

## LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES USED BY PEKANBARU SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS BASED ON THEIR TYPES OF SCHOOL FACTOR

FAKHRI RAS

An English Lecturer of FKIP of University of Riau Pekanbaru

### Abstract

The objective of this study was to examine the relationship between language learning strategies used by Pekanbaru senior high school students based on situational factors (types of school). The research identified the use of language learning strategies by the students of different types of school. The respondents of the study were 400 Senior High School students in Pekanbaru, Indonesia. Quantitative data was collected by using Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford (1989). Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. A One-Way Anova was used to determine the differences of language learning strategies usage based on types of school. This study was added with qualitative data by interviewing ten respondents taken from sample. The interview data was presented in the form of the patterns which only focus on their frequency use of the students' strategies in improving English language in general, the four skills of English language as well as vocabulary and grammar. The research findings revealed that there is significant differences between gender ( $F=4.18$  and  $Sig=.042>.05$ ), ethnicity ( $F=4.31$ , and  $Sig=.002>.05$ ), parents' income ( $F=3.10$  and  $Sig=.04>.05$ ), types of school ( $F=4.76$  and  $Sig=.030>.05$ ), as well as students' academic streaming ( $F=2.63$  and  $Sig=.034>.05$ ) and the overall mean of language learning strategies used (3.15-medium level). The qualitative data gives additional information about the respondents' strategies to learn English in general and the four skills of English language as well as vocabulary and grammar. The implication of the study is that although students are aware of several language learning strategies, they may need to be explicitly taught to use them.

**Keywords:** *language learning strategy, and types of school.*

### 1. Background.

The language learners with academic background –limited to the senior high school students- concentrated on two important language learning targets: a) the use of English and b) the score in the final national examination (2004 GBPP).



Referring to the development of the ability of using the language, the current curriculum provides a framework to follow. They have to adopt the genre of the

text-descriptive, narrative, procedure, explanation, discussion, exposition, review, news item, etc., before they practice speaking and writing (2006 GBPP). In addition, they are also required to master the materials offered in the final national examination (35 items for reading and 15 items for listening). To achieve both targets, the students employ certain language learning strategies in the classroom, out of the class, and in the national examination.

They commonly follow what the teachers assign them to do, for instance- underlining the variety of language expression in the text book, finding out the meaning of certain words (conceptual, structural, and contextual words) in the dictionary (Nuttall; 1980), and identifying types of questions linked to the written text. They are also asked to read authentic materials from certain English newspapers (*The Jakarta Post*, *The Indonesia Times*) and magazines (*Hello*). Besides, they are provided a break-through program, usually a few months before the national examination.

In other words, ways of learning English in Indonesia have been explicitly determined by the suggested approach of teaching from period by period of the curriculum practices (Tomlinson, 1990). For example, the students were asked to concentrate on correct practice in the classroom even though such kinds of practices were not acknowledged in workplaces (Prabhu: 1994). Another example was that the students memorized the meaning of the words in the text book in order to understand the content of the text and its vocabulary items. This way was followed by memorizing short dialogues in the text book for the purpose of speaking activities in the classroom. For the writing activity, the students imitated a certain model of written text in order to compose his/her own writing. For listening, the students read the transcription of the spoken text. In addition, the

Several recent studies have shown that the practices of language learning strategies have made learning language (including English) more efficient and produced a positive effect on learners' language use (Wenden & Rubin 1987; O'Malley & Chamot 1990; Chamot & O'Malley 1994; Oxford 1996; Cohen 1998). In line with it, the right choice of language learning strategies leads language learners to improve proficiency or overall achievement or in specific language skill areas (Wenden & Rubin 1987; Oxford & Crookall 1989; O'Malley & Chamot 1990).

## 2. Research Objective.

The objectives of this study are to:

1. Identify the level of language learning strategies usage among Pekanbaru senior high school students in learning English language.
2. Determine there is a significant difference between type of school (private & state schools) and language learning strategies use.

## 3. Research Question.

This study is designed to answer the following research questions (RQ): Is there any significant difference between type of school (private & state schools) and language learning strategies use?

