

Use of Second Language Communication Strategies to Teach Autonomy in Speaking: A Study of Indonesian EFL Learners' Use of Second Language Communication Strategies

Muhammad Sukirlan

Post-graduate Program of English Education, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Universitas Lampung, Indonesia

Mahpul

English Education Study Program, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Universitas Lampung, Indonesia

Ag. Bambang Setiyadi

Doctorate Degree Program, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Universitas Lampung, Indonesia

Hasan Hariri

Educational Management Program, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Universitas Lampung, Indonesia

Tuntun Sinaga

English Education Study Program, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Universitas Lampung, Indonesia

Abstract—This ponder pointed at exploring how regularly Indonesian EFL learners utilized moment dialect (L2) communication techniques and how their instructing influenced both their independence in talking and talking accomplishment after treatment. A few 33 understudies of the English Office, Universitas Lampung, Indonesia, were included in this ponder employing a one-group pretest-posttest quasi-experimental plan. The information of this think about was collected through talking tests and surveys. The collected data were analyzed utilizing graphic measurements and matched test t-tests. Comes about appears that, to begin with, we recognized six L2 communication techniques (circumlocution, guess, comparison, representation, word coinage, and foreignizing) utilized by the learners. Moment, in common, there was an expanded utilization of the techniques in, or the positive impact of the procedures on, their learning independence in talking and their talking accomplishment. These discoveries are practically noteworthy primarily to supply instructors with input within the Indonesian school setting to apply communication techniques that suit understudies conceivably.

Index Terms—learner, autonomy in speaking, second language, communication strategies

I. INTRODUCTION

English may be a very imperative worldwide language used within the world. Most individuals in the world utilize English. Hence, most schools educate in English, and understudies (local and non-native) utilize English as a communication dialect (Gonzalez, 2017). Without understanding English, individuals will tend to be left behind in information, communication, and data innovation. In English Dialect Educating (ELT), schools give understudies with four language abilities English counting tuning in, talking, perusing, and composing (Archana & Usha Rani, 2017) to assist understudies able to compete universally indeed with individuals from multicultural foundations (Sharifian, 2018). Like ELT within the Sultanate of Oman (Wealthy et al., 2019), culture-based materials in other nations counting Indonesia will likely essentially influence students' more noteworthy excitement for the English subject.

Specialists have unexpectedly seen ELT objectives. For illustration, Aksornkool (1981) declared that ELT aimed at creating modern masterminds and survivors in English-speaking settings. Be that as it may, the critical point of ELT was to form children to hone English for worldwide communication and for getting data and information (Wongsothorn et al., 2002).

The experts, however, show that there are two objectives of ELT, 1). education is coordinated to create students' communicative competence – the capacity to get it and express messages in assortments of communicative circumstances. 2) teaching English points at creating understudies to be free learners who can adapt to any issues confronted in learning occurrences, like selecting learning circumstances that might match students' learning types and can manage communication circumstances in talking. Utilizing dialect for effective communication in a remote or

moment dialect requires learners to have communicative competence. Be that as it may, the learners cannot maintain a strategic distance from issues to obtain communicative competence (Palmer & Christison, 2018). Subsequently, they require learning methodologies that make them conceivable to such communicative competence. Taking together, ELT points to communicative competence for them to communicate with local and non-native individuals. Communication familiarity in a foreign/second dialect is required in real-world circumstances (K árp áí, 2017).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

There are five components of communicative competence learners to be met: linguistic, sociolinguistic, talk, actional, and vital competence (Canale & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia et al., 1995). To begin with, linguistic competence or phonetic competence alludes to the information of what is syntactically rectified in a dialect. Moment, sociolinguistic competence bargains the knowledge of what is socially satisfactory in a local speech and understanding of the social setting in which communication takes put (who talks and to whom one talks). Third, talk competence concerns the elucidation of personal message components in accord with their interconnecting of how significance is spoken concerning the complete discourse or setting. Fourth, actional competence involves the capacity how to carry out discourse performances and discourse occasions within the target dialect intuitively as data changes, interpersonal trades, expression of conclusions and sentiments, and issues (complaining, accusing, lamenting, apologizing, etc.). Last, strategic competence centers on the capacity how to utilize one's dialect to convey the aiming explication. It is the capacity to manage a circumstance when lexicon and structures are missing so there will be no convey breakdown. It alludes to the adapting techniques that a talker utilizes to start, end, keep up, repair, and redirect communication (Sukirlan, 2014).

