



## **The Correlation between Students Strategies in Learning English Pronunciation and their Achievement in Speaking**

**Assyfa Rahma Selvia Phita Loka**

English Education Study Program, Department of Language and Art  
University of Bengkulu  
[assyfarsp@gmail.com](mailto:assyfarsp@gmail.com)

**Imranuddin**

English Education Study Program, Department of Language and Art University of Bengkulu  
[imranuddin@unib.ac.id](mailto:imranuddin@unib.ac.id)

**Ildi Kurniawan**

English Education Study Program, Department of Language and Art  
University of Bengkulu  
[ildikurniawan85@gmail.com](mailto:ildikurniawan85@gmail.com)

Corresponding author: [assyfarsp@gmail.com](mailto:assyfarsp@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

Pronunciation is one of important parts in speaking. Surely, those parts had correlation. The aim of this research was to identify students' pronunciation learning strategies and speaking achievement among students of the English Study Program at Universitas Bengkulu. Then, the research would like to find out whether or not there was any significant correlation between both variables. The research was a correlational research. The population consisted of 79 students of the English Education Study Program at Universitas Bengkulu in academic year 2018/2019. The total sample included 79 students. The instruments were pronunciation learning strategies questionnaire and students' score in speaking for presentation course from the lecturer. The collected data were analyzed by Pearson Product Moment formula. The result of this research showed that the Social Strategy was the most frequently used with a mean score 3.9 ("often" category). Then, high achievement students and middle achievement students used all strategies. The means of strategy score for high achievement students was 3.9 and the middle achievement students was 2.98. The result of this research also revealed that there was a correlation between students' pronunciation learning strategies and speaking achievement because the correlation coefficient was 0.595, in "moderate" correlation category. It is concluded that it is needed to strength students' achievement through introducing pronunciation learning strategies deeply.

**Keywords:** Students' strategies, English pronunciation, speaking achievement.

### **A. Introduction**

Learning strategies are certain actions, manners, steps, and ways that used by learners to improve their ability in learning. According to Oxford (1990), the word strategy comes from the ancient Greek, "strategia". Strategia means steps or actions that are used for the purpose of winning a war. The warlike meaning of strategia has fortunately fallen away, but

the control and goal-directedness remain in the modern version of the word. Weinstein and Mayer (1983) explained that learning strategies can be defined as behaviors and thoughts in which a learner and which are intended to influence the learner's encoding process, thus the goal of any particular learning strategy may be to affect the learner's motivational or affective state of the way in which the learner selects, acquires, organizes or integrates new knowledge. Furthermore, Oxford (1989) defines language learning strategies as steps that always be done by learners consciously to increase the acquisition, retention, recall, and use of new knowledge. Moreover, learning strategies are important to be used by learners because they can improve language performance, encourage learners' autonomy, can be taught, and expand the teacher's role in important ways. Learning strategies are important and useful for language learners especially for non native language learners in getting new knowledge of language and improving learners' skills; listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Speaking is an interactive process of developing meaning that starts from producing information, and processing information (Burns and Joyce, 1997). Johnson and Morrow (1981) stated that speaking which is known with term "oral communication", is an activity consists of two or more people called as hearers and speakers who must react to what they hear and make their contributions at high speed. Cameron (2001) defines speaking as an action for making people understand about speaker's meanings, feeling, and ideas by doing an act of communication through language. Moreover, it is known as an interactive, social, and contextualized communicative event. Finnochiaro and Brumfit (1983) claim that speaking is showing oral expression to thoughts, opinions, and feelings through talk or conversation. Having a good speaking is very useful in our life for example, many departments or institutions have a requirement for people who want to apply a job to have the ability in speaking English.

Good speaking is speaking which is understandable for the listener (Noermanzah, et al, 2020). In order to be understandable when speaking in English, we have to learn the foundation of speaking. Gilakjani (2011) claims that the important foundation of speaking is pronunciation. Based on the Adult Migrant English Program Research Centre (2002), pronunciation is referred to the sound production that used by human to make meaning. Dalton and Seidlhofer (1994) stated "pronunciation includes the production of sounds of a particular language in order to understand and interpret meaning. Moreover, to be understandable the non native learners do not have to pronounce a word really like a native but should pronounce a word clearly. Clear pronunciation can make people understand what

we are talking about. In addition, if the language learners' pronunciation is poor, it will affect their communication. Furthermore, Sihombing (2014) finds that students who have a lack of pronunciation get difficulty in comprehending and understanding their conversation with others.

