POSITIVE VERSUS NEGATIVE COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES IN TASK-BASED LEARNING

Siti Rohani
(siti_rohani_malang@yahoo.co.id)

Politeknik Negeri Malang
Jl. Soekarno Hatta No 9 PO BOX 04 Malang 65141

Abstract: This study aimed at describing how the implementation of Task-Based Learning (TBL) would shape or change students' use of oral communication strategies. Students' problems and strategies to solve the problems during the implementation of TBL were also explored. The study was a mixed method, employing both quantitative and qualitative analysis through multi-methods of questionnaire, interviews, focus group discussion, learning journals, and classroom observation. Participants were 26 second year students of the State Polytechnic of Malang. Data collection was conducted for one semester. Findings show linguistic and non-linguistic problems encountered by students during one-semester implementation of TBL. Students also performed increased use of positive strategies but reduced use of negative strategies after the implementation of TBL.

Keywords: oral communication strategies, positive strategies, negative strategies, task-based learning

Effective oral communication skills, especially speaking skills, are essential for learners of EFL (Goh, 2007; Ur, 1996). For Indonesian university students, oral communication skills are considered the most important skill they need to master; their first two priorities in learning English are "talking with native speakers in work situations" and 'talking with native speakers in social situations" (Bradford, 2007, pp. 311-312). However, with few exceptions, most students graduating from university cannot communicate adequately in English (Dardjowidjojo, 2000; Nur, 2004). Even if students do understand the input, they cannot produce expressions to which they have been exposed (Morries, 29

September 2001). Some causes for this have been identified, including large class size, teachers' low English proficiency, teachers' lack of familiarity with the implementation of new curriculum, and inappropriate methods of teaching (Dardjowidjojo, 7-10 October 1996, 2000).

As the latest realization of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Task-Based Learning (TBL) is regarded as a favourite method by English teachers in Asia (Nunan, 2003), and is also popular in Indonesia. The task is basically defined as a goal-oriented classroom activity (Ellis, 2003; Nunan, 2006; Oxford, 2006; Prabhu, 1987; Willis, 1998) which requires learners' use of target language, focusing on the conveying of meaning rather than on the practice of form (Ellis, 2003; Nunan, 2006; Skehan, 1998). There are two main reasons to choose TBL as an English teaching and learning approach, namely the desire for a meaning-focused approach that reflects real life language use (Leaver & Willis, 2004) and the task based interactions stimulating natural acquisition processes (Prabhu, 1987). A number of studies reveal the effectiveness of TBL in enhancing students' language proficiency, especially in oral communication skills (Ahmed, 1996; Lochana & Deb, 2006; Lovick & Cobb, 2007; Sae-Ong, 2010) despite some challenges to the implementation of TBL in Asia Pacific (eg., Adams & Newton, 2009; Butler, 2011; Littlewood, 2007) and in Indonesia (eg., Jazadi, 2000; Nur, 2004).

Oral communication skills and communication strategies in EFL learning are interconnected. Communication strategies are the means to close the gap between linguistic competence and communicative competence, the gap between what learners are capable of and what learners intend to express (Bialystok & Frohlich, 1980). Employment of communication strategies is considered one of the strategies in learning and developing oral communication skills.

Students' individual differences have been identified as influencing use and choice of communication strategies. Students of different levels of oral communication skills employ different communication strategies (eg., Griffiths, 2003; Macaro, 2006). Task types have also been identified as determining employment of communication strategies (eg., Ng, 1995; Oxford, Yunkyoung Cho, Santoi Leung, & Hae-Jin Kim, 2004). Implementation of TBL to promote students' oral communication skills may shape the pattern of students' use of oral communication strategies without discounting the possibility of this being influenced by other factors of individual difference.

Considering the interconnectedness between communication strategies and the development of oral communication skills as well as the role of TBL in promoting students' oral communication skills, this paper intends to investigate how the implementation of TBL shaped or changed students' use of oral communication strategies, namely positive and negative strategies. This change was associated with how students responded to the implementation of TBL and how they understood the development of oral communication skills during the implementation of TBL.

This study was, therefore, aimed at analysing non-English department students' use of oral communication strategies in a TBL program. To be specific, it sought to identify problems encountered by high, middle, and low achievers during the implementation of TBL, strategies (both speaking and listening strategies) used to solve the problems, and the shift in use of the strategies after the implementation of TBL.