Specifically, Tarone and Bigelow (2005) uncover that the key competence is the capacity to communicate data to an audience and accurately translate the data acquired. It incorporates the utilization of “communication strategies” to accomplish issues that emerge within the preparation of passing on this data. She advances and points out that vital proficiency is the capacity to communicate data to an audience and accurately decipher data acquired. It includes communication techniques and the utilization of fathom issues that emerge to handle passing on this data (Herlambang, 2023). In other words, vital competence incorporates both compensational attributes and transmission procedures. Tarone (1977) takes into consideration that “communication strategies” are joint attempts of a pair of conversationalists to concur on purpose within a circumstance where the specified purpose is not shared. The definition of communication methodology emphasizes the connections viewpoint (Tarone, 1977, 1981). Communication procedure is viewed as an endeavor to connect the crevice between the phonetic information of L2 understudies and the etymological information of their conversationalists in genuine communication circumstances. Tarone and Bigelow (2005) characterize communication techniques as the negotiation of an assertion of meaning between questioners. They view “communication strategies” as the learners’ commitment to the connections toil entailed to outgrowing a connections issue. In this way, EFL understudies must make strides in their information and abilities to meet the demand of mechanical insurgency 4.0 through English learning, and counting communication methodologies (Zhiyong et al., 2020).

As L2 understudies prepare for learning, they are battling to communicate the expected meaning by developing expressions to the leading they can when conveying with other understudies within the course. V áradí (1980) focuses on L2 mistakes that may emerge incidentally or intentionally. Within the previous case, they are about generation methodologies and give thought to the transitional state of students' L2 information. The last-mentioned case concerning communication methodologies deliberately utilized by the understudies to diminish or supplant a few components of meaning or frame within the beginning arrangement.

Indeed, in case the talker has satisfactory management of dialect, he/she might utilize relationship techniques when relating with non-native speakers. Bialystok (1990) proposes that relationship techniques may be reasonably applied similarly in circumstances where no issue has ascended when a local talker provides a street illustration to a foreigner employing along definition rather than an actual word. Bialystok (1990) juxtaposes a few of the procedures in the matter of viability and revealed that audience members get inventing or combine existing elements to form a word that expresses a particular concept, idea, or phenomenon better superior to an estimation, periphrasis, or dialect convert, notwithstanding, in the matter trivial recurrence, word coinage was uncommon, the most familiar procedures being periphrasis.

Even though, the significant justification for second language learners to make use of “communication strategies” (CS) is that learners have gaps in their linguistic repertoires that make it difficult to express their communicative intentions. Students' use of “communication strategies” may be due to a lack of strategic, linguistic, or sociolinguistic language skills to fill gaps (Hua et al., 2012). Littlewood (1984) suggests that if students can anticipate such problems, they may be able to prevent them by keeping away from communication or changing what they are trying to utter. In case trouble comes up when the learner is already talking, the learner positively attempts to find another method to convey the purpose. One of the methods is the way the person handles the situation is what we call a “communication strategy”. A key feature of transmission tactics (CS) is that they occur. In case a learner begins to be sensible of trouble that is difficult to address based on their current knowledge.

Ellis (2015) assigns “communication strategies” to the grading of L2 comprehension types. L2 comprehension can be split into declaratory (what you know) and step (how you know it). “Procedural knowledge” is split into “social

processes” and cognitive processes. “Communication strategies” is then split into learning L2 and utility L2. The usage of L2 is divided not only into “communication strategies” but also production processes and reception strategies.

