4. FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

In this chapter, the writer analyzes the data she has gotten. This chapter consists of two main parts; discussion on the findings of the study and an interpretation of the findings. For the discussion on the findings, the writer will report the result that the writer got from the identification. The writer also includes the tables to clarify the differences. In addition, for the interpretation of the findings, the writer will interpret the differences occur between the categories.

4.1. Discussions on the Findings.

The discussions on the findings consist of three main sections. This discussion is started with the comparison of good and poor students of speaking VI, followed by the comparison of good and poor students of Speaking II, and then the comparison of the good students of Speaking VI and Speaking II, and poor students of Speaking VI and Speaking II.

4.1.1. Findings on the Types of Compensatory Strategies Used by the Good and the Poor Students of Speaking VI

From the data, the writer found 242 compensatory strategies used by the good and the poor students of Speaking VI in overcoming the lexical problems appeared in the story they retold titled Sangkuriang.

The good and the poor students of Speaking VI do not show significant differences in the types of Compensatory Strategies they use. The detailed findings can be seen in the table 4.1.1.1 below.

From the findings above, we can see that the types of the Compensatory Strategies used by the good students of Speaking VI and the poor students of Speaking VI do not show significant differences. The analysis appeared with a result that both of them use the same principal with a little variation in percentage. The good students of Speaking VI use fewer strategies than the poor students of Speaking VI; the good students of Speaking VI use 117 strategies while the poor students of Speaking VI use 125 strategies. However, the good students of Speaking VI tend to use more Conceptual Strategies with percentage is 85.47 % (100 out of 117) and fewer Linguistic Strategies with the percentage is 14.53% (17 out of 117) than the poor students of Speaking VI do; the percentage of Conceptual Strategy is 78.4% and percentage of Linguistic Strategy is 21.6%. Although the differences is not striking, generally it can be seen that the students who are in the same level have different way to reach their communicative goal; in this case the good students tend to use more informative strategies to replace the target words. The clearer discussion can be seen below.

From Conceptual Strategy point of view, the difference between the good and the poor students of Speaking VI is not significant. Both the good and the poor students of Speaking VI tend to use Analytic Conceptual Strategy more than Holistic Conceptual Strategy. However, the good students of Speaking VI use more Analytic Conceptual Strategy (ANCO) with the percentage 58.11% (68 out of 117) than the poor students of Speaking VI do, that is 52% (65 out of 125). For example, to refer to 'jar', one of the good students said, "*a place that Indonesian usually used to place the water*" and other good student said *"kind of pottery which is made from clay."* Another example said by the poor students is to refer to 'mortar', the subject said, *"something to make a rice from traditional thing"* or *"it is like a plate but it is more taller, it is taller and it is made from wood"*. From those examples, it can be seen that the subjects mention the use and the characteristic of the target word to explain what they intend to say.

From Holistic Conceptual Strategy (HOCO) point of view, the good students of Speaking VI use fewer HOCO than the poor students of Speaking VI. As

the writer has mentioned in chapter II that by using HOCO, the subjects replace the target word with the word that has similar meaning as the target word. Both the good and the poor students of Speaking VI prefer to use the strategy of mentioning the word in general class called Superordinate word, for example, to refer to 'rice pestle' one of the good students said *"tool"* and other good student said *"stool".* Another example taken from the data of the poor students is to refer to 'coconut shell' the subject replaces it with *"coconut fruit".* From these examples above, the words they use are the general class of the target word. Besides the Superordinate word, there are Coordinate and Subordinate word they use. Coordinate word is the word that has similar meaning but in the same class with the target word. For example, to refer to 'wild boar' the subject said *"pig "* or *"bull"*. In addition, Subordinate word is the word that has similar meaning with the target word but in lower class than the target word. For examples, to refer to 'shawl' the subject said *"dress"* and *"linen".*