METHOD

In the current study, following the pattern of the research inquiries to be investigated, both quantitative and qualitative measurements were employed. The quantitative measurement was used to provide a backdrop, which was the profile of students' oral communication strategies, especially the shift in use of oral communication strategies after the implementation of TBL over one semester. Then, qualitative measurement was employed to gain a deeper understanding regarding students' use of oral communication strategies as well as reasons for the shifts in use of the strategies. This mixed-method study was determined mainly within the qualitative perspective with a contribution from quantitative measurement employed as a backdrop to initiate the analysis.

Methods used included Oral Communication Strategies Inventory (OCSI) developed by Nakatani (2006) covering both speaking and listening strategies (see appendix 1), learning journals (LJ), focus group discussions, in-depth interviews, and classroom observation. In the inventory (OCSI), Nakatani (2006) termed some strategies as positive strategies while others as negative strategies. Included in the positive speaking strategies are social affective, fluency oriented, negotiation, accuracy oriented, non-verbal strategies, and attempt to think in English while positive listening strategies include negotiating for meaning, fluency maintaining, scanning, getting the gist, non-verbal strategies, and word-oriented. Negative strategies include message reduction and alteration and mes-

sage abandonment for speaking strategies and less active listener for listening strategy.

There were 26 students who voluntarily participated in the study, and the data collection process was conducted for one semester. Participants were second year students of Business Administration department of the State Polytechnic of Malang. They were within a range of communication skills, namely high, middle, and low achievers. The grouping of the participants was based on their scores from previous semesters (semester 1 and 2).

To identify the shift in use of oral communication strategies before and after the implementation of TBL, OCSI distributed at the beginning of the semester and end of the semester were compared. The use of communication strategies during the implementation of TBL was observed through classroom observation. Within this semester, participants were also assigned to write learning journals once every two weeks. Deeper analysis for the shift in use of strategies as identified in the OCSI was conducted through focus group discussion and in-depth interviews.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In general, students mentioned they were happy with the implementation of TBL throughout the semester. They felt they had more courage to use English, and this was due to several factors, namely the provision of more opportunities to use English for oral communication in class, interesting and challenging teaching materials, and relaxed classroom atmosphere that reduces students' anxiety levels in producing oral English. Still, students encountered problems during the semester, and they used strategies to solve the problems. After one semester implementation of TBL, there were shifts in use of the strategies. These three points are highlighted in the next sub-sections.

Problems Encountered During the Implementation of TBL

Students mentioned several linguistic and non-linguistic problems encountered during the semester. Linguistic problems reported by students resulted from their limited vocabulary, which later caused them difficulty in arranging words into correct sentences and in expressing themselves in English. These problems were reported frequently at the beginning of the semester and report-

ed as being greatly reduced by the end of semester, especially by high and middle achievers.

Linguistic problems, as students reported in their LJs, were interrelated. Three linguistic problems encountered by students included limited vocabulary, difficulty in arranging sentences into appropriate sentences, and low speaking fluency. Of these, students' limited vocabulary seemed to be the most dominant as evident in students' learning journals and interviews. Most students in all groups, the high, middle, and low achievers, faced these linguistic problems. These problems were reported to occur mostly in the beginning and middle of semester by the high and middle achievers. However, the low achievers still confronted these problems by the end of semester despite their reported improved linguistic skills. The following are some excerpts of students' learning journals (LJ) in response to the question of "what problems did you encounter during the completion of oral communication tasks?"

> I have problems with my vocabulary. I think I can't speak better. (Dinata, LJ, 1st intake)

> Some words make me confused. (Dinata, LJ, 2nd intake)

> The main problem was my poor vocabulary, sometimes I did not understand some words the teacher said. It was also difficult for me to express myself in oral English because it's hard for me to put words in proper sentences. (Santi, LJ, 1st intake)

> I was not fluent enough in describing things in English. (Maulana, LJ, 5th intake)

> Yes, I was not fluent enough in speaking English. (Lincah, LJ, 4th intake)

The above mentioned linguistic problems seemed to be congruent with what Nation (1990) points out as two possible reasons for language learners not being able to express what they want: that students do not know adequate vocabulary and that they do not know how to use the words productively in the spoken language. These two problems result in lack of fluency. Of these linguistic problems, the root cause is basically limited vocabulary because vocabulary is the first prerequisite for communicative competence (Gebhard, 2000; Nunan, 1999) without which communication is seldom successful (Rivers,

1981; Widdowson, 1978). Lexicon as the first criterion for spoken fluency is relevant for the participants of the present study who were mostly at beginner and pre-intermediate proficiency levels. This is resonant with what Hilton (2008) asserts, that for fluency enhancement, lexical knowledge is fundamental.