Although defined differently, a “communication strategy” has three main characteristics. First: Problematic - refers to the fact that students use “communication strategies” when they encounter communication problems. Second, awareness is a subconsciously conscious scheme for complete transmission problems to achieve a specific contact goal. It also refers to the student's perception that a strategy is being used for a detailed objective or how that method achieves its aspired to inflict. Third, intentionality indicates the ability of students to control these strategies, choosing specific strategies among different options and consciously applying them to produce unique outcomes. Thus, “Communication strategies” are employed to overcome difficulties in expressing intended meaning (Tarone & Bigelow, 2005). They can also be defined as tactics learners use to accomplish verbal transmission troubles (Lam, 2006).

A “communication strategy” may provide a not long-term solution to balancing communication problems. Ellis (2015) accordingly concludes that communication strategy is a psycholinguistic plan that belongs to a language user's “communication strategies”. They are subconscious and conscious and operate as surrogates for production plans that students cannot execute.

In addition to developing communicative competence, a secondary objective of ELT is to develop student autonomy. This means that students have self-sufficiency and control over their learning objectives, choose learning materials, monitor their learning progress, and use specific learning strategies to assess their learning L2 (Gai, 2014; Holec, 1981; Wei, 2008; Xu-sheng, 2010). However, a lack of learning experience can make it difficult for students to develop learning autonomy (Lengkanawati, 2017). Even for students with low learning autonomy, there is no significant difference in learning performance whether taught with problem-based learning or conventional learning (Dewi, 2020). Therefore, students must continue to endure to improve their independent understanding over time (Khotimah et al., 2019).

An autonomous learner can be defined as who can cope with problems faced during the learning process by practicing objective language for making relationships. Autonomy means independence. The idea of autonomy arose from discussions on lifelong learning skill development in the 1960s, as cited by Benson and Voller (2014) (Holec, 1981; Rao, 2018). Autonomy is the capability to be responsible for one's learning. Dickinson (1987) consents to the meaning of autonomy as a set of circumstances in which a learner is responsible for all judgments affecting her learning and for the implementation of those decisions. Pemberton et al. (1996) defined autonomy as an engagement to lead one's learning. According to Thomson (1996), student autonomy indicates which students are responsible for learning.

Autonomous students can set goals, materials, methods, and tasks, perform, and evaluate their work/learning (Xu-sheng, 2010). The concept of autonomy, as mentioned by Finch (2002), relies on the following five aspects (Benson & Voller, 2014), the student's innate ability to be repressed by institutional education, the situation in which the learner is fully autonomous, the learner's right to decide how to learn, the different skills that can be learned and used to learn, and the learner's responsibilities. Practice independent learning. These five dimensions help learners learn independently. As other researchers have noted, when her five dimensions of autonomy are satisfied, the learner has her seven primary attributes (Masouleh & Jooneghani, 2012). These features are: Aware of learning strategy preferences, proactive, risk-taking, good at guessing, careful with form and content, open-minded and friendly, amending and rejecting rules and hypotheses that do not apply help to.

Research Problem

From this, we speculate that autonomous learners in speaking have ways of handling communicative hindrances and manipulating required “communication strategies” with little or no teacher assistance. Autonomy also deals with the set of circumstances in which the talker selects a particular arrangement of words and phrases to create well-formed sentences in a language (syntax) for each expression so that the story load is wrapped up consistently with the speaker's intentions (Thornbury, 2005). This indicates that learners' ability to act autonomously during learning is effective communication. However, little is known about how learners use “communication strategies” in Indonesian. The problems to be solved in this research are: How often did Indonesian EFL learners use “communication strategies” in L2 teaching to affect the learner's speaking autonomy and speaking performance? Did it affect the learners?

Research Focus

To meet the research problem, this study aims to the often-Indonesian EFL learners use the L2 communication strategy and how its teaching impacts their autonomy in speaking and speaking achievement. In detail, three research questions are formulated as the foci of this study:

- (1) How often did Indonesian EFL learners use an L2 “communication strategy”?
- (2) How did the teaching of L2 “communication strategies” affect their autonomy in speaking after “treatment”?
- (3) How did the teaching of “communication strategies” affect their speaking achievement after “treatment”?

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Research Goal

The purpose was to determine how often Indonesian EFL learners used L2 “communication strategies” and how the instruction affected their speaking autonomy and communication performance. In detail, his three research questions are formulated as the focus of this study.