English pronunciation should be considered in learning speaking by both teachers and students. Unfortunately, not all of the teachers teach pronunciation in English class. Gilakjani and Sabouri (2016) explained teachers do not teach pronunciation because teachers believe that grammar and lexis can help the students more in English rather than pronunciation. However, Gilakjani (2016), Syafryadin, et al. (2013), Diani, et.al (2019), Noermamzah, et al. (2020) and Syafryadin, et.al. (2020) explain English pronunciation is one of the most difficult basics in speaking and the learners will spend a lot of times for improving their pronunciation. In English Education Study Program at the University of Bengkulu, there is no special pronunciation course. It is included in the subject of Phonology and Speaking classes. Moreover, based on an informal interview on February 2019 to the students in the sixth semester, they still have difficulties in speaking English even though they have already learned phonology and speaking courses. The difficulties commonly occur on mastering vocabulary, conveying idea, using right grammar, and using correct pronunciation as well. As a result, learning pronunciation in the classroom is not enough for improving and having good pronunciation, so the students should know and have strategies of learning English pronunciation.

It is the same with Katarzyna Rokoszewska (2012) found in his study that there is a significant correlation between students' use pronunciation learning strategies and their production of English vowels and diphthongs. Ecsktein in 2007 found that noticing other's English mistakes, asking for pronunciation help, adjusting facial muscles have significant correlation with higher spontaneous pronunciation skill. Campos (2018) found that no major correlation etween pronunciation learning strategies frequency / duration and pronunciation accuracy, while there was a positive correlation between pronunciation learning strategies and pronunciation intelligibility levels.

As explained above, the problem faced by the students is having less pronunciation class influences learners in speaking which influences speaking achievement too. The different results from several researches make the researcher interested to find out whether a correlation between pronunciation learning strategies for English Study Program students in the University of Bengkulu and their Speaking for Presentation achievement

## **B. Research Methodology**

This research was quantitative correlational research. This design is used when there are two or more variables need to be related in order to find out whether or not they influence each other. Creswell (2012) stated, “a correclation is a statistical test to determine the tendency or pattern for two (or more) variables or two sets of data to vary consistently”. The correlation will be shown by the correlation coefficient. It will be a positive or negative correlation. Positive correlation means if the variable x increase so variable y will be increase too, and vice versa. Negative correlation means if the variable x increase so variable y will decrease and vice versa. In this study, the researcher tried to find out whether or not there is a significant correlation between students' pronunciation and their Speaking for Presentation achievement.

Moreover, The population of this research were the sixth-semester students of English Education Study Program at Universitas Bengkulu acedemic year 2018/2019 class A and B. The researchers chose the sixth-semester students because the sixth-semester students already learned phonology course, English conversation course, speaking for discussion course and Speaking for Presentation course. The total numbers of students from class A were 41 students. The total number of students from class B were 38 students. The total number of students from both class A and B were 79 students.

The instruments of this research were questionnaire and speaking for presentation score. The first instrument is questionnaire that was adapted from the pronunciation learning strategies table by Calka (2011). There were 43 statements in the final questionnaire with 5 options of response to each statements (1 for never, 2 for seldom, 3 for sometimes, 4 for often, and 5 for always). The second instrument is Speaking for Presentation score. Speaking for Presentation is the last speaking course for students of English Education Study Program at Universitas Bengkulu. The data of Speaking for Presentation course were collected by asking the lecturer to give the students' mid-term exam and final exam score. In mid-term exam, the students presented a topic about anything that they interested in, while in final exam the students presented an educational article about languge learning or language acquisition.