## 4. Hypothesis.

There is no significant difference between type of school (state and private schools) and language learning strategies use.

## 5. Language Learning Strategies (LLS)

### 5.1. Definition

A very basic element in defining language learning strategies is the concept of the strategy itself (Chesterfield & Chesterfield 1985). Based on this, there are various definitions of language learning strategies formulated by researchers in

relation to English as a second language (L2) or foreign language (FL). The terms of learning strategies and learning behaviors can be interchangeably used in this study (Mohamed Amin Embi 2000). On the other hand, learning strategies and learning techniques may not be used for similar purpose(s) (Stern 1983).

Tarone (1983) based her definition on the context of the use of communication strategies in which mutual attempt of two interlocutors agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared. Then, she differentiates communication strategy from production strategy in which one linguistic system is used efficiently and clearly. She also makes clear the distinction between communication strategy and learning strategy by which developing linguistic and socio-linguistic competence occurred in the target language. On the other hand, Tarone (1987) ascertains the impossibility of separating communication strategies and learning strategies because of the following reasons: (a) it is difficult to measure the individual's purposes whether it is communication or learning; (b) the purpose might be both; and (c) even if the person just wants to communicate and not to learn, learning often occurs anyway.

Some researchers use more terms for the word 'strategy' like: (a) steps and operations (Oxford 1989); and (b) any specific action (Oxford 1990b). On the other hand, to a certain extent, the same can be said about other researchers (Ehrman 1989; Nyikos 1989 & 1990; Chamot 1987 & 1990; Donato & McCormick 1994; Abdullah Hussein El-Saleh El-Omari 2002).

Rubin (1975) defines language learning strategies as the techniques or devices that learners use to acquire second language knowledge. According to Stern (1975) Language Learning Strategies are some general order higher approaches to learning which govern the choice of specific techniques. In addition, Naiman *et al* (1978) define Language Learning Strategies as generally more or less deliberate approaches to learning. Rubin (1987) states that Language

learners engage in, and regulate a second language learning. Chamot (1987) define LLS as techniques, approaches, or deliberate actions that students take in order to facilitate the learning and recall of both linguistic and content area information.

## 6. Factor Affecting Language Learning Strategies

### 6.1. Situational School Factors.

Indonesian legislation (decree number 20, 2003) states that both the government and society are responsible for managing education. In Indonesia the school system consist of state schools and private schools. The state schools are fully funded by the governments (central government and local government). The revised constitution of Indonesia states that the governments should allocate 20% the budget for education. The budgets for the private schools come from foundations, parents, certain stakeholders, their businesses, and government subsidy.

In most situations, private schools in town offer better education. They can pay high qualified and competent teachers. Besides, the schools can also provide comfortable classrooms, libraries, offices, laboratories, and other support facilities. In addition, the schools cooperate with other schools in other towns or in other countries. The rich parents from various ethnic and social backgrounds send their children to these schools, even though they have to pay higher tuition fees compared to state schools. Gardner and MacIntyre (1993) support the theory of language learning strategies in relation to situational variables. They found that characteristics of language learners, situational variables, and type of learning strategies interact in complicated way to influence proficiency in a second language.

## 7. Research Instrument.

### 7.1 Research Instrument for Quantitative Data

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (Oxford, 1989) is used to collect the data of how respondents learn English at Pekanbaru senior high schools.

### 7.2. Research Instrument for Qualitative Data

Interview is done in order to get additional information on how selected respondents (10 respondents) learn English in general and individual skills of English.

## 8. Analysis of Data

### 8.1. Analysis of Quantitative Data

To analyze the collected data, several procedures were followed. First of all, scoring the response of the respondents in the given questionnaires. In order to determine the level of the language learning strategies by the respondents, descriptive statistics was applied. Inferential statistics was used e.g., One-Way ANOVA, to determine the difference use of language learning strategies by types of school factor.