During the completion of the oral communication tasks, students also encountered non-linguistic problems, including students' belief that their English skills were poor and their low self-confidence in speaking English. Students, especially the middle and low achievers, mentioned that it was hard to speak in English because they had poor English skills. They felt that they did not understand English. They also said that they could not speak in English. As a result, they had problems in communicating with their friends and in accomplishing the oral communication tasks in the classroom. These were evident in their Learning Journals (LJ), as presented in the following excerpts.

> I have problems in speaking English and understanding English. It's because I can't speak English (Bidadari, LJ, 1st intake)

> Yes, my main problem in communicating in English is my poor English skills. (Vera, LJ, 2nd intake)

> Yes (I have problems), because I don't have courage to speak in English (Saputro, LJ, 1st intake)

Students' belief that their English skills were poor shows their low self-esteem; they measured themselves as poor in English skills (as put in a simple definition of 'self-esteem' by DeVito, 2009). Low self-esteem may hinder language learning development. As found in a study by Heyde (1979) about the relationship between self-esteem and oral production of a second language, low self-esteem was correlated to poor performance in oral production. The current study supports this finding. Regarding students' low self-confidence they stated that they were 'nervous' and 'shy' to speak in English. They were also afraid of making mistakes. They 'did not have courage' to talk, especially when they had to do oral presentations in front of the class. They were not confident enough to speak in English with their friends. This lack of confidence was encountered by students of all groups, irrespective of their achievement levels.

Strategies Employed during the Semester

As students mentioned in the learning journals and during interviews, students mentioned several strategies to solve linguistic problems, including having more reading activities, improving vocabulary, and having more practice in conducting oral communication activities. Students reported that by reading more they would learn more new words to enrich their vocabulary. They also believed reading would enable them to better arrange words into good sentences. In this way, students believed that they would be able to improve their vocabulary and, in turn, improve their oral communication skills. The provision of more opportunities to use English in oral communication tasks in class is one main pillar of TBL (for example, Nunan, 2006).

Concerning non-linguistic problems, students mentioned two main strategies to solve these problems. These strategies were improving self-confidence in performing oral communication tasks and asking for help from a friend or the teacher. After one semester implementation of TBL, students reported increased motivation, increased self-confidence, higher self-esteem, and lower anxiety in having oral communication activities. As students reported, this was due to several reasons such interesting and challenging real life teaching materials, relaxed classroom situations, and the provision of more opportunities for students to use English in oral communication activities. Thus, pillars of TBL were effective in improving students' motivation, self-confidence, and, in turn, oral communication skills, supporting findings of previous studies (Lochana & Deb, 2006; Sae-Ong, 2010).

Findings from the Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OCSI) indicated students' higher use of listening strategies as compared to their listening strategies at the beginning of the semester, as presented in Table 1 and Table 2. After one semester implementation of TBL, findings show a more balanced use of strategies during oral communication tasks with an increased use of strategies for coping with speaking problems approaching the level of strategies for coping with listening problems. Balanced use of strategies implies better strategic competence, one of the components of communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980).

It was also evident that students of higher levels of oral communication skills used higher frequency of strategies. From the beginning to the end of the semester, findings show that high achievers used strategies more frequently and

more numerously than the middle and the low achievers. This corroborates findings from previous studies (e.g., Macaro, 2006; Magogwe & Oliver, 2007).

Among the oral communication strategies for coping with speaking problems, the social affective strategy was the most favoured. This strategy was ranked second at the beginning of semester and ranked first at the end of semester. This finding echoes Wharton's (2000) study which indicated that bilingual Asian students favoured social strategies more than any other strategy and category and that social strategies in general were one of the most favoured strategies among all Asian students. However, findings at the end of semester showed an increased use of this strategy by the middle and low achievers, suggesting a stronger intention of these groups to use social affective strategies. Interestingly, only the high achievers showed a reduced use of social affective strategies. This relates to findings of a study by Oxford et al. (2004) which show that affective strategies are helpful when learners are anxious or when they need a motivational boost, so high-proficiency learners may not require these strategies as much as students with less advanced language skills.

In response to research question 3 regarding shift in use of oral communication strategies after one semester implementation of TBL, the next subsections discuss shifts in use of strategies for coping with speaking and listening problems.