- (1) How often did Indonesian EFL learners use “communication strategies” in an L2?
- (2) How did teaching “communication strategies” in the L2 affect their speech autonomy after “treatment”?
- (3) How did teaching “communication strategies” in the L2 affect speaking performance after “treatment”?

B. Sample and Data Collection

This study of a pseudo-experiment was conducted with 33 students in the third semester of an advanced language course at the Department of English at the University of Lampung, Indonesia. A one-group pre-test and post-test design were performed in three steps.

Pre-examination, “treatment”, post-examination. Before and after “treatment”, students were asked to label pictures of objects, describe unknown entities, and complete a questionnaire. Students' speaking autonomy was measured using a 5-point Likert scale. The Student Autonomy Questionnaire was developed based on the approach introduced by Holec (1981) and consists of his five elements:

Purpose, load, techniques, monitoring, and evaluation in speaking. In this point of view, participants are given statements and asked how often they perform each aspect. Always answers were given a maximum score of 5, often of 4, sometimes of 3, rarely of 2, and never 1.

In treatment, students were taught to recognize and use six categories of L2 and “communication strategies”: paraphrasing, approximating, comparing, illustrating, coining, and alienating. Teaching L2 “communication strategies” has mainly been conducted in her three stages: orientation, presentation, and practice (Sukirlan, 2011; 2014). During orientation, students have been introduced to different types of L2 “communication strategies”. Students were also taught how to use techniques to solve communication problems. At the production, students were presented with a dialogue from the listening material and asked to listen to the conversation. After the students listen, the teacher asked the students to recognize the specific L2 “communication strategy” the speaker used in the dialogue. Students were also introduced to the linguistic resources needed to use L2 “communication strategies” successfully L2. The linguistic aspects (materials, shapes, colors, sizes, textures, parts, clothing, tastes, synonyms, and antonyms) and grammatical elements (tenses, passives). In practice, each student was given a picture of an unknown object and explained it to the class. The study design is shown underneath.

X1 = “pre-test”

X = “treatment”

X2 = “posttest” (Hatch & Farhady, 1982).

C. Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and paired sample t-tests using SPSS version 20.

IV. RESULTS

This section attempts to answer the research questions posed in the previous area: (1) to examine the rate or number of occurrences of a particular event, action, or phenomenon within a specific time (frequency) of “communication strategies” used by students in speaking before and after “treatment”; (2) to examine how teaching the L-2 communication strategy affects students' autonomy in speaking; (3) to investigate the effect of instruction L2 communication strategy on the language ability of students after “treatment”.

A. Frequency of L2 “Communication Strategies” Used by the Students

This subsection presents research on L2 “communication strategies” before and after “treatment”. The report also presents the most common types of communication strategies used by students and fewer common types. The results of research question 1 How often did her Indonesian EFL learner use second language (L2) communication strategies? are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1
FREQUENCY OF L2 “COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES” USE BEFORE AND AFTER “TREATMENT”

No.	L2 „Communication Strategies”	Before “Treatment”	Examples of “communication strategies” Before “Treatment”	After “Treatment”	Examples of “communication strategies” After “Treatment”	Gain
1	Approximation	30	[brassier] <i>It is a kind of stove</i>	65	[crossbar] It is not short but long	35
2	Circumlocution	95	[latch] It is made of metal [latch] It is used to lock	125	[barbed wire] It is used to protect	30
3	Exemplification	10	[crossbar] For example, it is used in the door	20	[broom] example, there are many ribs of coconut leaf.	10
4	Comparison	12	[lantern] It is bigger than a lamp	30	[hanger] It is higher than the base	18
5	Word-Coinage	3	[rug] It is welcome-mat	6	[barbed wire] It is bodiless	3
6	Foreignizing	1	[screwdriver] It is to bor	1	[brazier] It can be applied	0

Table 1 shows that the frequency of six L2 “communication strategies” used by Indonesian EFL learners increased “treatment” results, except that foreign language was a constant one. In detail, approximation was the most commonly

used, followed by euphemism, comparison, illustration, and word coin, and the least used and always-used strategy was alienation.