#### 8.1.1. Scoring the Response of the Respondents in the Given Questionnaire

The questionnaire used is Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). The SILL produced by Oxford (1990). Each statement has five choices : 1. Never or almost never true of me; 2. Generally not true of me; 3. Somewhat true of me; 4. Generally true of me; and 5. Always or almost always true of me. The answers of the respondents were scored as the following. Choice 1 is scored 1, 2 is 2, 3 is 3, 4 is 4, and 5 is 5. The SILL consists of 6 parts with 50 statements.

Descriptive statistics was used in order to get the central tendency (mean, median, and mode) (John W. Cresswell: 2005) of the response of the respondents in using the category of language learning strategies (memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies).

The mean score of the respondents' level of each language learning strategies was calculated and this mean score indicated the respondents' overall self-report on their own level of strategy used. In order to interpret the mean score, this study refers to interpretation of Likert scale in SILL by Oxfords (1989).

The students' mean score of each item and construct were collapsed into three new groups, as seen in Table 4.6. Mean score within 1.00 to 2.4 is categorized as low level in language learning strategies, and mean score within 2.5 to 3.4 falls under the medium level. If the mean score falls within 3.5 to 5.0, the level of learning strategies is high.

#### 8.1.3. The Use of Inferential Statistic Analysis

Inferential statistics was used to investigate the phenomenon of relationships and differences among different characteristics of the sample. The inferential statistics analysis used in this study includes One-Way ANOVA.

##### The Use of One Way ANOVA

ANOVA was used to test hypothesis 2 and hypothesis 5 in comparing the differences among three or more independent variables on a single variable in each hypothesis (see the earlier research design). The alternative hypothesis is accepted (see 1.5 in Chapter One) if the calculated value is smaller than table value with the level of significance  $p < .05$  (Ferguson: 1976 & Gall *et.al*: 2003).

#### 8.1.4. Analysis of Qualitative Data

The 10 students as purposive sampling were interviewed about the ways they learn English in general and language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing, structure and vocabulary). Most of the given responses were in English language,

and some of them were in Bahasa Indonesia. The responses were written down in space below the question.

#### Steps of Qualitative Analysis

The findings were saliently used to support the quantitative data. The analysis investigated indicators related to language strategies used by the students. In general, the steps of analysis taken were referred to Miles & Huberman (2004:9). They stated that qualitative analytic practices and techniques follow the steps below; affixing codes, noting reflections or other remarks, sorting and shifting ...to identify similar phrases, relationships between variables, patterns, themes, distinct differences between subgroups and common sequences, isolating these patterns and processes, commonalities and differences, elaborating a small set of generalizations, and confronting those generalization (Miles & Huberman, 2004).

The process of data interpretation was interactive and involved data reduction, examination and conclusion verification by: looking for comments that described the ways language skills were acquired, looking for comments that indicated strategies of language learning, looking for new strategies that might not be included in this study.

### 9. Respondents' Profiles

Table 1 Distribution of Respondents by Type of School Background

No	Type of school	Frequency	Percentage
1.	State School	200	50.0
2.	Private School	200	50.0
Total		400	100.0

Table 1 shows the distribution of respondents by the types of schools. The respondents are equally distributed, 200 students from state schools and 200 students from private schools.

## 10. QUANTITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

### 10.1. DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS

Table 2. Distribution of Respondents by Types of School.

No	Type of school	Frequency	Percentage
1.	State School	200	50.0
2.	Private School	200	50.0
Total		400	100.0

Table 3 shows the result of One Way ANOVA between state and private schools toward dependent variables memory, cognitive, compensation, meta-cognitive, affective, social and overall language learning strategies. The findings show that there is no significant difference between state school and private school students in Memory ( $F=.041$ ,  $sig=.839>.05$ ), Cognitive ( $F=2.589$ ,  $sig=.108>.05$ ), Compensation ( $F=1.438$ ,  $sig=.231>.05$ ), Metacognitive ( $F=.534$ ,  $sig=.465>.05$ ) and Affective ( $F=.010$ ,  $sig=.919>.05$ ) strategies. However, there is a significant different between 'state school and private school in using social strategies ( $F=4.321$ ,  $Sig=.038<.05$ ) and overall language learning strategies ( $F=4.763$ ,  $sig=.030<.05$ ). Students at private school yielded higher mean score for social strategies and overall language learning strategies than students at state schools. Thus,  $H_04$  is rejected.