In additional, from the Linguistic Strategy point of view, both the good and the poor students of Speaking VI tend to use Linguistic Strategy of Transfer (LITRA) than Linguistic Strategy of Morphological Creativity (LIMO). However, the good students of Speaking VI use fewer LITRA than the poor students. The good students use 17 out of 117 with the percentage 14.53% while the poor students use 27 out of 125 with the percentage 21.6%. In addition, both the good and the poor students of Speaking VI prefer to use Literal Translation than Borrowing and Foreignizing. The good students use fewer Literal Translation with the percentage 9.40% (11 out of 117) than the poor students do with the percentage 11.2% (14 out of 125). For examples, to refer to 'wild boar', the subject said *"forest pig"* or other subject said *"jungle pig".* Besides, to refer to 'deer liver', the subject said *"deer's heart".* Then the good students of Speaking VI use fewer Borrowing (with the percentage 2.57%, 3 out of 117) than the poor students do (with the percentage 8.8%, 11 out of 125). For example, to refer to 'rice pestle', the subject said *"alu"* and to refer to 'wild boar, the subject said *"celeng "* . These examples show that the subjects borrow their L1 (in this case Indonesian) directly without any changes to replace the target word. While Foreignizing strategy is only used by the good student with the percentage is 0.85%

(1 out of 117). For example, to refer to 'deer liver', the student pronounces *"deer /lever/ "*. It shows that the subject makes the L1 looks like the target language. LIMO is only used twice by the good students to compensate the target words. In this strategy, the subjects create new words by modifying the existing target words using their knowledge of morphological rules. For example, to refer to 'deer liver', the subjects said *'deer's liver'*.

4.1.2. Findings on the Types of Compensatory Strategy Used by the Good and the Poor Students of Speaking II

From the data, the writer found that the whole Compensatory Strategies produced by the good and the poor students of Speaking II in solving the lexical problems when they are doing retelling-story task are 261.

The difference of the Compensatory Strategies used between the good and the poor students of Speaking II is very striking. In order to have clear differences, the detailed findings can be seen on the table 4.1.1.2 below.

As shown in the table 4.1.1.2 above, the types of the Compensatory Strategies used by the good and the poor students of Speaking II show significant differences. The good students of Speaking II use fewer Compensatory Strategies that is 126 strategies than the poor students of Speaking II that is 135 strategies as long as they retell the story. However, both the good and the poor students of Speaking II still prefer to use Conceptual Strategies than Linguistic Strategies. The good students of Speaking II use more Conceptual Strategies with the percentage 65.08 % (82 out of 126) than the poor students do, with the percentage is 51.11% (69 out of 135). It means that although they are in the same level, as stated by Joan Rubin that the good learners will be different from the poor learners in the way of learning. The good students still use strategies which are more informative. For further illustration of each types of Compensatory Strategies, it can be seen below.

From Conceptual Strategies point of view, the difference is significant. Both the good and the poor students of Speaking II tend to use Analytic Conceptual Strategy (ANCO) than Holistic Conceptual Strategies (HOCO). The good students use more ANCO with percentage 46.82% (59 out of 126) than the poor students do; with the percentage is 25.93% (35 out of 135). As it has been explained in chapter II, the students who use analytic strategy describe the properties of the target words, such as the function, location, shape and color of the target word. The following examples are taken from the data of the good students of Speaking II. To refer to a 'wild boar', the subject said, "*a pig, a kind of Indonesian pig"* or *"celeng is a kind of a pig, a big pig".* Other example taken from the data of the poor students of Speaking II is to refer to 'coconut shell', the subjects said, *"It is like a coconut but it's not use anymore"* or *"coconut fruit but it just a half of a coconut fruit without its meat".* From Holistic Conceptual Strategy (HOCO) point of view, the good students of Speaking II use fewer HOCO with percentage 18.26 (23 out of 126) than the poor students do which is 25.18% (34 out of 135). In this strategy, the subjects replace the target word with the word that has similar meaning as the target word. Both the good and the poor students prefer to mention the word that has similar meaning in general class, that is Superordinate word. For examples, to refer to 'coconut shell' the subject

said *"cocunut fruit"* and to refer to 'basket' the subject said *"place"* or *'box"*. Besides the Superordinate word, they also use Coordinate and Subordinate word. By mentioning the Coordinate word, the subjects mention the words that have similar meaning but they are in the same class with the target word. Some Coordinate words mentioned by the subjects are to refer to 'shawl' the subject said "*scarf* " and to refer to 'wild boar', the subject said *'pig"*. While by mentioning the Subordinate word, the subjects mention the words that have similar meaning with the target word but they are in lower class than the target word. For example, to refer to 'shawl' the subject said " *silk* ".