B. Effects of L2 “Communication Strategies on Speaking”

This subsection presents research findings on student speaking autonomy: the ability to set goals, content, technique, control, and speaking assessment. A 25-item questionnaire was distributed to answer research questions. The questionnaire was a Likert scale with five categories (1 never to 5 always).

Data were analyzed using repeated measures t-tests. The results show that the t-score (11.8075) is higher than the t-table (2.042). This suggests actively teaching L2 “communication strategies” significantly improves students' speaking autonomy. In other words, after realizing that the student uses L2 “communication strategies”, she becomes more self-directed in setting goals, content, techniques, monitoring, and evaluation when speaking and speaking to other students. Learners will be able to resolve communication issues.

C. Effects of L2 “Communication Strategies” on Speaking Achievement

This subsection presents findings on student language performance. Language performances were five dimensions: grammar, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, and pronunciation. To respond to the study's question, the researchers compared the students' speaking performance before and after “treatment”. The speaking performance scores range from 1 to 100.

Data were analyzed using repeated measures t-tests. The results show that the t-score (14,200) is higher than the t-table (2,042). Based on statistical tests, teaching L2-based “communication strategies” significantly improved speaking performance. In short, as the student becomes more responsive to her use of L2 “communication strategies”, she becomes more proficient in all aspects of speaking, including grammar, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, and pronunciation, as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2
FREQUENCY OF SPEAKING ASPECTS STUDENTS USE BEFORE AND AFTER “TREATMENT”

No.	Aspects of Speaking	Frequency		Gain
		Before “Treatment”	After “Treatment”	
1	Grammar	61	70	9
2	Vocabulary	66	76	10
3	Fluency	66	69	3
4	Comprehension	63	67	4
5.	Pronunciation	65	69	4

Table 2 shows improvements in all aspects of speaking with “treatment”. Compared to speaking, each speaking element has increased many folds. Grammar was 61-70, vocabulary was 66-76, fluency was 66-69, comprehension was 63-67, and pronunciation was 65-69.

V. DISCUSSION

Even if someone communicates in the mother tongue, it is generally accepted that no one knows the language perfectly. For example, when a chemistry student tries to illustrate his major to an economics student, he probably suffers from communication hindrances such as misunderstandings and contact breakdowns. We could say how difficult it can be to get the right way to communicate (CS).

In other words, communication problems can occur when two people communicate without using the proper way to communicate (CS). “Communication strategies” are attempts to successfully convey messages when speakers lack language resources (see examples) (Bialystok, 1983; Faerch, 1983; Faerch & Kasper, 1984; Tarone, 1981).

Regarding the first results of this study, we can report that Indonesian EFLs in Indonesian contextual learners were more likely to use different L2 “communication strategies” before and after “treatment”. After “treatment”, students used L2 “communication strategies” more frequently than before “treatment”. This suggests that “treatment” can improve the ability. Based on Table 1, we can report that the most common communication strategy used by students was paraphrasing, and the least common communication strategy was a foreign language. The results of this study appear to be consistent with the work done by Bialystok (1990) and Kim (2019) results of a study done in South Korea. Bialystok (1990) compares several ways to communicate (CS) in the matter of their fruitfulness and finds that although word coinage is rare and most common in frequency, listeners often have found that I understand it much better than approximating, paraphrasing, or changing language. Strategy was his paraphrase. Detours are especially useful for bridging communication gaps and keeping conversations flowing. Paraphrasing complements compensatory strategies for problematic vocabulary (Campillo, 2006). Here, educators must provide learners with learning experiences that effectively improve communication (Subekti, 2020). This is because the learning experience is a critical factor in enabling learners to be autonomous in learning, including communication (Lengkanawati, 2017). In this way, students' ability to use L2 communication strategies can be improved.