Moreover, the researcher analyzing the questionnaire by using weighted mean formula and proportion formula from Sugiyono (2012) and dividing students' speaking for

presentation score based on Category of Students' Score by Fitri (2017). Furthermore the researcher used Pearson Product Moment to analyze the data. The result from calculating ( $r_{\text{count}}$ ) compared to ( $r_{\text{table}}$  with the level significance 5%) in order to know whether or not the hypothesis is accepted. If the  $r_{\text{count}} > r_{\text{table}}$  the hypothesis was accepted, while if the  $r_{\text{count}} < r_{\text{table}}$  the hypothesis was rejected. Moreover, the interpretation of correlation coefficient strength, and it range from 0.00 to 1.00. According to Nunan (1992), there are three possible result of correlational study. Those are positive correlation, negative correlation and no correlation. Positive correlation is when both variables improve or decrease at the same time. A correlation coefficient close to 1.00 indicates a strong positive correlation. Perfect positive correlation would result in a source of 1. Negative correlation is when the amount of one variable improves the other decreases. A correlation coefficient close to -1.00 indicates a strong negative correlation. Perfect positive correlation would result in -1. No correlation indicates that there is no relationship between the two variables. A correlation coefficient of 0 indicates no correlation.

### C. Findings and Discussion

#### Findings

*Table 1. Summary on Students' Pronunciation Learning Strategies*

No	Strategy Group	Mean	Category
1	Memory Strategy	3	Sometimes
2	Cognitive Strategy	3.3	Sometimes
3	Compensation Strategy	3.4	Sometimes
4	Metacognitive Strategy	3.3	Sometimes
5	Affective Strategy	3.3	Sometimes
6	Social Strategy	3.9	Often
$\Sigma$	<b>Average of Mean Score</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>

Based on the table 1, it can be seen that students used all of the groups of strategies. The frequencies of strategies were showed by the mean score in the table differently. The lowest mean score of strategy was (3.0) with sometimes category from memory strategy.

Social strategy is the most frequently used with mean score was 3.9 and Often category. Furthermore, the average of mean score of all of the strategies was 3.4 with “Sometimes” category. From the result, it can be concluded that English Education Study Program students’ strategies in learning English pronunciation was categorized as “Sometimes” category.

Table 2. Memory Strategy

QI	Frequency (f)					Mean	Category
	N	S	Sm	O	Al		
1	7 (8.9%)	17 (21.5%)	36 (45.6%)	17 (21.5%)	2 (2.5%)	2.9	Sometimes
2	8 (10.1%)	20 (25.3%)	34 (43%)	14 (17.7%)	3 (3.8%)	2.8	Sometimes
3	2 (2.5%)	15 (19%)	38 (48.1%)	21 (26.6%)	3 (3.8%)	3.1	Sometimes
4	11 (13.9%)	26 (32.9%)	24 (30.4%)	14 (17.7%)	4 (5.1%)	2.7	Sometimes
5	4 (5.1%)	17 (21.5%)	38 (48.1%)	17 (21.5%)	3 (3.8%)	3	Sometimes
6	10 (12.7%)	24 (30.4%)	31 (39.2%)	12 (15.2%)	2 (2.5%)	2.6	Seldom
7	0 (0%)	4 (5.1%)	21 (26.6%)	35 (3.8%)	19 (24.1%)	3.9	Often
8	2 (2.5%)	14 (17.7%)	33 (41.8%)	21 (26.5%)	9 (11.4%)	3.3	Sometimes
Average Mean						3.0	Sometimes

QI : Questionnaire Item, N: Never, S: Seldom, Sm: Sometimes, O: Often, Al: Always,  $\Sigma f$ : frequency of respondents, W: Weighted mean

Table 2 showed the strategies in memory group. The mean from all of the items in this group was 3.0 with “sometimes” category. Item number 7 was the item that most frequently used by the students. The mean of item number 7 was 3,9 and categorized in “Often”. The lowest frequency in this group was in item number 6. It was caused that the mean of item number 6 was only 2.6 with “seldom” category.