As the writer has mentioned before that there are two subtypes of Linguistic Strategies; Linguistic Strategy of Transfer (LITRA) and Linguistic Strategy of Morphological Creativity (LIMO). From the Linguistic Strategies point of view, the difference between the good and the poor students of Speaking II in using Compensatory Strategies is significant. Both the good and the poor students of Speaking II tend to use Linguistic Strategy of Transfer (LITRA) than Linguistic Strategy of Morphological Creativity. However, the good students of Speaking II use fewer LITRA with percentage 33.33% (42 out of 126) than the poor students do which is 48.89 (66 out of 135). In LITRA, there are three subtypes; those are Borrowing, Foreignizing, and Literal Translation. From the three strategies of LITRA, both the good and the poor students of Speaking II prefer to use Borrowing strategy than Literal Translation and Foreignizing. However, the good students use fewer Borrowing with percentage 20.63% (26 out of 126) than the poor students who use it 36.30% (49 out of 135). For examples, to refer to 'bow', the subject said " *busur* " and to refer to 'jar', the subject said " *kendi* ". It shows that the subject borrows his L1 or Ln directly without any changes to replace the target word. In addition, both the good and the poor students of Speaking II use Literal Translation in the same number; the good students of Speaking II who used 16, it is out of 126 with the percentage 12.70% while the poor students of Speaking II also use 16 out of 135 with the percentage11.85%. For example, to refer to 'wild boar', the subject said "*forest*

pig" or "*jungle pig*" and to refer to 'deer liver', the subject said *"deer heart"* or *"deer's heart"*. They translate their L1 into L2 word by word.

Then the Linguistic Strategy of Transfer (LIMO) is only used twice in their retelling story task by the good students of Speaking II. For example, to refer to 'deer liver', they said *"deer's liver"*. When they use this strategy, they are influenced by the morphological rule of additional ('s) to mean possession.

4.1.3. Findings on the Comparison between the Compensatory Strategies Used by the Good Students of Speaking VI and the Good Students of Speaking II, and those used by the Poor students of Speaking VI and the Poor students of Speaking II.

The types of Compensatory Strategies used by the good students of Speaking VI, who have higher proficiency level, are different from the Compensatory Strategies used by the good students of Speaking II, who have lower proficiency level. There are differences and similarities of Compensatory Strategies used by the poor students of Speaking VI and the Compensatory Strategies used by the poor students of Speaking II. Therefore, the writer will divide this section into two. The first is the comparison of the Compensatory Strategies used by the good students of Speaking VI and the good students of Speaking II. Then the second section is the comparison of the Compensatory Strategies used by the poor students of Speaking VI and the poor students of Speaking II.

Besides, the writer also gives a table which contains the comparison of Compensatory Strategies used by the good students of Speaking VI and the good students of Speaking II, and the poor students of Speaking VI and the poor students of Speaking II. The comparison can be seen in the table 4.1.3 below.

4.1.3.1. The Comparison on the Compensatory Strategies Used by the Good Students of Speaking VI and the Good Students of Speaking II.

a. The similarities

Both the good students of Speaking VI and the good students of Speaking II tend to use more Conceptual strategy than Linguistic strategies. Both of them prefer to use Analytic Conceptual strategy (ANCO) when they are using their conceptual knowledge. For example, when the good students of Speaking VI do not know the word 'wild boar', they then replace it with " *kind of pig but live in jungle* ", while the good students of Speaking II replace it with " *celeng is a kind of pig, a big pig* ". Both the good students of Speaking VI and the good students of Speaking II use description of the properties of the target word to replace the target word. When they use HOCO, they prefer to use Superordinate word to replace the target word. For example, to refer to 'bow', the good student of Speaking VI compensates it with "*equipment* ", while the good student of Speaking II compensates it with " *tool* ". In addition, the next approximate words used by both the good students of Speaking VI and Speaking II after Superordinate words are the Coordinate and Subordinate word. The example of Coordinate word is; to refer to 'wild boar', both the good student of Speaking VI and good student of Speaking II said " *pig*". While the example of Subordinate word is; to refer to 'shawl', the good student of Speaking VI said " *linens* " and the good student of Speaking II said "*silk*".