Table 3

Dependent Variable	Group of School	Mean	Source	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Memory	State	3.04	Between Groups	.003	1	.003	.041	.839
	Private	3.03	Within Groups	24.220	398	.061		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>24.222</b>	<b>399</b>			
Cognitive	State	3.15	Between Groups	.152	1	.152	2.58	.108
	Private	3.19	Within Groups	23.298	398	.059		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>23.450</b>	<b>399</b>			
Compensatio	State	3.12	Between	.141	1	.141	1.43	.231



Average	7	10	Relating words with available options.							1	1
		11	Explaining and developing into a good sentence							1	1
		12	Restating words in my own statement based on my logical perception							1	1
		13	Taking a note from the lecturer							1	1
<b>Total</b>										<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Average</b>										<b>5.</b>	<b>8</b>

Table 4 shows that there are several strategies used by the private school students and state school students to improve listening skill based on types of school. First of all, both groups of students choose a similar sense of strategies as the highest frequency among all strategies that is the strategy of focusing on listening ideas of listening text. At the same time, the state school students used another strategy as the same height as the earlier strategy that is the strategy of concentrating to the spoken text. For example R1 says "I listen carefully what the speaker say", R4 says "I am serious to listen to the speaker", R2 says "I hear the two speakers talking about and make conclusion, R3 says "I prepare and listen to the speaker", R4 says "I am serious to listen to the speaker", R5 says "I'll listen carefully and repeatedly", R6 says "I concentrate and understand the conversation", R7 says "I'll follow and the speech, if the topic not so important for me", R8 says "I will try to catch the point what the speakers are talking about", R9 says "I listen carefully, understand their body language and gesture",

voice of man or woman, imitating the action of a speaker – especially in conversation – and following the plot of the story.

In addition, the average number of strategies practiced by state school students is only 5.8 while the private school students is 7. It means the private school students used more strategies than the state school students did.

#### K.1 Strategies used by the respondents to improve speaking skill based on types of school

Table 5 shows the detail strategies used by the respondents to improve speaking skill based on types of school.

#### Table 5 Strategies used by the respondents to improve speaking skill based on types of school

Private School Students							State School Students								
No	Strategies used	R6	R7	R9	R10	F	No	Strategies used	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R8	F
1	Finding interesting ideas to explain in class	1	1	2	2	6	1	Finding interesting ideas to explain in class	1						1
2	Practicing Speaking whenever possible	1	1		1	3	2	Trying to do that as I can	1				1		2
3	Preparing vocabulary as many as possible to speak	1	1	2		4	3	Feeling nervous is one of my problem in English	1						1
<b>Total</b>						<b>13</b>	4	Preparing		2	3	2	1		<b>8</b>

			vocabulary as many as possible to speak						
Average	3.3	5	Answering the question that I know	1					1
		6	Explaining some topic		1				1
		7	Telling experience to friends, trying to speak what I know clearly		1			1	2
		8	Doing best to express ideas			1			1
		9	Speaking English with friends				1		1
		10	Learning about topic and trying to understand it					1	1
			<b>Total</b>						<b>9</b>

Table 5 presents several valuable data for both group of students (the private school students and the state school students) to improve the speaking skill based on types of school. The private school students choose the strategy of finding interesting ideas to explain in class as the highest frequency while the state school students use the preparing vocabulary as many as possible to speak. For example, R2 says "I will prepare any vocabulary to speak", R3 says "I will prepare a lot of vocabulary items and practice in speaking", R4 says "I prepare a lot of vocabulary items", In addition, both group of students use a similar sense of strategies as second priority to improve the speaking skill. The strategies are practicing speaking whenever possible and speaking English with friends. For example, R7 says "I'll practice my English by making a conversation with friends, and R9 say "I'll speak without any hesitation".

Most of the students from both two groups put prior on the understanding the meaning of vocabulary items before they do speaking activity. The understanding of certain new vocabulary items will be the basis for various purposes like expressing ideas in English to other speaker, getting involved in conversation, and using English expression whenever possible.