Table 3. Cognitive Strategy

QI	frequency (f)					Mean	Category
	N	S	Sm	O	Al		
9	1 (1.3%)	5 (6.3%)	15 (19%)	42 (53.2%)	16 (20.3)	3.8	Often
10	3 (3.8%)	4 (5.1%)	16 (20.3%)	37 (46.8%)	19 (24.1%)	3.8	Often
11	2 (2.5%)	13 (16.5%)	35 (44.3%)	25 (31.6%)	4 (5.1%)	3.2	Sometimes
12	0 (0%)	8	36	29	6 (7.6%)	3.4	Sometimes

		(10.1%)	(45.6%)	(36.7%)			
13	5 (6.3%)	24 (30.4%)	29 (36.7%)	20 (25.3%)	1 (1.3%)	2.8	Sometimes
14	2 (2.5%)	11 (13.9%)	39 (49.4%)	23 (29.1%)	4 (5.1%)	3.2	Sometimes
15	6 (7.6%)	11 (13.9%)	28 (35.4%)	28 (35.4%)	6 (7.6%)	3.2	Sometimes
16	0 (0%)	2 (2.5%)	9 (11.4%)	31 (39.2%)	37 (46.8%)	4.3	Usually
17	8 (10.1%)	27 (34.2%)	34 (43%)	8 (10.1%)	2 (2.5%)	2.6	Seldom
18	4 (5.1%)	16 (20.3%)	26 (33%)	20 (25.3%)	13 (16.5%)	3.3	Sometimes
19	5 (6.3%)	30 (38%)	24 (30.4%)	15 (19%)	5 (6.3%)	2.8	Sometimes
20	3 (3.8%)	10 (12.7%)	39 (49.4%)	23 (29.1%)	4 (5.1%)	3.2	Sometimes
21	7 (8.9%)	16 (20.3%)	35 (44.3%)	19 (24.1%)	2 (2.5%)	2.9	Sometimes
22	5 (6.3%)	12 (15.2%)	37 (46.8%)	19 (24.1%)	6 (7.6%)	3.1	Sometimes
Average mean						3.3	Sometimes

QI : Questionnaire Item, N: Never, S: Seldom, Sm: Sometimes, O: Often, Al: Always,  $\Sigma f$ : frequency of respondents, W: Weighted mean

As shown on the table 3, there were 14 items in the cognitive strategy group. Item number 17 was the lowest frequency used which had “seldom” category and mean score 2.6. The most frequently used strategy in cognitive strategy group was the item number 16. Item number 16 had mean score 4.3 and “Usually” category.

Table 4. Compensation Strategy

QI	frequency (f)					Mean	Category
	N	S	Sm	O	Al		
23	0 (0%)	3 (3.8%)	19 (24.1%)	29 (36.7%)	28 (35.4%)	4	Often
24	4 (5.1%)	16 (20.3%)	29 (36.7%)	21 (26.6%)	9 (11.4%)	3.2	Sometimes
25	6 (7.6%)	24 (30.4%)	29 (36.7%)	14 (17.7%)	6 (7.6%)	2.9	Sometimes
Average mean						3.4	Sometimes

QI : Questionnaire Item, N: Never, S: Seldom, Sm: Sometimes, O: Often, Al: Always,  $\Sigma f$ : frequency of respondents, W: Weighted mean

The table 4 showed that there were three questionnaire items for compensation strategy group. Item number 23 was the most frequently used strategy with mean 4 and

“often” category. The result of the calculation showed that the mean of compensational strategy was 3.4 with “sometimes” category.

Table 5. Metacognitive Strategy

QI	frequency (f)					Mean	Category
	N	S	Sm	O	Al		
26	5 (6.3%)	24 (30.4%)	39 (49.4%)	10 (12.7%)	1 (1.3%)	2.7	Sometimes
27	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	13 (16.5%)	33 (41.8%)	32 (40.5%)	4.2	Often
28	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	19 (24.1%)	42 (53.2%)	17 (21.5%)	3.9	Often
29	7 (8.9%)	23 (29.1%)	40 (50.6%)	8 (10.1%)	1 (1.3%)	2.7	Sometimes
30	7 (8.9%)	3 (3.8%)	50 (63.3%)	16 (20.3%)	3 (3.8%)	3.1	Sometimes
31	2 (2.5%)	14 (17.7%)	30 (38%)	29 (36.7%)	4 (5.1%)	3.2	Sometimes
32	11 (14%)	22 (27.8%)	34 (43%)	10 (12.7%)	2 (2.5%)	2.6	Seldom
33	2 (2.5%)	2 (2.5%)	32 (40.5%)	35 (44.3%)	8 (10.1%)	3.6	Often
Average mean						3.3	Sometimes

QI : Questionnaire Item, N: Never, S: Seldom, Sm: Sometimes, O: Often, Al: Always,  $\Sigma f$ : frequency of respondents, W: Weighted mean

The table 5 showed that item number 27 was in “often” category and had highest mean score 42. It means item number 27 was the most frequently used by the students in metacognitive strategy. Item number 32 was the lowest one which had “seldom” category in metacognitive strategy group. Based on the table above, it can be concluded that the average mean of metacognitive strategy is 3.3 and the category was “sometimes”.