Besides Conceptual Archistrategy, there is Linguistic Archistrategy used by both of them. In using their linguistic knowledge, both the good students of Speaking VI and the good students of Speaking II use Linguistic Strategy of Transfer (LITRA) more than Linguistic Strategy of Morphological Creativity (LIMO). The amount of LIMO used by the good student of Speaking VI and the good students of Speaking II is the same. The example of LIMO is; to refer to 'deer liver', both the good student of Speaking VI and the good student of Speaking II said " *deer's liver* ".

b. *The differences*

We can see from the table that the types of Compensatory Strategies used by the good students of Speaking VI and the good students of Speaking II show significant differences. The good students of Speaking VI use fewer Compensatory Strategies than the good students of Speaking II, that is 117 : 126. However, the good students of Speaking VI use more Conceptual Strategy than the good students of Speaking II do. The comparison is 100 : 82. In addition, the difference on the use of Conceptual and Linguistic Strategy by the good students of Speaking VI and the good students of Speaking II is very striking. The number of Conceptual Strategy is 100 and the number of Linguistic Strategy is 17. In addition, the difference on the use of Conceptual and Linguistic Strategy by the good students of Speaking II is also large. The number of Conceptual Strategy is 82 and the number of Linguistic Strategy is 44.

From the Conceptual Strategy point of view, the difference is significant because the good students of Speaking VI use more Analytic Conceptual Strategy (ANCO) that is 68 than the good students of Speaking II that is 59. When they got difficulty in saying 'bow', they prefer to explain it by using their own words. For example, to refer to bow, the good student of Speaking VI said *"a half of wood which usually we use it with an arrow "* or *'the tools that is used with the arrow to shot the arrow".* Then, the good students of Speaking VI use Holistic Conceptual Strategy (HOCO) more than the good students of Speaking II do. The comparison is 32 : 23. As the writer had explained in chapter II and other findings that in this strategy the students use approximation to compensate the intended word and the approximate words can be Superordinate, Coordinate, and Subordinate word. The good students of Speaking VI still use those three approximations more than the good students of Speaking II do. The good students of Speaking VI use 17 Superordinate words, 12 Coordinate words and 3 Subordinate words, while the good students of Speaking II use 11 Superordinate words, 8 Coordinate words, and 4 Subordinate words.

The difference appears in the use of Linguistic Strategies by the good students of Speaking VI and the good students of Speaking II is very significant. The good students of Speaking VI use fewer Linguistic Strategies of Transfer (LITRA) than the good students of Speaking II. The comparison is 15 :42. In LITRA, the good students of Speaking VI prefer to use Literal Translation strategy to replace their target word while the good students of Speaking II prefer to use Borrowing strategy to replace the target words. For example, when both of them are faced on the target word of 'celeng/babi hutan ' (wild boar) and both of them do not know what it is in English, they have to decide which strategy they will use to help them solving this problem. So, some of the good students of Speaking VI chose to replace it by translating word by word, that is *forest pig* or *jungle pig* from 'babi hutan' *w*hile the good students of Speaking II tend to borrow their first language, which is Indonesian, to help them in overcoming the lexical problem. Then they said, '*celeng'* to compensate wild boar (babi hutan/celeng).

The difference in the use of Linguistic Strategy of Mprphological Creativity is not really significant because only one of the good students of Speaking VI use Foreignizing strategy, while the good students of Speaking II do not use it.

4.1.3.2. The Compensatory Strategies Used by the Poor Students of Speaking VI and the Poor Students of Speaking II

a. The Similarities

From the data, the writer finds that both the poor students of Speaking VI and the poor students of Speaking II prefer to use more Conceptual Strategy than Linguistic Strategy.

When they use their conceptual knowledge to help them solving the lexical problems, both of them prefer using the Analytic Conceptual Strategy (ANCO) than Holistic Conceptual Strategy (HOCO). For example, to refer to 'jar', the poor student of Speaking VI said " *a kind of pot made from clay* ", while the poor students of Speaking II said " *the place of the water* ". When

they use HOCO, they prefer using Superordinate word to replace the target word than using Coordinate and Subordinate word. For example, in order to refer to 'rice pestle, one of the poor students of Speaking VI replaces it with '*equipment'*. Then, Coordinate word is more used after Superordinate word. For example, one of the poor students of Speaking VI replaced the word 'jar' with '*pot'*. Then Subordinate is the least one used by the poor students of Speaking VI and Speaking II. For example, one of the poor students of Speaking II replaced 'shawl' with *"cotton"*.

