይ በመወያየት ቋንቋውን አዳብራለሁ				
27	የሚፈጠሩትን ስህተቶች መምህራን ወይም ጓደኞቼን በመጠየቅ ከስህተቴ እማራለሁ				
28	የመማሪያ ክፍል ውስጥ በሚደረጉ የቡድን ውይይት ላይ ቅሬታ፣ ሐሳብ እና አስተያየቶችን እሰጣለሁ				
29	ያልገባኝን እና ማብራሪ የሚያስፈልጋቸውን ርዕሶች ላይ ጥያቄ አነሳለሁ				
30	ንግግር ሳደርግ የምፈጥራቸውን ስህተቶች የመጀመሪያ ቋንቋቸው እንግሊዝኛ የሆኑ ሰዎች እንዲያስተካክሉኝ እጠይቃለሁለ።				

Appendix- B1

**አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ
ድህረ ምረቃ ትምህርት ቤት
የቋንቋዎች ትምህርት ክፍል
በተማሪዎች የሚሞላ መጠይቅ**

የተከበራችሁ ተማሪዎች

ይህ መጠይቅ የእንግሊዘኛ ማሻሻያ ዘዴ / speaking strategies / ምን ያህል ጊዜ እንደምትጠቀም/ሚ /use/ የሚጠይቅ ነው። መጠይቁ ያስፈልገዎልዎታል። ለጥናትና ምርምር ብቻ ነው። በመሆኑም ለጥናትና ምርምር ወጤታማነትና ታላማነት የርስዎ አስተዋጽኦ በጣም ከፍተኛ በመሆኑ እያንዳንዱን የእንግሊዘኛ መማሪያ ዘዴ በጥንቃቄ በማንበብና በመረዳት ለእያንዳንዱ ጥያቄ ተስማሚ ነው ብለህ/ሽ/ ያመንክበትን/ሽን/ መልስ ከተሰጡት አማራጮች አንዱን በጥያቄው ትይዩ ባሉት ሳጥኖች ውስጥ የሚመለከት በማድረግ ይምረጡ።

ክፍል አንድ: ለሚከተሉት ጥያቄዎች መልሱን በመጻፍ ይመረጡ

1. የ ት/ት ቤቱ ስም -----
2. የታ ወንድ----- ሴት-----

ክፍል ሁለት: የእንግሊዘኛ ማሻሻያ ዘዴ መጠይቆች

ተ.ቁ		የመጠቀም ድግግሞሽ መለኪያ				
		ሁልጊዜ	አብዛኛውን ጊዜ	አንድ አንድ ጊዜ	ጥቂት ጊዜ	አልጠቀምም
1	አዲስ የእንግሊዘኛ ቃልን ወይም ንግግርን ለማስታወስ በፊት ከማውቀው ቃል ወይም ንግግር ጋር በማዛመድ ለማስታወስ እሞክራለሁ					
2	አንድ አዲስ የእንግሊዘኛ ቃልን ለማስታወስ ቃሉን የምጠቀምበትን ሁኔታ ወይም ቦታ ስዕላዊ በሆነ መልኩ ጭንቅላቴ ውስጥ በመቅረፅ ለማስታወስ እሞክራለሁ					
3	አዲስ የእንግሊዘኛ ቃል ወይም ሐረግ በደብተር ወይም በጥቁር ሰሌዳ ላይ የተጻፈበትን ቦታ ትኩረት በመስጠት ለማስታወስ እሞክራለሁ					
4	በተደጋጋሚ ጊዜ ልምምድን በማድረግ የተማርኩትን ለማስታወስ እሞክራለሁ					
5	አዲስ የእንግሊዘኛ ቃልን ድምፅ ከራሱ ስዕል ጋር በማገናኘት /በማዛመድ/ ለማስታወስ እሞክራለሁ					
6	በቃላት በመናገር አዳዲስ የእንግሊዘኛ ንግግርን እለማመዳለሁ					
7	እንግሊዘኛ የመጀመሪያ ቋንቋቸው የሆኑ ሰዎችን አነጋገር ዘዴ እከተላለሁ					
8	የእንግሊዘኛ ቋንቋ ድምፆችን በመለማመድ ቋንቋ ለማሻሻል እሞክራለሁ					
9	በንግግር ወቅት የመጀመሪያ ቋንቋ ቃላቶች፣ ሐረጎች ወይም ሰዎች ለማወቅ አገባቦች እውቀቴን ወደ እንግሊዘኛ ቋንቋ በመተርጎም ለመናገር እሞክራለሁ					