Shifts in Use of Speaking Strategies

Regarding the shifts in the use of oral communication strategies for coping with speaking problems, some noteworthy findings were evident. First, after the implementation of TBL, students' use of positive strategies was increased while their use of negative strategies was reduced. Summary of findings is presented in Table 1.

The high achievers follow the pattern of increasing use of positive strategies and reducing use of negative strategies, the only difference being the reduced use of the social affective strategy. As stated by Oxford et al. (2004), affective strategies are helpful when learners are anxious or when they need a motivational boost, so high-proficiency learners may not require these strategies as much as students with less advanced language skills.

Shift in use of oral communication strategies for coping with speaking problems shown by the middle achievers were of similar pattern to those of the

high achievers. There were five increased and three decreased use of accuracy oriented strategies. Middle achievers reduced using negative strategies.

The low achievers did not fully follow this pattern of shifts of increasing the use of positive strategies and reducing the use of negative strategies. Instead, they increased using one negative strategy (message reduction and alteration) and two positive strategies (negotiation for meaning while speaking and non-verbal strategies in speaking) and reduced using three positive strategies (social affective, fluency-oriented, and accuracy-oriented). That the low achievers increased using negative strategies of message reduction and alteration may be due to their limited linguistic knowledge, especially lexicon knowledge, that Gebhard (2000) and Nunan (1999) state as the first requirement for communicative competence to occur.

In general, these findings suggest that, after the implementation of TBL, the higher the students' levels of oral proficiency, the greater their likelihood of increasing the use of positive strategies and reducing the use of negatives strategies. In other words, students increased the effectiveness of strategies use, showing higher strategic competence. This is consistent with Willis (1996) who explains that one of the specific goals of TBL is to develop learners' strategic competence in order to make them more communicatively effective. These findings also corroborate a study by Lee (2004), that second language acquisition can evolve from learner-learner interaction in communicative tasks, as one of the main pillars of TBL, through strategies.

A number of factors were evident regarding the influence of students' affective factors in shifts in use of strategies. Toward the end of the semester, most students reported increased self-esteem, higher risk-taking behaviour, lower anxiety, and higher degree of motivation with higher degree of motivation the most outstanding finding. Change in these affective factors was found to positively impact on their use of strategies, and in turn, improve their oral communication skills. This confirms previous studies (eg. Mochizuki, 1999) that high motivation positively impacts on the use of strategies.

Shift in Use of Listening Strategies

Regarding the shift in use of listening strategies as presented in Table 2, in general, findings show that, after one semester implementation of TBL, students across different levels of communication skills reduced use of strategies, except negotiation for meaning and non-verbal strategies that were increasingly

used. A significantly reduced use of strategies was found in the use of the strategy of being less active listeners, which belongs to negative strategy. That students tended to reduce using listening strategies may be due to the fact that, by the end of the semester, students tended to be more actively communicating in English. They used more speaking strategies, which may mean that they were more active in the communication. It seems that, after one-semester implementation of TBL, students improved their strategic behaviour in interactive listening, being more selective in using the strategies by using more cognitive and metacognitive strategies and reducing the use of negative strategies.

As shown in Table 2, in general, students across different levels of oral proficiency reduced the use of listening strategies. However, further analysis on each group reveals that the high achievers tended to increase the use of positive strategies and reduce the use of negative strategies whereas the middle and low achievers showed more decreases in the use of both positive and negative strategies. This confirms that the higher students' levels of proficiency, the higher their strategic competence since strategic competence is one part of communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980).

Students' improvement in their strategic behaviour in interactive listening is shown in the shift in use of listening strategies, and reasons for this progress was reported during the interviews or in students' learning journals.

First, students' increased use of the strategies of negotiation for meaning may mainly result from their higher motivation to be more engaged in oral communication and to improve English skills. As students feel a closer relationship with their friends, they are not reluctant to ask the speakers to use easier words, to ask for repetition, or to ask for clarification. This finding is similar to that of a study by Gardner and Steinberg (2005) and by Kurihara (2006) that found the positive effect of peer relationship in increasing learners' courage to take risks.

Second, in using fluency oriented strategies, students' increased use of the strategies of paying attention to speakers' intonation and rhythm as well as pronunciation of the teacher or friends of higher level of oral communication skills shows their higher motivation to improve English skills and learn from others. Paying attention to teacher's intonation and rhythm was found to be one strategy students preferred. Teachers were considered as the role model and learning resource, and teachers' talk is an essential source of linguistic input (Tulung, 2004). Reliance on teachers as mediating agents in learning shown by

students in this study is consistent with Gao's (2006) finding about Chinese students' maintaining preference for this strategy after moving to Britain.