Concerning the second finding concerning students' independence in speaking, reported that before the “treatment”, the students were less independent in the matter that they were deficit in the capability to: an act of establishing or

determining an objective or target to be achieved by talking, understanding the content, choosing the techniques, monitor the process of speaking, and evaluate what is wrong. After doing the “treatment” in the lesson, the students were more independent in speaking and their ability to accomplish communication troubles. Analysis showed that the t-value (11.807) was bigger than the t-table (2.042). This result was approved by Weinstein and Mayer (1983) revealing that any learning/teaching set of circumstances pervades two goal sorts: desired results in connection with the learning yields and the acquisition of knowledge of the process. The preceding focuses on what to acquire skills into what students should acquire as an output of learning, whilst the next focus on the ways to acquire knowledge, on ways and game plans students can adopt to fulfill. The outcomes also suggest that students are using more L2 “communication strategies”. This indicates that students can face communication troubles. In other words, students speak more autonomously as their attempts to solve communication problems are more effectual (Manchón, 2000; Wei, 2008). Learning motivation is related to learner autonomy, so they are motivated to become autonomous learners (Ghufroon & Nurdianingsih, 2019). Students' speaking abilities can be significantly improved by teaching (Arfae, 2020).

As for the third finding, teaching L2 “communication strategies” influence improving students' speaking ability. It can be concluded that learner autonomy is crucial for learners to succeed in learning a second or foreign language. However, this success is not complete without using the language they are learning (Khaki, 2013). Quantitative results suggest that the t-value (14,200) is bigger than the t-table (2,042). The student's speaking performance improves significantly. Table 2 shows that students perform better in all aspects of speaking, with the most vocabulary, coming behind by grammar, comprehension, pronunciation, and fluency being the least important. To sum up, teaching L2 “communication strategies” helps students use language to communicate ideas. In other words, students seem to use language more independently. This is consistent with Little (2007), who points out that independence in language learning and independence in language use are two sides of the same coin. This indicated that direct instruction before or after using such activities helps provide students with a basic vocabulary set that enables them to describe properties and functions. Tarone (1981) is also consistent. The willingness to communicate improves their ability (Subekti, 2020), and effective communication is essential to build trust (Rosyidah & Rosyidi, 2020).

VI. CONCLUSION

Referring to the research results and discussion, we can draw three main conclusions:

- 1) After “treatment”, the frequency with which students use L2 “communication strategies” increases of the six “communication strategies”. Paraphrasing is used most occurring often by students and causes the least alienation.
- 2) After the intervention, the students began to speak more independently. In other words, students will better anticipate communication troubles when sending messages in class.
- 3) “Treatment” involving the use of L2 “communication strategies” is effective in improving learners' verbal skills. Students will be able to perform better in all areas of speaking. The methods may provide alternative means for teachers to teach speech.
- 4) These findings theoretically complement our knowledge of communication skills, especially in terms of “communication strategies”, and give practical feedback to teachers, especially in the Indonesian school setting, so that they can apply “communication strategies” tailored to their students and bring possibilities.
- 5) In addition, the results of this study support further investigation of “communication strategies” by incorporating qualitative research to gain a deeper understanding of student “communication strategies” and expand the research environment and sample coverage to ensure reliability and provide researchers with the opportunity to research results.

Limitations

The limitation of this article is that it uses a quasi-experimental, one-group, pre-test-post-test design with no control group or randomization, which compromises its efficacy and robustness.

Suggestions

For educators, especially instructors, the results of this work can be used as input for applying appropriate “communication strategies” to students, particularly to improve their speaking skills. For researchers, the main limitation of this article is that it provides an opportunity for further research, for example employing natural experimental designs to obtain robust results.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aksornkool, N. (1981). *EFL planning in Thailand: A case study in language planning*. Georgetown University.
- [2] Archana, S., & Usha Rani, K. (2017). Role of a teacher in English language teaching (ELT). *International Journal of Educational Science and Research (IJESR)*, 7(1), 1-4.
- [3] Arfae, A. M. (2020). Teaching autonomy and speaking skill: A case study of Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 11(2), 166-176.
- [4] Benson, P., & Voller, P. (2014). Introduction: Autonomy and independence in language learning. In *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 1-12). Routledge.
- [5] Bialystok, E. (1983). Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies. *Strategies in interlanguage communication*, 100-118.
- [6] Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication strategies: A psychological analysis of second-language use*. (No Title).