In using Linguistic knowledge, both the poor students of Speaking VI and the poor students of Speaking II use Linguistic Strategy of Transfer (LITRA) more than Linguistic Strategy of Morphological Creativity (LIMO). Both of them give significant difference.

b. The Differences

The differences appear in the analysis of the types of Compensatory Strategies used by the poor students of Speaking VI and the poor students of Speaking II are significant. The poor students of Speaking VI use fewer compensatory strategies than the poor students of Speaking II. The comparison is 125 : 135. However, the difference of the Conceptual and Linguistic Strategy that the poor students of Speaking VI used is large; the number of Conceptual Strategy is 98 while the number of Linguistic Strategy is 27. The difference of the Conceptual and Linguistic Strategy that the poor students of Speaking II used is almost equal; the number of Conceptual Strategy is 69 while the number of Linguistic Strategy is 66.

From Conceptual Strategy point of view, the poor students of Speaking VI use Analytic Conceptual Strategy (ANCO) more than the poor students of Speaking II do. The difference is very significant, that is 65 compared to 35. It seems that the high semester students, although they are included as the poor learners, they have enough linguistic knowledge which enables them to say what they want to compensate the target word. For example, they compensated 'mortar' with '*it's like plate but it is more taller, it*

is taller and it's made from wood'. The poor students of Speaking VI use fewer HOCO than the poor students of Speaking II but the amount is almost the same, the difference is only one. The comparison is 33 : 34. When they used approximation to compensate the target word, they still gave priority to the Superordinate word than Coordinate and Subordinate word. The poor students of Speaking VI use 21 Superordinate words, 8 Coordinate words, and 4 Subordinate words, while the poor students of Speaking II use 15 Superordinate words, 13 Coordinate words, and 6 Subordinate words.

In using the Linguistic Strategy, the poor students of Speaking VI use fewer Linguistic Strategies of Transfer (LITRA) than the poor students of Speaking II. The comparison is 25 : 66. It is also very significant because the poor students of Speaking VI tend to use Translation while the poor students of Speaking II tend to use Borrowing. In using Translation Strategy they translate word by word which is influenced by their native language (Indonesian). For example, when they have to say 'wild boar' (celeng/babi hutan), they replaced it with *'forest pig'* or *'jungle pig'*. Another example is when they have to say 'hati rusa' in English (deer liver), they translate the word by word directly. They said *'deer's heart'* although actually the meaning of the heart is jantung (in this case is Indonesian). However, the poor students of Speaking II tend to choose Borrowing Strategy to overcome the lexical problems. The example is the same as the good students of Speaking II do. For another example, when they did not know 'alu' (rice pestle) in English, they borrow Indonesian by saying 'alu' so the story will not break down. The poor students of Speaking VI do not use Foreignizing strategy to overcome the target word while the poor students of Speaking II use one, when they compensated 'shawl' with *<•i•//>*.

4.2.   Interpretation of the Findings

In this part, the writer will interpret the findings above. This part is began with the interpretation on the Compensatory Strategy used by the good and the poor students of Speaking VI, the compensatory Strategy used by the good and the poor students of Speaking II, and then the comparison between the Compensatory Strategy used by the good students of Speaking VI and Speaking II and those used by the poor students of Speaking VI and Speaking II. The writer also supports the interpretation with additional theories, which are relevant to indicate why they use those strategies, to support the writer's analysis.

4.3.   On the Compensatory Strategies Used by the Good and the Poor Students of Speaking VI.

The good students of Speaking VI use more Conceptual Strategies than the poor students of Speaking VI. Conceptual Strategy is the strategy that takes much effort, which needs the willingness of the students to take risk. Joan Rubin (1985) stated that the good language learners take and create opportunity to practice what they have learned, actively attempt to develop the target language and they are willing to take risk in order to communicate and pay attention to the meaning. If the good students of Speaking VI use this strategy more than the poor students, this supports Joan Rubin's statement. This awareness to communicate and willingness to take a risk in communicating might be the reason why the good students use more Conceptual strategies than the poor students.

From the conceptual point of view, Analytic Conceptual Strategies (ANCO) is the most strategy used by both the good and the poor students of Speaking VI. ANCO is a strategy which can give high information of the intended word which the speaker gives the description or mentions the properties or the components of the target word so that the listener can easily understand the intended meaning that the speaker wants to say. As the writer also has explained in chapter one that the good and the poor students of Speaking VI have developed cognitive ability and a large quantity of vocabulary based on the time of learning they got, so that they survive to reach the communicative goal by using this strategy. Thus, based on this theory, the writer thinks that maybe the good and the

poor students of Speaking VI manage all their abilities to try to make the listener understand easily what they really want to say.