Third, with regard to the shift in use of scanning strategies, students' increased use of strategies to get the main point of the message shows improved strategic behaviour since this strategy is believed to be employed effectively by successful listeners.

Fourth, dealing with the shift in use of getting the gist strategies, linguistic knowledge and higher motivation reasons were evident. Improved linguistic knowledge results in reduced attempts to use the strategy of getting the gist, especially in responding to the speaker when unable to understand the speakers' utterances. However, higher motivation to maintain two-way communication results in increased use of this strategy by the high achievers. Reduced use of 'getting the gist' strategy by the low achievers was due to their limited linguistic knowledge which Macaro, Graham, and Vanderplank (2007) believe as the underlying reason for differences in listening strategy use.

Fifth, students' increased use of non-verbal strategies in paying attention to gestures and eye-contact while listening indicates higher awareness of mutual understanding in oral communication, which consists of not only verbal but also non-verbal messages. As suggested by Kellerman (1992), paying attention to the speakers' eye contact shows their improved awareness of the importance of kinesics behaviour in real communication.

Sixth, significant reduced use of less-active listener strategies suggests students' improved strategic behaviour. Included in this strategy is focus on familiar expressions, which was found to be reduced in use by all the students across different oral communication proficiency. This, as students stated in the interviews, was due to their higher motivation to maintain the flow of communication. In this way, motivation is highly correlated with effective listening strategic behaviour (Ghavamnia, Kassaian, & Dabaghi, 2011; Vandergrift, 2005).

Finally, with regard to the shift in use of word-oriented strategies, students have better understanding of the importance of words used by the speakers, being more selective in determining when to focus on words. That the high achievers increased using this strategy while the middle and low achievers reduced using it may show that less successful listeners rely much on word-by-word basis (O'Malley, Chamot, & Kupper, 1989; Young, 1997).

Table 1. Shifts in Use of Oral Communication Strategies for Coping with Speaking Problems

Positive Strategies

No	Categories	High Achievers				Middle Achievers				Low Achievers				Average All Groups			
		Means		t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)	Means		t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)	Means		t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)	Means		t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Begin	End			Begin	End			Begin	End			Begin	End		
1	Social Affective	4.188	4.021	.847	.425	3.650	4.183	-2.157	**.059**	3.778	3.500	.945	0.444	3.952	4.024	-.554	.586
2	Fluency Oriented	3.458	3.771	-1.472	.185	3.467	3.517	-.214	.835	3.333	3.056	.714	0.549	3.444	3.548	-.699	.492
3	Negotiation for Meaning while Speaking	3.375	3.844	-2.007	.085	3.375	3.500	-.432	.676	3.000	3.333	-.355	0.757	3.321	3.607	-1.445	.164
4	Accuracy Oriented	3.325	3.675	-1.433	.195	3.380	3.280	.522	.614	3.467	3.200	.512	0.659	3.371	3.419	-.316	.755
5	Non-Verbal Strategies in Speaking	4.125	4.375	-1.871	.104	3.450	4.050	-4.129	.003	2.667	3.167	-.866	0.478	3.595	4.048	-3.97	.001
6	Attempt to Think in English	3.563	3.625	-.284	.785	3.817	4.150	-1.861	.096	3.833	3.833	.000	1.000	3.643	3.905	-1.562	.134

Negative Strategies

No	Categories	High Achievers				Middle Achievers				Low Achievers				Average All Groups			
7	Message Reduction and Alteration	4.167	3.708	2.762	.028	4.400	4.067	1.732	.117	4.333	4.444	-.378	0.742	4.302	3.984	2.633	.016
8	Message Abandonment	3.250	3.107	.760	.476	3.725	3.675	.452	.662	3.917	3.917	.000	1.000	3.588	3.513	.842	.410

169

Table 2. Shifts in Use of Oral Communication Strategies for Coping with Listening Problems

