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ABSTRACT
This study aims at exploring lecturers’ strategies in teaching speaking skill at university context. The participants were one male lecturer and one female lecturer. The data were collected by conducting observations and interviews. The research findings showed Lecturer A focused the class on accuracy while lecturer B encouraged the students to speak smoothly without too much hesitation and confidence which is related to fluency. The strategies used by the lecturers to promote speaking activity successfully were talking a lot as much as possible of allocated time given, the students is not dominated by the talkative participation in the class, encourage students to be motivated. The students are interested to talk on the given topics. Therefore, it can be concluded that those lecturers have their own ways to apply five speaking strategies which are associated with the level of students and the class environment.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Speaking ability is one of the English subjects that students must pass in order to advance to the next level; it is divided into three or four semesters. In some universities, speaking one, three or four starts in the first semester as English that students learn. In speaking one, students learn basic speaking skills for freshmen. They study items such as greetings, introductions of one-self and others, and so on. At this level, students should be able to utilize plain English in ordinary conversation. In this course, students are introduced to two different functions or subjects in order to help them speak better English in their daily conversations. In this case, the relevant vocabularies and intonation will also be integrated in the subject through many kinds of practice. Speaking three teaches students to express their opinion while interacting in English. Speaking four emphasizes on various strategies used in speaking to allow students interact more advanced.

Lecturers and textbooks encourage students to talk in the target language in a variety of ways. From direct approaches that concentrate on specific aspects of oral contact (e.g., turn-taking, subject management, and questioning strategies) to indirect approaches. Through group work, task work, and other tactics, it establishes conditions for conversational contact. (Richards, 1990) [14].

Besides, classroom is equally important in supporting students speaking practice, where they have very much time to interact in the target language unlike in reading, writing or listening class. As [4] [P: 20] argued that classroom has a value as collaborative approach to reach learning goals. Similarly, [6] [P: 74] advised lecturers to establish an environment in the classroom that encourages students to experiment with language, to respond without waiting for someone else to do so. [18] used a classroom interaction technique in English language training to help students improve their conversational skills. Furthermore, according to Abdul (2013) [2], instructors should devise a plan to encourage students to participate in class discussions. In this way lecturers organize classroom activities, as well as their perceptions of the various phases involved in activity planning, have a major impact on the overall efficiency of the activity and, as a result, the development of speaking skills. Additionally, the ideal speaker is well-versed in both their teaching materials and the method. They have access to a wide range of educational methods, strategies, and approaches. They are always perfecting their repertory, just as they are honing their comprehension of the topic. They never have any doubts about the procedure’ ability to predict student learning results. [19]. Thus, the tactics that decide the lecturer’s approaches and techniques in class activities have an impact on the success of language teaching activities and, as a result, the learners’ academic progress. According to [9] [P:197] the methods are used to
implement the strategy, while the techniques and tactics are used to implement the methods.

From the previous statement, it is clear that one of the long-term aims that the language professor hopes to achieve in class is for students to be able to speak English spontaneously. As a result, English major students commonly evaluate their language learning performance as well as the effectiveness of their English subject based on how well their spoken language abilities have improved. It is vital to use appropriate strategies such as developmental speaking [17], broadcasting activities [1] describing pictures [13], and Students’ speaking skills in the classroom will be aided via problem-based learning.

In this instance, the language instructor faces a difficult task in providing and facilitating appropriate inputs for pupils to become proficient English speakers. Typically, some students are self-conscious about their English skills and struggle to communicate and express themselves in the target language. As a result, individuals prefer to communicate in their native tongue or remain mute in order to avoid making a mistake and they do not actively participate in speaking activities. Furthermore, students should be exposed to the target language in speaking class through a range of activities, and the components of English speaking competency, such as accuracy in pronunciation, grammar, and word choice, fluency, and comprehensibility, should be drilled.

2. METHODOLOGY

In this study, the researcher used a qualitative approach in grounded design to perform the research. In order to get insights into a certain issue of interest, qualitative research requires gathering, evaluating, and interpreting narrative and visual (nonnumeric) data [8] [P:399]. The systematic process of grounded theory design entails the finding of theory through empirical analysis. The study's major goal was to uncover the tactics used by English speaking lecturers to conduct their classes.