In term of the average number of strategies used, the state school students used 3.2 strategies while the private school students used 3.3 strategies. It means the private school students used more strategies than the state school students did.

#### **K.2 Strategies used by the respondents to improve reading skill based on types of school**

Table 6 shows the detail strategies used by the respondents to improve reading skill based on types of school.

#### **Table 6 Strategies used by the respondents to improve reading skill based on types of school**

Private School Students						State School Students									
No	Strategies used	R6	R7	R9	R10	F	No	Strategies used	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R8	F
1	Reading aspects of the text	1	1	2	3	7	1	Focusing mind for the test	1						1
2	Practicing at home	1				1	2	Mastering kinds of ideas of the text	1	1	1		1		4
3	Asking friends	1				1	3	Reading aspects of the text		2	1	1	2	1	7
4	Answering the question	1				1	4	Preparing the text			1				1
5	Studying and learning the lesson		1			1	5	Doing exercise			1				1
6	Relocating the answers with the text			1		1	6	Trying to understand what the topic			1				1
<b>Total</b>						<b>12</b>	7	Relaxing mind				1			1
<b>Average</b>						<b>3</b>	8	Trying to practice and learning more vocabulary items						1	1
							<b>Total</b>								<b>17</b>
							<b>Average</b>								<b>2.8</b>

Table 6 shows several strategies used by the private school students and the state school students to improve the reading skill. Both groups of students choose similar strategies as the highest frequency that is reading aspects of the text. For example, R2 says "I'll prepare any vocabulary and I'll prepare my knowledge about the topic", R3 says "I'll prepare a lot of vocabulary items and practice them in speaking", R4 says "I'll prepare a lot of vocabulary items", R7 says "I'll prepare the material of the topic", and R10 says "I have to prepare any vocabulary that related to the topic. In addition to the highest usage of the strategies, both groups of the students also practiced a similar sense of strategies as one of the least frequency use of the strategies. The strategies are studying and learning the lesson (by the private school students) and focusing mind for the test (by the state school students). For example, R5 says "I prepare the topic material and deliver it", R7 says "I'll prepare the material of the topic", R9 says "I prepare things I should say and shouldn't say", and R10 says "I have to prepare any vocabulary that related to the topic".

Most students from both two groups emphasized on the understanding of vocabulary items as the starting point. By acknowledging certain amount of vocabulary items, the students begin to read the test and search related ideas to the questions. The understanding of reading ideas is used to do speaking or writing activity.

In term of the average number of strategies employed, the state school students used 2.8 strategies while the private school students used 3 strategies. It means the private school students used more strategies than compared to the private school students did.

### K.3 Strategies used by the respondents to improve writing skill based on types of school

Table 7 shows the detail strategies used by the respondents to improve writing skill based on types of school.

**Table 7 Strategies used by the respondents to improve writing skill based on types of school.**

Private School Students						State School Students									
No	Strategies used	R6	R7	R9	R10	F	No	Strategies used	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R8	F
1	Doing writing procedurally	6	5	3	3	17	1	Developing ideas to write	5	2	4	5	5	3	24
2	Making bubble network		1			1	3	trying to speak and writing it	1						1
3	Enjoying doing writing			1		1	4	Searching any books and information related to the topic		1					1
4	Imagining things			1		1	5	Doing Writing procedurally		1	1	1		1	4
<b>Total</b>						<b>20</b>	6	Making bubble network					1	1	2
<b>Average</b>						<b>5</b>	7	Finding the conclusion					1		1
<b>Total</b>															<b>33</b>
<b>Average</b>															<b>5.5</b>

strategies are doing writing procedurally (by the private school students) and developing ideas to write (by the state school students). For instance, R1 says "after I develop an idea I try to speak and write it as many as possible", R2 says "I will search a problem to write". R3 says "I write what it is known", R4 says "I find an interesting topic", R5 says "I'll make a bubble network and choose an interesting topic and I'll find the fact or main idea of a text and compose it sentences", and R7 says "I'll imagine the object and develop the object". In addition, the two groups of students choose similar strategies (making bubble network) as their second prior strategies. For example, R5 says "I'll make a bubble network and choose an interesting topic and I'll find the fact or main idea of a text and compose it sentences".