- [7] Campillo, P. S. (2006). The use of circumlocution in the foreign language context. *Porta Linguarum: revista internacional de didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras*(5), 7-16.
- [8] Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- [9] Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 5-35.
- [10] Dewi, K. M. S. (2020). The Effect of Project Based Learning and Learner Autonomy on Students' Speaking Skills. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, 4(1), 82-89.
- [11] Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-instruction in language learning*. (No Title).
- [12] Ellis, R. (2015). *Understanding second language acquisition 2nd edition*. Oxford university press.
- [13] Faerch, C. (1983). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. *Strategies in interlanguage communication*.
- [14] Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1984). Two ways of defining communication strategies. *Language learning*, 34(1), 45-63.
- [15] Finch, A. (2002). Autonomy: Where are we? Where are we going? *JALT CUE-SIG Proceedings*, 15-42.
- [16] Gai, F. (2014). The Application of Autonomous Learning to Fostering Cross-cultural Communication Competence. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(6).
- [17] Ghufron, M. A., & Nurdianingsih, F. (2019). Flipped Teaching with Call in EFL Writing Class: How Does It Work and Affect Learner Autonomy? *European Journal of Educational Research*, 8(4), 983-997.
- [18] Gonzalez, S. Y. (2017). *The Most Effective Best Practices for English Language Teaching (ELT) Classroom Interactions* the University of South Dakota].
- [19] Hatch, E., & Farhady, H. (1982). *Research design and statistics for applied linguistics*.
- [20] Herlambang, M. A. (2023). *Strategic Competence of English Education Department Students in Proposal Seminar and Thesis Defence Examination* Universitas Jambi].
- [21] Holec, H. (1981). Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning. *Council of Europe modern languages project, Education et culture*. In: Pergamon Institute of English, Oxford. Council of Europe Modern Languages
- [22] Hua, T. K., Mohd Nor, N. F., & Jaradat, M. N. (2012). Communication Strategies Among EFL Students-An Examination Of Frequency Of Use And Types Of Strategies Used. *GEMA online journal of language studies*, 12(3).
- [23] Kárpáti, L. (2017). The use of communication strategies in English language education. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Development Research*, 1(2), 5-14.
- [24] Khaki, S. (2013). The relationship between learner autonomy and willingness to communicate (WTC) in Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 2(5), 97-109.
- [25] Khotimah, K., Widiati, U., Mustofa, M., & Ubaidillah, M. F. (2019). Autonomous English learning: Teachers' and students' perceptions. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 371-381.
- [26] Kim, M. (2019). *Communication Strategy of Korean EFL Learners*.
- [27] Lam, Y. K. W. (2006). *Gauging the effects of ESL oral communication strategy teaching: A multi-method approach*.
- [28] Lengkanawati, N. S. (2017). Learner autonomy in the Indonesian EFL settings. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 222-231.
- [29] Little, D. (2007). Language learner autonomy: Some fundamental considerations revisited. *International Journal of Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 14-29.
- [30] Littlewood, W. (1984). *Foreign and second language learning: Language acquisition research and its implications for the classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- [31] Manchón, R. M. (2000). Fostering the autonomous use of communication strategies in the foreign language classroom. *Links & Letters*, 13-27.
- [32] Masouleh, N. S., & Jooneghani, R. B. (2012). Autonomous learning: A teacher-less learning! *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 55, 835-842.
- [33] Palmer, A., & Christison, M. (2018). Communication strategies and teaching speaking. *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*, 1-6.
- [34] Pemberton, R., Li, E. S., Or, W. W., & Pierson, H. D. (1996). *Taking control: Autonomy in language learning* (Vol. 1). Hong Kong University Press.
- [35] Rao, P. S. (2018). Learner autonomy: Trends and issues in ELT. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 8(11), 84-96.
- [36] Rich, S., Weekes, S., al Jardani, M., & al Sinani, S. (2019). Plugging the gap: Supporting primary school teachers to create culturally appropriate English language teaching (ELT) materials. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching: The Case of the Middle East and North Africa*, 39-59.
- [37] Rosyidah, N., & Rosyidi, U. (2020). Internationalization in Higher Education: University's Effective Promotion Strategies in Building International Trust. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 9(1), 351-361.
- [38] Sharifian, F. (2018). Metacultural competence in English language teaching (ELT). *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*, 1-6.
- [39] Subekti, A. S. (2020). Self-perceived communication competence and communication apprehension: A study of Indonesian college students. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, 5(1), 14-31.
- [40] Sukirlan, M. (2014). Teaching communication strategies in an EFL class of tertiary level. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(10), 2033.
- [41] Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: A progress report. On *TESOL*, 77(194-203).
- [42] Tarone, E. (1981). Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15(3), 285-295.
- [43] Tarone, E., & Bigelow, M. (2005). Impact of literacy on oral language processing: Implications for second language acquisition research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 77-97.
- [44] Thomson, C. K. (1996). Self-assessment in self-directed learning: Issues of learner diversity. *Taking control: Autonomy in language learning*, 77-92.