Holistic Conceptual Strategy (HOCO) is less used than Analytic Conceptual Strategy (ANCO) by both the good and the poor students of Speaking VI. HOCO requires the speaker to select a word that has similar meaning with the original intended word. That word can be in the Superordinate and Subordinate, but it can also be in the same hierarchical level, that is Coordinate. The students do approximation to replace the target words. In other words, HOCO does not really convey the speaker's intended meaning. It may become the cause why both of the good and the poor students of Speaking VI use less HOCO than ANCO. Then, when both the good and the poor students of Speaking VI use HOCO to help them to overcome the lexical problems, they prefer to use Superordinate word than Coordinate and Subordinate. It might be caused that by compensating the target word with Superordinate word is easier than compensating with Coordinate and Subordinate word. The speaker only mentions a word which has similar meaning but in general class and maybe this general class makes the listener know a little of what the speaker means. Subordinate word is the least one that the good and the poor students of Speaking VI use. It might be caused that the Subordinate word might cause the listener becomes misunderstanding because the speaker said another thing which has lower level. For example, when the speaker should say 'wild boar' but he says 'bull'. This will make the listener becomes misunderstanding; s/he will think that the speaker's mean is bull not wild boar.

In using Linguistic Strategy, the poor students of Speaking VI use more Linguistic Strategies of Transfer (LITRA) than the good students of Speaking VI do. Linguistic Strategy of Transfer is easy strategy, which does not need much effort. If the poor students use it more, this supports the characteristics of the poor language learners stated by Joan Rubin (1985), which the poor language learners are passive and not willing to take risk to communicate. They also lack desire for satisfaction, have low motivation and interest to communicate. Besides, as stated by Ringbom that learner's proficiency is the determinant of the cause of the language transfer. This might be the reason why the poor students for Speaking VI produce more LITRA.

Literal Translation is used more than Borrowing by the good and the poor students of Speaking VI. Before both the good and the poor students of Speaking VI performed the retelling story task, the writer told them that the target words have certain vocabularies in English. This awareness of all the problematic words have certain vocabulary in the target language is one of the possible reasons why they choose to use Literal Translation

LIMO is rarely used by both the good and the poor students of Speaking VI. It may be because in the story there is only one problematic word which can produce this strategy, that is 'hati rusa'.

4.2.1. On the Compensatory Strategies Used by the Good and the Poor Students of Speaking II

The good and the poor students of Speaking II use Analytic Conceptual Strategy (ANCO) more than Holistic Conceptual Strategy (HOCO) may be because ANCO can give high amount of information to the listener so that the listener can guess easily what the speakers intend to say, while HOCO does not really convey the speaker's intended meaning. The good students of Speaking II use ANCO more than the poor students of Speaking II do. Since ANCO takes much effort, the poor students, who are not willing to take risk in order to communicate, maybe tend to avoid using this strategy. While the good students of Speaking II, who use more ANCO, supports Joan Rubin statement that good language learners are willing to take risk. The difference of the characteristics the good and the poor learners have maybe the reason of this tendency.

When both the good and the poor students of Speaking II are using HOCO, they choose Superordinate word to replace the target word. It may be because the Superordinate word is easy to find and to be understand by the listener. The good students of Speaking II, however, use fewer HOCO than the poor students of Speaking II do. The lack of linguistic knowledge that the poor students have may also be the reason why the poor students use more HOCO than the good students. It also suggests that the good students try to avoid misunderstanding between them and the listener.

The poor students of Speaking II use more LITRA than the good students of Speaking II. Maybe, it is because the poor students have limited L2 vocabulary and language competence. Besides, the low proficiency the students have, which determinately affects the extent of transfer, maybe this causes them less sensitive to the successful communication (Ringbom, 1983). It suggests that the L1 still influences their way of thinking. In addition, both of the good and the poor students of Speaking II use Borrowing more than Literal Translation. Their tendency to borrow their L1 to replace the target word, however, suggests that the lack of linguistic knowledge and the nearness of their L2 with their L1 influence their communication. Besides, the poor students of Speaking II who adopt passive attitude possibly cannot figure out other ways to solve the lexical problems. This passive attitude can be the possible reason why they tend to borrow their L1 to replace the target words.