Participant

The participants in this study were two non-native English instructors who taught English speaking classes at an Islamic private university where the responder studied. There were two lecturers involved in this study. The lecture was given name initial, female lecturer as A and male lecturer as B. The researcher conducted a primary study in the targeted subject through an interview before deciding on the participant. The researcher interviewed some English students in English graduate program to get information regarding their English speaking lecturers.

Data Collection Procedure

In collecting the data, the researcher employed three primary data collection techniques, as follows:

1. At the first, the researcher observed the class activities. In this case, the researcher as nonparticipant observation, or also known as external observation. Researcher is not directly involved in the situation being watched. During the speaking lesson, she took field notes on all of the actions in the classroom. She also used a videotape to record verbal and nonverbal communication between lecturer and students, which was afterwards validated and modified to field notes, and she was supported in the interview phase by a volunteer.

2. Then, by using voice recorders, the researcher interviewed both the professor and the students. The two interviews were semi-structured, meaning that certain questions were prepared ahead of time and some additional questions were asked on the spot. At the end of each meeting, a lecturer interview was conducted to acquire qualitative data or validate what had been observed. In the meantime, a student interview was conducted to learn about students’ perspectives on the usage of tactics in speaking class. In order to interview the pupils, a group interview was used.

3. After that, the researcher examined the recording from observation and making transcription of the recording of observation and interview.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The researcher discovered that both lecturers utilized different tactics in English speaking class based on the data. The following are examples of these strategies:

a. Checking attendance

A teacher’s normal activity is to check attendance at the start of a lesson, after explaining an assignment, or at the end of a lesson. Both instructors devised processes for how and when to do it in the classroom. It can be seen in the table below.

Table 1. Lecturer’s Strategies in Checking Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Students are asked to label the number, and then the student writes the number on the number label based on the attendance list and pins it on the shirt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling</td>
<td>Call the student number to see whether the lecturer is available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Call out the student’s name once and quickly without repetition and looks at the student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(One-Off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calling)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In table 1, the lecturer A asked the class leader to provide number tag for his friends then write their consecutive number on it based on attendance list and attached the number tag on their cloth. At the following meetings, the lecturer checked the attendance only by calling the students’ number. The lecturer A said that called the consecutive number was easier and shorter than called the student’s name. Another strategy to check attendance used by lecturer was A one-off calling whereby the lecturer called out each of student’s name once and quickly. Both of those strategies required the students’ rapt attention, otherwise, they would get an absent mark on attendance list if they missed their name. Using student numbers or names in this manner allows both lecturers to devote more time to student activities. It is in line with [16] gives ideas for taking classroom attendance taking attendance after explaining the assignment, taking attendance as ice breaker activity, taking register using a seating chart, and taking attendance using name cards. Yet, the two lecturers had their own strategy for checking their students’ presence.

b. Arrangement of Seating

It is critical to tailor spoken learning exercises to the seating arrangement in order to make class activities more successful. Students should sit according to what the lecturer does if the actual conversation takes place in the classroom.

Table 2. Seating Arrangement Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>One-big Circle Model</td>
<td>Students should sit in chairs that are arranged around the perimeter of the room. Students and lecturers are seated in a circle. It’s utilized for group presentations as well as lectures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-circle Model</td>
<td>Form a broad circle, then assign one student in each half of the circle to swivel his chair to the left. The chairs then turned around and sat next to each other on the outer edge. As a result, the seats are arranged side by side to form two circles, one inner and one outer. For pair activities, this seating model is used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>U-Model</td>
<td>Students should form a U-shape with their chairs. This is used in pairs and during lectures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Island Model</td>
<td>Formed for group work activities. First, ask students to count from 1 to 6. The numbers 1 with 1, 2 with 2, 3 with 3, and fourth. Finally, request that each group sit in a small circle. It appeared to be an island.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the two speaking classes, four ways for arranging students’ sitting positions have been noticed. The first was a one-big-circle setup, in which students arranged their chairs in a large circle before the professor arrived. When the professor gave an explanation and the students conducted individual presentations, it was employed. The second was two-circles, when the lecturer set up his activity for pair work activity to share idea, he asked part of students to turn back their chair closed to the outside edge of their other friends’ chair. In this seating position, the students were divided into two positions; there were inner and outer position. And the students’ position in this pair work was more inclined to side by side than face to face (opposite); it trained their ears to listen rather than see their partner’s mouth movement and made the students move easily. The third seating arrangement was U-model; the lecturer would ask the students to set their chair in this model when the students worked in pair for role-play activity. It was far different from the second one, because the lecturer simply asked to set the position in U-model then let the students to have a partner next to him/her. The last one was island-model, at beginning the position of seat was in raw-model faced to the whiteboard then when the activity moved to group work the lecturer asked the students to count 1 to 6 for forming 6 groups. And when the students knew in which group they belonged to, they set up their chairs which likely looked island-model.