Most students from two groups put emphasis on "what they have known" to write. It is commonly followed by making outline of a composition in order to develop the ideas. In addition, the students also add the ideas by collecting certain related data to support their knowledge about the topic.

In term of the average number of strategies used, the state school students used 5.5 strategies while the private school students practiced 5 strategies. It means the state school students used more strategies than the private school students did.

#### K.4 Strategies used by the respondents to improve vocabulary based on types of school

Table 8 shows the detail strategies used by the respondents to improve vocabulary based on types of school.

**Table 8 Strategies used by the respondents to improve vocabulary based on types of school.**

Private School Students						State School Students									
No	Strategies used	R6	R7	R9	R10	F	No	Strategies used	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R8	F
1	Using	2	4	1	2	9	1	Using	3	3	3	2	3	2	16

	vocabulary in various language activities								vocabulary in various language activities							
2	Reading some songs lyrics and finding the meaning	1				1	2		I try to use it in speaking	1						1
3	Enriching the vocabulary items	1	1		1	3	3		Making a sentence by using new vocabulary in sentences	1		1	1			3
4	Watching movies			1		1	4		I try to practice them in speaking	1						1
5	Learning new vocabulary items from various sources			3		3	5		Preparing them before I used	1						1
6	Preparing it as a speech or persuasion ideas			1		1	6		I can understand that if I always use it in speaking	1						1
<b>Total</b>						18	7		Practicing English everyday		1					1
<b>Average</b>						4	8		Reading		1		1	1		3

speak or write clearly							
<b>Total</b>							<b>28</b>
<b>Average</b>							<b>4.7</b>

Table 8 shows the there are several strategies used by the private school students and the state school students to improve vocabulary items. Both groups of students used similar strategy that is using vocabulary in various language activities as the highest frequency use of strategies. For the second priority, each group of students used two strategies. The strategies are enriching the vocabulary items (by the private school students) and reading various English sources (by the state school students). Both groups of students regarded that knowing a lot of vocabulary items is the main target to improve the vocabulary in order to use them in related language skills such as listening, speaking, reading, writing, and structure. In other words, the students focus on how to add the number of vocabulary instead of acknowledging kinds of meanings on the vocabulary like lexical meaning, conceptual meaning, structural meaning, contextual meaning, and pragmatic meaning.

In term of the average number of strategies practice, the state school students used 4.7 strategies while the private school students used only 4.5 strategies. It means the state school students used more strategies than the private school students did.

#### K.5 Strategies used by the respondents to improve grammar based on types of school

Table 9 shows the detail strategies used by the respondents to improve grammar based on types of school



English”, R2 says “I’ll make an English sentence”, R3 says “I correct the mistakes in sentence”, R4 says “I correct the mistake in sentence”, R5 says “firstly, I look for mistakes and then correct the mistakes as good as I can”, R6 says “I’ll try to find the mistakes and correct them”, R7 says “I’ll try to find the mistakes and correct them”, R8 says “If I know the right answer, I’ll correct the mistakes”, R9 says “I follow the rules I know”, and R10 says “I follow the rules I know and use my feeling”. As the second priority of using the strategies, both groups of students did not use the same strategies as the second prior strategies, either. The private school students used three different strategies such as making English sentence, reading a book, and using the patterns of English. On the other hand, the state school students used one strategy that is correcting mistakes.

Based on the priority use of the strategies, most of students from both groups regard that understanding rules of the language as the basic element to improve grammar. Doing exercise to correct the mistakes is one of activities to get further understanding of sentence construction.

In term of the average number of strategies employed, the state school students used 5 strategies while the private school students used 4.8 strategies. It means the state school students used more strategies than the private school students did.

In short, the strategies used by the respondents to improve the four skills of English language as well as vocabulary and grammar include focusing on listening ideas of listening text, concentrating to the spoken text, finding interesting ideas to explain in class, preparing vocabulary as many as possible to speak, reading aspects of the text, using vocabulary in various language activities, using the patterns of English, and learning structure through understanding the rule of language.