4.2.3. On the Compensatory Strategies Used between the Good Students of Speaking VI and Speaking II, and the Poor Students of Speaking VI and Speaking II.

The writer divides this part into two. The first is interpretation on the Compensatory Strategies used by the good students of Speaking VI and the good students of Speaking II, and the second is on the Compensatory Strategies used by the poor students of Speaking VI and the poor students of Speaking II.

4.2.3.1. On the Compensatory Strategies Used by the Good Students of Speaking VI and Speaking II

Both the good students of Speaking VI and the good students of Speaking II use Conceptual Strategy more than Linguistic Strategy. In addition, appropriate to the characteristics of the good students, they have high motivation to communicate, pay attention to the meaning, actively attempt to develop their target language and they are willing to take risk to communicate and create opportunities to practice their language. These characteristics may be support the

use of Conceptual Strategies by both the good students of Speaking VI and the good students of Speaking II.

The good students of Speaking VI use Holistic Conceptual Strategy (HOCO) more than the good students of Speaking II do. This may be because the good students of Speaking II who are in the lower proficiency level and just learn L2 for two semesters, do not have large enough L2 vocabulary at their solution to come up with suitable approximations while the good students of Speaking VI have a large quantity of vocabulary so that they can survive.

The good students of Speaking VI use fewer LITRA than the good students of Speaking II. It may be because of the different quantity of L2 vocabulary among them. The good students of Speaking VI have enough vocabularies to help them solving the lexical problems while the good students of Speaking II do not have enough vocabularies to help them solving the lexical problems. Besides, Krashen stated that all learners in the early stages of language acquisition fall back on their native language. It suggests that the good students of Speaking II are still influenced by the native language. This difference causes them to have different type of Linguistic Strategy of transfer. The good students of Speaking VI tend to use Literal Translation, while the good students of Speaking II tend to use Borrowing to solve the lexical problems. The limited vocabularies, which the good students of Speaking II have, and the L1 influence may be the main reason of the different strategy they use. Besides, the awareness to communicate (Joan Rubin, 1985) and to minimize language transfer which reduces avoidance of structures (Susan Bull, 1994) that the good students of Speaking VI have possibly makes them tend to use Literal Translation.

4.2.3.2. On the Compensatory Strategies Used by the Poor Students of Speaking VI and Speaking II

The poor students of Speaking II almost use Conceptual and Linguistic Strategy equally. The poor students of Speaking II who are in the second semester are supposed to have limited L2 knowledge (Beattie, 1980), limited cognitive ability and still influenced by their native language. Krashen said that learners in the early stages of language acquisition fall back on their mother tongue. This

limited knowledge of L2, limited cognitive ability, and the nearness with L1 may also influence the poor students of Speaking II to use more Linguistic Strategy.

The poor students of Speaking VI use more Conceptual Strategy than the poor students of Speaking II. It possibly means that the development of cognitive ability and a large quantity of vocabulary that the poor students of Speaking VI have make them unhampered to survive their intended meaning.

The poor students of Speaking VI use fewer Linguistic Strategies of Transfer (LITRA) than the poor students of Speaking II do. It may be because of the quantity of vocabulary they have. As the students at higher level, the poor students of Speaking VI with large vocabularies generally have more developed intellectuality. While the poor students of Speaking II who have been learning L2 just two semesters and they are still influenced by the L1 cannot limit the use of language transfer. The quantity vocabulary, early stage of acquiring L2 and the distance between each of the languages they know and the target language maybe the reason why the poor students of Speaking II use more LITRA.

In Linguistic Strategy of Transfer, the poor students of Speaking VI tend to use Literal Translation. It suggests that besides the different quantity of vocabulary both of the poor students of Speaking VI and the poor students of Speaking II have, the poor students of Speaking VI have developed cognitive ability than the poor students of Speaking II. Besides, as stated by Susan Bull (sited from Wang and Garigliano, 1992) that translation is the most powerful methods of minimizing native language transfer ad reduce the avoidance of structures which they are unsure maybe also become the reason.

The poor students of Speaking II tend to use Borrowing strategy. The poor students of Speaking II who lack desire to communicate, adopt passive attitude and are in low semester maybe cause them having small quantity of vocabulary and falling back on the native language. Besides, the poor students of Speaking II who just starts learning English for two semesters maybe causes the distance of their L1 and L2 is near or this influences them to transfer their native language.