Positive Strategies

No	Categories	High Achievers				Middle Achievers				Low Achievers				Average All Groups			
		Means		t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)	Means		t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)	Means		t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)	Means		t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Begin	End			Begin	End			Begin	End			Begin	End		
1	Negotiation for Meaning while Listening	3.525	3.950	-2.072	**.077**	3.556	3.622	-.201	.846	3.267	3.333	-.2000	.860	3.500	3.710	-1.204	.243
2	Fluency Maintaining	3.775	3.675	.540	.606	3.420	3.380	.156	.879	3.333	3.133	1.000	.423	3.543	3.457	.616	.545
3	Scanning	4.250	4.250	.000	1.000	4.300	4.300	.000	1.000	4.083	3.667	.762	.525	4.250	4.191	.488	.631
4	Getting the Gist	3.594	3.625	-.126	.903	3.472	3.472	.000	1.000	3.167	3.083	.180	.874	3.475	3.475	.000	1.000
5	Non-Verbal Strategies in Listening	4.313	4.438	-.552	.598	3.700	4.100	-1.238	.247	3.333	3.833	-.866	.478	3.881	4.191	-1.652	.114
6	Word Oriented	4.313	4.375	-.333	.749	4.528	4.500	.244	.813	4.333	3.750	1.750	.222	4.413	4.338	.688	.500

Negative Strategies

No	Categories	High Achievers				Middle Achievers				Low Achievers				Average All Groups			
7	Less-Active Listener*	3.875	3.625	1.000	.351	4.350	3.950	1.238	.247	4.167	3.333	2.500	.130	4.143	3.738	2.193	.040

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This study was conducted to see the impact of TBL implementation on students' use of oral communication strategies, consisting of speaking and listening strategies. After one semester implementation of TBL, students reported improved oral communication skills, including improved linguistic and non-linguistic aspects. Findings also show a more balanced use of strategies during oral communication tasks with an increased use of strategies for coping with speaking problems approaching the level of strategies for coping with listening problems. Without ignoring the existence of other influential factors, these findings confirm the effectiveness of TBL in improving students' oral communication skills as well as in making students more skilful in using oral communication strategies.

Students' use of speaking strategies, by the end of the semester, was found to be more effective, employing more positive strategies and reducing the use of negative strategies. Students were effectively selective in using the speaking strategies, and this was highly related to their improved linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge.

Regarding strategies for coping with listening problems, toward the end of semester, after the implementation of TBL throughout the semester, students' use of listening strategies in oral communication activities were found more effective. They were more selective in using the strategies, using more cognitive and metacognitive strategies as well as reducing negative strategies commonly favoured by less effective listeners.

After one-semester implementation of TBL, students improved strategic behaviour, increasing use of positive strategies, reducing use of negative strategies, and being more selective in choosing certain strategies needs to be taken into account, since it is clearly related to students' improved oral communication skills. This confirms the positive correlation between strategic competence and communicative competence: that improved strategic competence supports the development of communicative competence and that improved communicative competence includes improved strategic competence. Thus, providing explicit training in effective use of learning strategies or communication strategies may help students improve communication skills. This, further, implies the need of strategy training to be provided in educational institutions.

REFERENCES

Adams, R., & Newton, J. (2009). TBLT in Asia: Constraints and opportunities. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 19*, 1-17.

Ahmed, M. K. (1996). Teaching oral communication skills in academic settings: A case study in task-based approach to syllabus design. *Working Papers, 7*, 1-16.

Bialystok, E., & Frohlich, M. (1980). Oral communication strategies for lexical difficulties. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin, 5*(1), 3-30.

Bradford, A. (2007). Motivational orientations in under-researched FLL contexts: Findings from Indonesia. *RELC Journal, 38*(3), 302-323. doi: 10.1177/0033688207085849

Butler, Y. G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 36-57. doi: 10.1017/S0267190511000122

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, I*(1), 1-47.

Dardjowidjojo, S. (1996, October 7-10). *The role of English in Indonesia: A dilemma*. Paper presented at the TEFLIN Seminar, Surabaya, Indonesia.

Dardjowidjojo, S. (2000). English teaching in Indonesia. *EA Journal, 18*(1), 22-30.

DeVito, J. A. (2009). *The interpersonal communication book* (12th ed.). Boston; London: Pearson.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gao, X. (2006). Understanding changes in Chinese students' uses of learning strategies in China and Britain: A socio-cultural re-interpretation. *System, 34*(1), 55-67. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2005.04.003

Gardner, M., & Steinberg, L. (2005). Peer influence on risk taking, risk preference, and risky decision making in adolescence and adulthood: An experimental study. *Developmental Psychology, 41*(4), 625-635.

Gebhard, J. (2000). *Teaching English as a foreign language*. Michigan: Michigan University Press.