Table 6. Affective Strategy

QI	frequency (f)					Mean	Category
	N	S	Sm	O	Al		
34	2 (2.5%)	5 (6.3%)	21 (26.6%)	28 (35.4%)	23 (29.1%)	3.8	Often
35	1 (1.3%)	2 (2.5%)	16 (20.3%)	32 (40.5%)	28 (35.4%)	4.1	Often
36	11 (13.9%)	22 (27.8%)	35 (44.3%)	11 (13.9%)	0 (0%)	2.6	Seldom
37	2 (2.5%)	24 (30.4%)	34 (43%)	15 (19%)	4 (5.1%)	2.9	Sometimes
38	7 (8.9%)	10 (12.7%)	28 (35.4%)	24 (30.4%)	10 (12.7%)	3.3	Sometimes
39	5 (6.3%)	21	27	23	3 (6%)	3	Sometimes

		(26.6%)	(34.2%)	(29.1%)			
Average mean						3.3	Sometimes

QI : Questionnaire Item, N: Never, S: Seldom, Sm: Sometimes, O: Often, Al: Always,  $\Sigma f$ : frequency of respondents, W: Weighted mean

As shown on the table 6, the highest mean score was in item number 35. Item number 35 was in “often” category with mean score 4.1. It makes item number 35 is the strategy that most frequently used in affective strategy. From all of the items in affective strategy, it can be calculated that the mean of affective strategy is 3.3 with “sometimes” category.

Table 7. Social Strategy

QI	frequency (f)					Mean	Category
	N	S	Sm	O	Al		
40	2 (2.5%)	3 (3.8%)	16 (20.3%)	37 (46.8%)	21 (26.6%)	3.9	Often
41	7 (8.9%)	9 (11.4%)	32 (40.5%)	24 (30.4%)	7 (8.9%)	3.2	Sometimes
42	2 (2.5%)	1 (1.3%)	10 (12.7%)	25 (31.6%)	41 (51.9%)	4.3	Often
43	1 (1.3%)	2 (2.5%)	17 (21.5%)	29 (28.2%)	30 (38%)	4.1	Often
Average mean						3.9	Often

QI : Questionnaire Item, N: Never, S: Seldom, Sm: Sometimes, O: Often, Al: Always,  $\Sigma f$ : frequency of respondents, W: Weighted mean

Based on table 7, all of the items were in “often” category except item number 41. Item number 41 was the item with lowest mean score. The mean score of this item is 3.2 with “sometimes” category. The strategy that most frequently used is strategy number 42. The mean score of this item is 4.3 with “often” criteria. The average mean of social strategy group is 3.9 with category “often”. Moreover this group of strategy was the most frequently used by the English Education Study Program students in sixth semester.

Table 8. Students' Speaking for Presentation Achievement

Score	Category	Students	Percentage
>80	High Achievement	71	89,87%
65-79	Middle Achievement	8	10,13%
0-64	Low Achievement	0	0%

Table 8 showed that there are 71 students or 89,87% from respondents get high achievement in Speaking for Presentation, 8 students or 10,13% from respondents get middle achievement in Speaking for Presentation. The high achievement students consisted of 2 students with score 90, 6 students with score 88, 6 students with score 87, 13 students with score 86, 8 students with score 85, 13 students with score 84, 2 students with score 83, 9

students with score 82, 6 students with score 81, and 6 students with score 80. Middle achievement students consisted of 3 students with score 79, 1 student with score 78, 1 student with score 77, and 3 students with score 76.