- [45] Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach Speaking*.-Pearson Education.
- [46] V áradi, T. (1980). Strategies of target language learner communication: Message-adjustment. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 18(1), 59.
- [47] Wei, C. (2008). Developing Learners' Autonomy through Metacognitive Awareness Training in ELT. *CELEA Journal (Bimonthly)*, 31(4), 110-120.
- [48] Weinstein, C. E., & Mayer, R. E. (1983). *The teaching of learning strategies*. Innovation abstracts.
- [49] Wongsathorn, A., Hiranburana, K., & Chinnawongs, S. (2002). English language teaching in Thailand today. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 22(2), 107-116.
- [50] Xu-sheng, W. (2010). Promoting language learners' autonomy in cooperative learning. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 7(2), 1-6.
- [51] Zhiyong, S., Muthukrishnan, P., & Sidhu, G. K. (2020). College English Language Teaching Reform and Key Factors Determining EFL Teachers' Professional Development. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 9(4), 1393-1404.

Muhammad Sukirlan, since 1990, he is currently teaching at the English Education Research Program, Department of Language and Arts Education, Faculty of Teacher Education, Lampung University, Indonesia. She graduated in 1989 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in English Language Teaching from the Faculty of Teacher Education and Education, Lampung University. She went to Singapore in 1992 to get a certificate in TESOL Practice, Implementation, and Techniques. He completed his TESOL MA in 1997 from the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, UK. In 2001 he attended the School of International Training (SIT) in Vermont, USA, and obtained a TOEFL and Multimedia Trainer Certificate in English Training. In 2011, he completed his Ph.D. in Teaching English at the Indonesian University of Education (UPI-Bandung). His main interests are second language acquisition and English teaching. You can contact him by email: muhammad_sukirlan@yahoo.co.id

Mahpul is a lecturer at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Department of Language and Arts Education, English Language Teaching Research Program, Lampung University, Indonesia. He graduated with a Bachelor's Degree in English Education from the Faculty of Teacher Education, at Lampung University. He completed his master's degree from La Trobe University in 2014 and his Ph.D. from Curtin Institute of Technology in Perth, Western Australia. His main interest is his TEFL.

Ag. Bambang Setiyadi is a Professor of English Education at, the Department of Language Arts Education, Faculty of Teacher Education, Lampung University, Indonesia. He earned his master's degree from SIT, Vermont, USA, and his Ph.D. from Trove University in La He, Australia. His main interests are linguistics and educational methodology.

Hasan Hariri is currently teaching at the Department of Education Management, Faculty of Teacher Education, Lampung University, Indonesia. He holds a Bachelor's degree in English Language Teaching from the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Lampung, his MBA from James Cook University, Australia, and his Ph.D. from James Cook University, Australia. His main interests are educational management and leadership.

Tuntun Sinaga is currently teaching in the English Language Teaching Research Program, Department of Language Arts Education, Faculty of Teacher Education and Education, Lampung University, Indonesia. He received a Bachelor's degree in English Language Teaching from the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Lampung University in 1985, a Master's degree from the Faculty of Letters/Cultural Studies, University of Indonesia in 1999, and a Ph.D. in Cultural Studies from Udayana University in 1999. Got. 2014. His main interests are in the fields of education, language, and cultural issues.