Ghavamnia, M., Kassaian, Z., & Dabaghi, A. (2011). The relationship between language learning strategies, language learning beliefs, motivation, and proficiency: A study of EFL learners in Iran. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*(5), 1156-1161.

Goh, C. (2007). *Teaching speaking in the language classroom*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language learning strategy use. *System, 31*(3), 367-383.

Heyde, A. W. (1979). *The relationship between self-esteem and the oral production of a second language* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Michigan), Retrieved from http://ezproxy.lib.monash.edu.au/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=760032211&Fmt=7&clientId=16397&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Hilton, H. (2008). The link between vocabulary knowledge and spoken L2 fluency. *Language Learning Journal, 36*(2), 153 - 166.

Jazadi, I. (2000). Constraints and resources for applying communicative approaches in Indonesia. *EA Journal, 18*(1), 31-40.

Kellerman, S. (1992). 'I see what you mean': The role of kinesic behaviour in listening and implications for foreign and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 13*(3), 239-258.

Kurihara, N. (2006). Classroom anxiety: How does student attitude change in English oral communication class in a Japanese senior high school? *Accent Asia [Online], 1*(1), 34 - 68.

Leaver, B. L., & Willis, J. (2004). *Task-based instruction in foreign language education: Practices and programs*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Lee, C. F. K. (2004). *Language output, communication strategies and communicative tasks: In the Chinese context*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.

Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching, 40*(03), 243-249. doi: 10.1017/S0261444807004363

Lochana, M., & Deb, G. (2006). Task-based teaching: Learning without tears. *Asian EFL Journal, 8*(3), Article 7.

Lovick, N., & Cobb, M. (2007). *The concept of foreign language task, misconceptions and benefits in implementing task-based instruction.* Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference on Task-Based Language Teaching, University of Hawaii.

Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: revising the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(iii), 320 - 337.

Macaro, E., Graham, S., & Vanderplank, R. (2007). A review of listening strategies: focus on sources of knowledge and on success. In A. D. Cohen & E. Macaro (Eds.), *Language learner strategies: Thirty years of research and practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Magogwe, J. M., & Oliver, R. (2007). The relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age and self-efficacy beliefs: A study of language learners in Botswana. *System, 35*(3), 338-352.

Mochizuki, A. (1999). Language learning strategies used by Japanese university students. *RELC Journal, 30*(2), 101-113. doi: 10.1177/003368829903000206

Morries, L. (2001, September 29). *What constitutes context in contextualized grammar teaching*. Paper presented at the Seminar on Teaching Grammar in Context, State University of Malang.

Nakatani, Y. (2006). Developing an oral communication strategy inventory. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(2), 151-168.

Nation, P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Ng, I. W.-Y. (1995). Task type and proficiency level as variables determining the use of communication strategies in spoken non-native English discourse. In K. P. Y. Wong & C. F. Green (Eds.), *Thinking language:*

Issues in the study of language and language curriculum renewal. Hong Kong: Language Centre, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching & learning*. Boston, Mass.: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(4), 589-613.

Nunan, D. (2006). Task-based language teaching in the Asia context: Defining 'task'. *Asian EFL Journal, 8*(3), Article 1.

Nur, C. (2004). English language teaching in Indonesia: Changing policies and practical constraints. In H. W. Kam & R. Y. L. Wong (Eds.), *English language teaching in East Asia today - Changing policies and practices* (second ed.). Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., & Kupper, L. (1989). Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics, 10*(4), 418-437. doi: 10.1093/applin/10.4.418

Oxford, R. L. (2006). Task-based language teaching and learning: An overview. *Asian TEFL Journal, 8*(3), Article 5.

Oxford, R. L., Yunkyoung Cho, R., Santoi Leung, R., & Hae-Jin Kim, R. (2004). Effect of the presence and difficulty of task on strategy use: An exploratory study. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 42*(1), 1-47.

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Rivers, W. M. (1981). *Teaching foreign-language skills* (2nd edition. ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sae-Ong, U. (2010). *The use of task-based learning and group work incorporating to develop English speaking ability of Mattayom Suksa 4 students*. (Unpublished master's thesis), Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tulung, G. J. (2004). Teachers managing a task within task-based instruction: A case study in an ESL setting. In B. Y. Cahyono & U. Widiati (Eds.), *English Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 143-156). Malang, Indonesia: State University of Malang Press.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Vandergrift, L. (2005). Relationships among motivation orientations, metacognitive awareness and proficiency in L2 listening. *Applied Linguistics, 26*(1), 70-89. doi: 10.1093/applin/amh039

Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning, 50*(2), 203-243.

Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Harlow: Longman.

Willis, J. (1998). *Task-based learning: What kind of adventure?* Retrieved from The Japan Association for Language Teaching

Young, M.-Y. C. (1997). A serial ordering of listening comprehension strategies used by advaced ESL learners in Hong Kong. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 7*, 35-53.

APPENDIX 1

Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OCSI)

Please read the following items, choose a response, and write it in the space after each item.
1. *Never or almost never true of me*
2. *Generally not true of me*
3. *Somewhat true of me*
4. *Generally true of me*
5. *Always or almost always true of me*

Strategies for Coping with Speaking Problems		
(Social Affective)	1	I try to use fillers when I cannot think of what to say.
	2	I try to give a good impression to the listener
	3	I don't mind taking risks even though I might make mistakes.
	4	I try to enjoy the conversation.
	5	I try to relax when I feel anxious.
	6	I actively encourage myself to express what I want to say.
(Fluency-Oriented)	7	I change my way of saying things according to the context.
	8	I take my time to express what I want to say.
	9	I pay attention to my pronunciation.
	10	I try to speak clearly and loudly to make myself heard.
	11	I pay attention to my rhythm and intonation.
	12	I pay attention to the conversation flow.
(Negotiation for Meaning)	13	While speaking, I pay attention to the listener's reaction to my speech.
	14	I give examples if the listener doesn't understand what I am saying.
	15	I repeat what I want to say until the listener understands.
	16	I make comprehension checks to ensure the listener understands what I want to say.
(Accuracy Oriented)	17	I pay attention to grammar and word order during conversation.
	18	I try to emphasize the subject and verb of the sentence.
	19	I correct myself when I notice that I have made a mistake.
	20	I notice myself using an expression which fits a rule that I have learned.
	21	I try to talk like a native speaker.

(Message Reduction & Alteration)	22	I use words which are familiar to me.
	23	I reduce the message and use simple expressions.
	24	I replace the original message with another message because of feeling incapable of executing my original intent.
(Non-Verbal Strategies)	25	I try to make eye-contact when I am talking.
	26	I use gestures and facial expressions if I can't communicate how to express myself.
(Message Abandonment)	27	I abandon the execution of a verbal plan and just say some words when I don't know what to say.
	28	I leave a message unfinished because of some language difficulty.
	29	I ask other people to help when I can't communicate well.
	30	I give up when I can't make myself understood.
(Attempt to Think in English)	31	I think first of what I want to say in my native language and then construct the English sentence.
	32	I think first of a sentence I already know in English and then try to change it to fit the situation.

Strategies for Coping with Listening Problems

(Negotiation for Meaning)	1	I ask the speaker to slow down when I can't understand what the speaker has said.
	2	I ask the speaker to use easy words when I have difficulties in comprehension.
	3	I make a clarification request when I am not sure what the speaker has said.
	4	I ask for repetition when I can't understand what the speaker has said.
	5	I make clear to the speaker what I haven't been able to understand.
(Fluency-maintaining)	6	I ask the speaker to give an example when I am not sure what he/she said.
	7	I pay attention to the speaker's rhythm and intonation.
	8	I send continuation signals to show my understanding in order to avoid communication gaps.
	9	I use circumlocution to react the speaker's utterance when I don't understand his/her intention well.
	10	I pay attention to the speaker's pronunciation.

(Scanning)	11	I pay attention to the first part of the sentence and guess the speaker's intention.
	12	I try to catch the speaker's main point.
	13	I especially pay attention to the interrogative when I listen to WH-questions.
	14	I pay attention to the subject and verb of the sentence when I listen.
(Getting the Gist)	15	I try to respond to the speaker even when I don't understand him/her perfectly.
	16	I guess the speaker's intention based on what he/she has said so far.
	17	I don't mind if I can't understand every single detail.
	18	I anticipate what the speaker is going to say based on the context.
(Nonverbal Strategies)	19	I use gestures when I have difficulties in understanding.
	20	I pay attention to the speaker's eye contact, facial expression and gestures.
(Less Active Listener)	21	I try to translate into native language little by little to understand what the speaker has said.
	22	I only focus on familiar expressions.
(Word-Oriented)	23	I pay attention to the first word to judge whether it is an interrogative sentence or not.
	24	I try to catch every word that the speaker uses.
	25	I guess the speaker's intention by picking up familiar words.
	26	I pay attention to the words which the speaker slows down or emphasizes.