Doing speaking activities with the strategy given to each student, namely providing equal opportunities and lots of time to talk a lot, this is an effective way. As stated by [12] [P:7] that the allocation of time for students to speak is 80% of the students’ talk time (STT) and the lecturer is 20% of the teacher's talking time (TTT).

Even if class discussion is not dominated by a small number of students who talk a lot, giving students 80% of the time and professors 20% enables for participation. Everyone has a chance to speak, and contributions are allocated evenly. According to a classroom management specialist, the cheapest method of classroom management is a proper classroom arrangement. [7] [P:3. Many experienced lecturers recommend assigned burning.

c. Teaching and Learning Activity

In the classroom, there are five learning activities to meet the aims of teaching speaking English at the students’ level.
As seen in the chart above, a variety of activities can be used in an English speaking lesson. The lecturer A provided the audio CD as many as the student number and distributed them to each student without printed material. Then asked the students to listen two or three sub-units on the audio CD at home; after listening, they wrote the passage which had been listened and read it in order to store it in memory; finally they delivered one sub-unit orally, which was chosen randomly by the lecturer, in front of the class. In line with technique of audio-lingual strategy (ALM), [10] [P:79] contends that audio-lingual strategy depended intensely on penetration to make dialect propensity. The sub-units, which the under-studies tune in were monolog discussions. Another trend in expansion was topic-based introduction. The teacher offered a theme and then explained how to build that theme orally by providing an outline or subtopics.

While the instructor was explaining anything, the students took notes. At home, they developed the topic given then read it to store in memory; finally the students submitted their writings and delivered the topic in front of the class individually. In this time, the lecturer invited them one by one based on the paper writing submitted. Besides, peer share idea was also one of activity was given if the students had poor individual presentation, the lecturer might ask them to seat in two-circles (inner and outer) to reduce anxiety and let them to share their ideas with peer. In this activity, the lecturer asked the students to move for many times in term of taking turn. The lecturer asked inner students to move to the right, for instance, after few minutes he would asked outer students to do so; it could happen about 4 to 7 times turn taking. It encouraged even participation and risk taking without fear of feeling embarrassed or foolish.

In this case, speaker A and speaker B locked in her understudies in change sorts of movement. The most important was role-playing. The understudies were grouped into groups to practice their speeches or to act out the basic script from their handbook; they were assigned to roles of A or B, and after a few minutes, the speaker instructed them to switch partners. This procedure made a different the understudies to be more intelligently since they might expect what his/her accomplice said.

Besides, bunch discourse whereby applying center bunch dialog (FGD). The understudies were divided into small groups and given different themes. Giving different points for different groups helped them focus on their goals. Each gathering contained five people: one understudy as the bunch pioneer, one as the note taker, and two as gather individuals. The gather pioneer's job was to ask bunch members questions, while the note taker took down the bunch pioneer's and members' flaws, such as elocution, late reaction, or filler usage. After a few moments, the understudies began to work on their gather. The speaker asked each component to move around and look for unused groups. Each understudy chose a different component from their previous bunch and gave a modern point to be assessed within the underused gathering.

At the end of the course, the speaker invited note takers from each group to report on what they had observed during the discussion movement in their group. Because each gather part played their part, and simulation-this connected technique is similar to part
play, the students' cooperation was great. Understudies act out a real-life scenario. Understudies were given two types of exercises to complete. The first was a person assignment, in which the speaker asked each understudy to perfect their skills in making and canceling plans for outside lesson action. She planned the day when the students contacted to make an agreement with her, but they had to cancel it after a few minutes.