10	እንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋን ከመማሪያ ክፍል ውጪ በመጠቀም ለማሻሻል እሞክራለሁ				
11	በንግግር ወቅት የእንግሊዝኛ ቃል ወይም ሐረግ ከጠፋብኝ ተመሳሳይ ትርጉም ያለው ቃል ወይም ሐረግን እጠቀማለሁ				
12	በንግግር ወቅት የእንግሊዝኛ ቃል ወይም ሐረግ ከጠፋብኝ የሰውነት እንቅስቃሴ ማለትም የእጅ፣ የሬት ወዘተ..በመጠቀም ሐሳቤን ለመግለፅ እሞክራለሁ				
13	ትክክለኛ የእንግሊዝኛ ቃል፣ ሐረግ ወዘተ.. ከጠፋብኝ መምህራን ወይም የክፍል ጓደኞቼን ትክክለኛውን ቃል፣ ሐረግ ወዘተ.. እንዲነግሩኝ እጠይቃለሁ				
14	በንግግር ወቅት አንድ የእንግሊዝኛ ቃል ከጠፋብኝ ቀደም ብዬ የተጠቀምኩትን ቃል ለተወሰነ ጊዜ በመደጋገም የጠፋብኝን ለማስታወስ እሞክራለሁ።				
15	በንግግር ወቅት አንድ ቃል ከጠፋብኝ የመጀመሪያ ቋንቋዬን ተመሳሳይ ትርጉም ያለውን ቃል እጠቀማለሁ				
16	የተለያዩ ርዕሰ ጉዳዮችን በመምረጥ እንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋዬን ለማሻሻል ብዙ ልምምድ አደርጋለሁ				
17	የምፈፀማቸውን ስህተቶች በመውሰድ ከስህተቶቼ ለመማር ጥረት አደርጋለሁ				
18	እንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋን የሚጠቀሙ ሰዎችን በመፈለግ ከነሱ ጋር ንግግር ለማድረግ እሞክራለሁ				
19	ለፈተና ብዬ ብቻ ሳይሆን ፕሮግራም በማውጣት በተከታታይ እንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋን አጠናለሁ /አለማመዳለሁ/				
20	ስለ እንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ መማር ችግሮችና ስለ ውጤታማ የንግግር ማሻሻያ ዘዴዎች ከመምህራ ጋር በማውራት ሐሳብ እለዋወጣለሁ				
21	ስህተት እሰራለሁ ብዬ ባስብም እራሴን በማበረታታት በእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ ለመናገር እጥራለሁ				
22	በቋንቋው በአጥጋቢ ሁኔታ መልእክቴን ካስተላለፈኩ ወይንም በደንብ ከተናገርኩ ለእራሴ ሽልማት እሸልማለሁ				
23	ጥሩ የሆነ የእንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ ንግግር መንፈስ እንዲኖረኝ የእንግሊዝኛ ሙዚቃዎችን አዳምጣለሁ				
24	እንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋን ለመጠቀም በምፈራበትን ወቅት በተቻለ መጠን እራሴን ከጭንቀት ነፃ ለማድረግ እሞክራለሁ				
25	እንግሊዝኛ ቋንቋ ስማር ያለኝን ስሜት ለሌለው ሰው አካፍላለሁ/ እነግራለሁ				
26	ከጓደኞቼ ጋር በመሆን ቋንቋውን በመጠቀም በአንዳንድ ርዕሰ ጉዳዮች ላይ በመወያየት ቋንቋውን አዳብራለሁ				
27	የሚፈጠሩትን ስህተቶች መምህራን ወይም ጓደኞቼን በመጠየቅ ከስህተቴ እማራለሁ				
28	የመማሪያ ክፍል ውስጥ በሚደረጉ የቡድን ውይይት ላይ ቅሬታ፣ ሐሳብ እና አስተያየቶችን እሰጣለሁ				
29	ያልገባኝን እና ማብራሪ የሚያስፈልጋቸውን ርዕሶች ላይ ጥያቄ አነሳለሁ				
30	ንግግር ሳደርግ የምፈጥራቸውን ስህተቶች የመጀመሪያ ቋንቋቸው እንግሊዝኛ የሆኑ ሰዎች እንዲያስተካክሉኝ እጠይቃለሁ።				

Appendix- C

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate studies
Faculty of language studies
Department of English

Dear Respondents,

This questionnaire is designed to gather information about the levels of seriousness of the major factors that hindered you from using speaking strategies as most frequently as possible. There is no right and wrong answers so put a tick mark (✓) in the box corresponding to your choice that fits you in terms of degrees of seriousness of the factors mentioned below. The responses you give will be kept confidential. Therefore, feel free, be frank and objective in responding the questions provided.

No	Factors	Very serious	serious	Moderately serious	Not at all
1	Lack of awareness of strategies				
2	Lack of self encouragement to improve speaking skill				
3	Lack of EFL teachers advice and encouragement				
4	Negative attitude towards English language				
5	Fear of making mistakes.				
6	Fear of students' laughter at students who attempt to use English.				
7	Negative attitude of the students to wards who use English				
8	Lack of motivation				
9	Lack of experience				
10	The influence of culture				
11	Absence of conducive school environment				

Appendix- D

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate studies
Faculty of language studies
Department of English

Classroom Observation Checklist

No	Questions	Yes	No
1	Do students practice using English language in the class room?		
2	Do students use body movement like gesture, facial expression, their L1, repeating the previous word in order to compensate for the missing part?		
3	Do students make an attempt to learn from their mistakes?		
4	Are students confident while using English?		
5	Do students cooperate, give comments and opinions in class discussions or ask their friend or teacher for correction of errors?		

Appendix- E
Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate studies
Faculty of language studies
Department of English

Interview questions

1. How do you remember new language items?
2. Do you transfer (use) knowledge of L1 to practice using L2?
3. Can you tell me how you practice speaking in order to be an effective speaker of English?
4. Do you attempt to imitate the way native speakers talk and say orally in order to practice?
5. If you forget a word (phrase) while speaking, how do you compensate (express) your idea?
6. What personal efforts do you make in order to practice English, for example, choosing a topic arranging a schedule for practice, learning from your own mistakes, and asking your teacher for effective strategies?
7. How do you relax or encourage your self when you get stressed while speaking?
8. How far do you cooperate with your friends, ask your teacher a question, comments in class discussion, and ask your teacher or classmates for correction of errors in order to improve your speaking?

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that this thesis is my original work, and has not been presented for a degree in any other university, and that all sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Henok Alemu

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Date: 11/12/2024

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as a university advisor.

Name: _____

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Date of approval: _____