*Table 9. Pronunciation Learning Strategies Used by Students with High and Middle Achievement*

No	Strategy Group	Pronunciation learning strategies mean			
		Students with high achievement	Category	Students with middle achievement	Category
1	Memory Strategy	3,1	Sometimes	2.7	Sometimes
2	Cognitive Strategy	3,3	Sometimes	3.1	Sometimes
3	Compensation Strategy	3,5	Often	2.8	Sometimes
4	Metacognitive Strategy	3,3	Sometimes	2.8	Sometimes
5	Affective Strategy	3,3	Sometimes	3.1	Sometimes
6	Social Strategy	3,9	Often	3.4	Sometimes
	Average mean	3,9	Sometimes	2.98	Sometimes

Based on the table 9, it could be seen that there were similarity and differences between the use of pronunciation learning strategies by students who got high speaking achievement and students who got middle speaking achievement. The similarity was both students who got high achievement in speaking and students who got middle achievement in speaking had social strategy as their strategy that most frequently used. The difference was students with high achievement used strategies more frequently rather than students with middle achievement. It was shown by the strategies of students with high achievement had average score 3,9 which was higher than average score of students with middle achievement, 2.98.

*Table 10. The Correlation between Pronunciation Learning Strategies and Speaking Achievement*

	PLS	SA
PLS Pearson Correlation	1	.595"
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
N	79	79
SA Pearson Correlation	.595"	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	

N	79	79
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).		

Based on the table 10, the coefficient correlation ( $r_{\text{count}}$ ) was 0.595 and the significant value was 0.000. To know the variable X and Y correlates or not, the  $r_{\text{count}}$  compared with  $r_{\text{table}}$ . To get the  $r_{\text{table}}$  of pronunciation learning strategies and speaking achievement, the researcher used the formula:  $df=n-2$  ( $df=79-2$ ) ( $df=77$ ). So, the  $r_{\text{table}}$  was 0.186, for knowing the X variable and Y variable correlates or not based on SPSS, that was, if the  $r_{\text{count}} > r_{\text{table}}$  then it correlated. However, if the  $r_{\text{count}} < r_{\text{table}}$  then it was not correlated. According to the table above, it could be know that  $r_{\text{count}}$  (0.595)  $>$   $r_{\text{table}}$  (0.186). Thus, there is significant correlation between students' strategies in learning English pronunciation and their speaking achievement or the alternative hypothesis was accepted. Furthermore, the coefficient correlation was 0.595 which means moderate correlation. It indicated a moderate positive correlation between students' pronunciation learning strategies and their speaking achievement.

## Discussion

Based on the research results, it can be concluded that there was a moderate correlation between students' pronunciation learning strategies and their speaking achievement at the sixth semester students of the English Education Study Program of Bengkulu University. It means students who were best in speaking, he or she should not have the most frequently in using pronunciation learning strategies and students who used pronunciation learning strategies most frequently it did not mean he or she get the highest score in speaking. Moreover, in this research, the students were in the different level (high achievement and middle achievement), had same categories in using pronunciation learning strategies which was "sometimes" category.

These result were caused by how students assess their self in using the pronunciation learning strategies. There was a tendency of the students who get high achievement to assess their self not really high, while the middle students assess their self not to be low. It was caused by the self-esteem and self-perception of the students in completing their questionnaire. The students with high achievement did no confidence to think that they use the strategies frequently so they had sometimes category in using pronunciation learning strategies. In another hand, the students who get middle achievement did not want to be seen

in low, so they had moderate category as well in using pronunciation learning strategies. It seems like a research result by Kim, Kwon, Lee, and Chiu in 2016. In their research result, the low achievement students overestimated and high achievement students underestimated their performance in doing the strategies. The students with middle achievement had higher self-esteem and did not want to be seen in low category so they rated their ability more favorably of their actual performance, while the students with high achievement had low self-perception of their ability so they underestimated their performance.

Furthermore, based on the result of the research, social strategy was the most frequently used by students. Social strategy is the strategy that facilitate the students to have interaction with others in learning. According to Oxford (1990), there are three points in social strategy; questioning, cooperating with others, and emphasizing to others. In this research, “I learn pronunciation with others”, “I help other in learning pronunciation”, “I ask for help if I do not know how to pronounce a word”, and “I ask English speaker to correct my pronunciation” were most frequently used because those strategies can be applied by students naturally, in the classroom even though out of classroom. It was supported by Amalina (2016) who found that “asking to the native speaker or to the more fluent people” was the most frequently used by the students in learning language. It was caused students can use social strategies naturally, means in every situations such as in the classroom even though through something out of classroom that they enjoy in.