The lecturer divided the understudies into six groupings and each gather consisted of 5 or 6 understudies for the moment action. She then gave different topics to each gathering and told them how to run the show of introduction: (1) each gathering had to supply a flipchart, (2) each bunch part had a part (a arbitrator and the rest of the people as speakers), (3) each gathering had 2-3 minutes to do introduction, and (4) using loud filler ‘ee...or...er...’ was not permitted in introduction. Each bunch part's work description as follows to begin with understudy is as mediator showed his/her group. Second understudies serve as speaker 1, introducing each part and its function. Speaker 2 is the third understudy, who is presenting the subject and holding the flipchart. As speaker 4, the fourth understudy passes on the designated time for each session in the presentation. Speaker 4 is the fifth understudy, who passes on the appointed time for each session of the presentation. As speaker 5, the sixth understudy gives the floor to anyone who wants to ask a question.

The purpose of delivering a reenactment of an introduction, according to speaker A, was to encourage common verbal familiarity or to train understudies for particular aptitude in making wonderful introductions methodically and naturally. [6] [P:11] entirety up the thought of ALM such as there is small or no syntactic clarification (language structure is instructed by inductive similarity instead of deductive clarification); There is a lot of use of recordings, dialect labs, and visual aids; elocution is quite important; there is a tendency to regulate dialect while ignoring substance. On the full, in case the speaker A tended to apply the procedure of ALM and speaker B more likely utilized both procedure of PPP and CLT strategy appeared closely related to what [3] found that the English dialect instructors of private segment more like to apply CLT procedures in creating their understudies phonetic capacity.

d. Correction

Based on the observation, it applied the strategy of teacher correction and peer correction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Teacher correction</td>
<td>Correct the students’ mispronunciation or ungrammatical utterance when the incorrectness happened in mid-flow of presentation. Correct the incorrectness by reformulating and get the students to repeat it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Peer correction</td>
<td>Delegate bright students to be ‘note taker’ noticing their friends’ mistakes on pronunciation and grammar or noticing their participation in either role-play or discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher correction was used by lecturer A when the students made mistake on pronunciation and grammar, the lecturer would correct the mispronunciation directly by pronouncing the correct pronunciation and/or ask whole class to repeat it. The following examples were to showing incorrectness (taken from FN 01):

1) Student: ...but perhaps you are not going to see very often [ often ] a gorilla driving ......
Lecturer: ....... [ ofn ]
Student: [ ofen ] ee [ ofn ]

2) Student: ....the salesman want to manager office....
Lecturer: ......went to manager office. From go to went (he explained)
Student: the salesman went to manager office (student reformulated)

Another was by employing the note taker in group discussion. The note taker was the student who had good English. He/she was responsible to notice his/her group members’ mistakes then reported to the lecturer. Her students said that noticed mistakes by friend was more comfortable rather than noticed by the lecturer. It ought to be recognized between a blunder and botch; A blunder, unlike a botch, indicates the learner's skill. While botches can be self-corrected, a blunder cannot (Brown, 2007) [6]. Subsequently, straightforwardly adjusted technique seem avoid ceaseless botches and the understudies were mindful of which portion they both as [12] [P: 61-62] says on the off chance that you listen the same botch being made more than once, it is superior to rectify it sooner instead of afterward.

e. Assessment

In assessing the students, the two lectures basically had similar ways. It was noticed the table below:
Table 5. Lecturer’s Strategy of Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Performance-based assessment</td>
<td>Assess the students’ individual presentation, submitted assignment and also the students’ attendance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Performance-based assessment</td>
<td>Assess the student’s participation during role-play and discussion activity and also the student’s attendance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lecturers took score on students’ performance in each meeting, this was a continuous assessment in which the students judged by various pieces of tasks during the course. Lecturer A assessed mostly his students in individual presentation and from submitted assignments. While lecturer B assessed the students’ performance during the class activities (pair work and group work). This was thought to be a broad exam, one of the tests used to assess students’ dialect abilities; broad verbal generation includes discourses, verbal introductions, and story-telling in which the option for audience verbal participation is either limited or non-existent (Brown, 2004) [5].
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