#### **D. Conclusion and Suggestion**

##### **Conclusion**

Based on the results of the research, the researcher concluded that, firstly the use of pronunciation learning strategies by the students was in “sometimes” category with mean 3.4. The strategy group that most frequently used was social strategy with mean score 3.9 and “often” category.

Secondly, there were two groups of students based on their speaking achievement. There were students with high achievement (89.87%) and students with middle achievement (10.13%). Both of them used all of the strategies. The high achievement students used memory strategy, cognitive strategy, compensational strategy, metacognitive strategy and affective strategy in “sometimes” category while, social strategy in “often” category. Then the middle achievement students used all of the strategies in “sometimes” category.

Thirdly, there was correlation between English Education Study Program students' strategies in learning English pronunciation and their speaking achievement. The correlation was moderate with the correlation coefficient was 0.595, so the alternative hypothesis was accepted. Thus the students' pronunciation learning strategies contributed moderate significantly to the speaking achievement. It means if the students had good and frequent strategies in learning English pronunciation, so it could be predicted that they speaking achievement was good as well, so when they did not use good and frequent pronunciation learning strategies, it could be predicted that their speaking achievement was not good either. Moreover in this study, the category of the correlation was "moderate". It means that, the student who got highest achievement in speaking could be got lower score in using pronunciation learning strategies rather than his or her friend who got lower achievement than him/her, but a student who was not best in the speaking, he/she could be the best in using pronunciation learning strategies.

### **Suggestion**

Based on the research results, the researcher would like to give some suggestions as follow:

#### 1. For the Lecturer

This research is expected giving the feedback about how importance the use of pronunciation learning strategies, so that the teacher have to introduce and drill the students about pronunciation learning strategies. Moreover, teachers should guide the students in measuring the appropriate pronunciation learning strategies for them successfully. The English teachers should know more about strategy use in order to help students to achieve better result in speaking.

Secondly, English teachers should develop and increase their awareness of language learning strategies. According to the result of this research, some students know that there are pronunciation learning strategies which can help them in learning but they do not apply these strategies frequently and intensively. It is very important to understand the advantages of using learning strategies in learning process. In another hand, the students who aware and understand how important the pronunciation learning strategies are, they use the appropriate and frequent learning strategies to help their language learning process.

#### 2. For the students

This research is expected to improve students awareness about pronunciation learning strategies, the influence of pronunciation learning strategies in their speaking achievement. The students should choose the appropriate and adequate strategy in learning pronunciation and speaking as well, in order to help them to solve their problem in learning and mastering speaking skill. Social strategies can be one of the strategies that can be used by the students. It is because the social strategies are the most frequently used by high achievement students and it can make students learn with others in order to improve students' pronunciation.

### 3. For the researcher

Since this research is limited to the Speaking for Presentation score, for further researchers who interest to conduct a study under the same topic can use specific pronunciation score by testing students' pronunciation ability. Moreover, the further researchers can try to conduct a research to investigate factors that influence students' strategies and pronunciation score.

## References

- Amalina, S. H. (2016). *Analisis strategi sosial dan afektif dalam kompetensi erbicara siswa kelas xi ipa 1 di Sleman Yogyakarta 2014/2015*. Unpublished thesis. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- AMEP Research Centre. (2002). *Fact sheet-setting goals for teaching pronunciation*. Retrieved on December 23rd, 2019, from <http://www.nceltr.mq.edu.au/pdamep>
- Burns, A. & Joyce, H. (1997). *Focus on speaking*. Sydney, Australia: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Calka, A. (2011). Pronunciation learning strategies-identification and classification. In M. Pawlak., E. Waniek-Klimczak., & J. Majer (Eds.), *Speaking and instructed foreign language acquisition*. Clevedon: England.Multilinguals Matters.
- Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. Oxford, England: SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Campos, V. M. (2018). Pronunciation learning strategies, aptitude, and their relationship with pronunciation performance in pre-service english language teachers in Chile. *Iranian journal of language teaching research*. Retrieved on May 22nd, 2019 from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/32613219>
- Creswell, W. J. (2012). *Educational research planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston, Massachusetts: Pearson Education Inc. Retrieved on April 24th, 2019 from <http://basu.nahad.ir/uploads/creswell.pdf>
- Dalton, C. & Seidlhofer, B. (1994). *Pronunciation*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

- Eckstein, T. G. (2007). *A correlation of pronunciation learning strategies with spontaneous english pronunciation of adult ESL learners*. Provo, Utah: BYU Scholar Archive. Retrieved on March 14th, 2019 from <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/973>
- Finnocchairo, M. & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The functional-national approach from theory to practice*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Fitri, R. (2017). *Students' english achievement (a study at grade xi of sman 4 south Bengkulu)*. Unpublished thesis. Bengkulu, Indonesia: Universitas Bengkulu.
- Gilakjani, P. A. (2011). A study on the situation of instruction in ESL /EFL classroom. *Journal of studies in education*.1(1).1 doi:10.5296/jse.v1i1.924
- Gilakjani, P. A. (2016). English pronunciation instruction: a literature review. *International Journal of Research in English Education*.1(1).1. Retrieved February 26nd, 2019 from <http://ijreonline.com/article-1-21-en.pdf>
- Gilakjani, P. A. & Sabouri, B. N. (2016). *The significant of listening comprehension in english language teaching*. Tehran, Iran: Academi Publication. 6 (8).1671. Retrieved on June 22nd, 2019 from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/38db>
- Diani, I., Yunita, W., & Syafryadin, S. (2019). Interferensi Bahasa Indonesia terhadap Kemampuan Berbicara Bahasa Inggris Mahasiswa Universitas Bengkulu. In *Seminar Nasional Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra* (pp. 164-173).
- Johnson, K. & Morrow, K. (1981). *Communication in the classroom*. Harlow, England: Longman.
- Kim, Y. H., Kwon, H., Lee, J., & Chiu, C. Y. (2016). Why do people overestimate or underestimate their abilities? a cross-culturally valid model of cognitive and motivational processes in self-assessment biases. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*. Retrieved on July 23rd, 2019 from <http://sci-hub.tw/https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/00220221166661243>
- Noermanzah, N., Syafryadin, S., Castrena, O. W., & Abid, S. (2020). Rhetoric Structure of the Master of Ceremony and the Function of the Akikah Event in Lubuklinggau City. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 4(2), 232-247.
- Noermanzah, et al. (2020). "The Rhetorical Structure of the Lubuklinggau Mayor's Speech in Building Community Trust." *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies (IJPSAT)*, 19(2), 146-154.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research method in language learning*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved on June 23rd, 2019 from [https://www.academia.edu/31150928/David\\_Nunan\\_Research\\_Methods\\_in\\_Language\\_Learning](https://www.academia.edu/31150928/David_Nunan_Research_Methods_in_Language_Learning)
- Oxford, R. L. (1989). *Use of language learning strategies: a synthesis of students with implications for strategy training*. Retrieved on May 25th, 2019 from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0346251X89900365>
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers. Retrieved on May 24th, 2019 from <https://escholarship.org/content/qt1446j36q/qt1446j36q.pdf>
- Rokoszewska, K. (2012). *The influence of pronunciation learning strategies on mastering english vowels*. Poznan, Poland: Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching. Retrieved on December 23rd, 2019 from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1135885.pdf>

- Sihombing, G. N. A. M. (2014). *The correlation between the students' pronunciation mastery and their ability in speaking*. Paper presented at The Second International Conference Education and Language (2<sup>nd</sup> ICEL), Universitas Bandar Lampung, Indonesia.
- Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode penelitian kuantitati kualitati dan R&D*. Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta.
- Syafryadin, I. N. R., & Widiastuti, R. (2013). Improving grade X students' speaking achievement under Round Robin technique. *International Journal on Education*, 1(1).
- Syafryadin, W., & DEC, A. Noermanzah.(2020). Maxim Variation, Conventional, and Particularized Implicature on Students' Conversation. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 9(2).
- Syafryadin, S. (2020). Students' Strategies in Learning Speaking: Experience of Two Indonesian Schools. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, 9(1), 34-47. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.21580/vjv9i14791>
- Weinstein, C. E., & Mayer, R.E. (1983). *The teaching of learning strategies* . University of Texas, Texas,Texas: Education Resources Information Center. ED 237 180. JC 830 845