## 12. The Implication of the Finding

possible to enhance the practices of each item, so that, they can increase the score of using SILL to high level. Next is that the students from academic background use certain strategies to learn English language in general and individual skills of English. They still highlight some elements like the mastery, structure rules, and ideas of the text as crucial factors to own. Based on the facts, the English teachers should equip them with such amount of knowledge which directly enhance them in order they are able to learn those language skills efficiently. In addition, the students among five group of academic should have a cooperative activities by which they are possible to work together to solve the problems of learning English.

## 13. Suggestions for Further Study.

Factors affecting language learning strategies in this study are limited to types of school. Therefore, other related or dominant factors in Indonesian context such as gender, parents’ income, ethnicity, academic streaming, successful learners, less successful learners, and gifted children should also be investigated in the near future. The successful learners can be found in a certain old age school, qualified senior high school and selected funded school. The learners are grouped in accelerated classes by which the learners are possible to shorten the terms of learning through enriching and deepening learning materials including English language. The less successful learners are mostly found in new age schools, less qualified school and at out of skirt area of Pekanbaru and other cities in Indonesia. The students should be equipped with sufficient number of learning materials, full guidance from teachers and tightly controlled by parents and school committee as well. The gifted children is found in very rare condition and type of school in Pekanbaru senior high schools and in schools of cities in Indonesia.

References (only on main matters)

## References

- Abdullah Hussein ElSalleh El-Omari (2002). *Language learning strategies employed by Jordanian secondary school learners learning English as a foreign language*. Thesis. Bangi: Faculty of Education Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Chamot & O'Malley (1987). *The cognitive academic language learning approach: A bridge to the mainstream*. TESOL Quarterly 21:227-249.
- Chamot, A.U., and Kupper, L., (1989). *Learning strategies in foreign language Instruction*. Foreign Language Annals 22: 13-24.
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley *et al.*, (1994). *The CALLA handbook: implementing cognitive academic language learning approach*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Chesterfield, R., & Chesterfield, K. B., (1985). *Natural order in children's use of second language learning strategies*. Applied Linguistics 6 (1):45-59.
- Cohen A. D., (1999). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Creswell. J. W., (2005). *Educational research. planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. New Jersey: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional (2004). *Garis-garis besar program pengajaran (education guidelines)*. Jakarta: Pusat Kurikulum Nasional.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional (2006). *Garis-garis besar program pengajaran (education guidelines)*. Jakarta: Pusat Kurikulum Nasional.
- Donato, R., & McCormick, D., (1994). *A socio-cultural perspective on language*
- Ehrman, M. , & Oxford, R., (1989). *Effects of sex differences, career choice, and Psychological type on adult language learning strategies*. Modern Language Journal 73 : 1-13.
- Ehrman, M., (1990). *Adults language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting*. Modern Language Journal 74: 311-327.
- Ferguson, G. A. 1976. *Statistical analysis in psychology and education*. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company.
- Gall D Meredith, Gall P Joyce, Borg R Walter. (2003) *Educational research an introduction*. Ometype Typography, Inc.
- Gardner, r. C., & MacIntyre P. D., (1993). *A student's contribution to second language learning: Part II, affective factors*. Language teaching 26: 1-11.
- Mohammed Amin Embi (2000). *Language learning strategies: A Malaysian context*. Bangi: Fakulti Pendidikan Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Naiman, N., Forhlich, M., Stern, H.H., & Todesco, A., (1978). *The good language language learner*. Research in Education Series, 7 . Toronto: OISE.
- Nuttal, Ch., (1981). *Teaching reading skills*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O'Malley *et al.*, & Chamot, A. U., (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, Rebecca L., (1989). *Use of language learning strategies: a synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training*, System 17: 1-13.
- Oxford, R., & Nyikos, M., (1989). *Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students*. Modern Language Journal 73: 291-300.
- Oxford, R. L., (1990a). *Use of language learning strategies: a synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training*, system 17: 235-247.

- Oxford, R. L., (1990b). *Language learning strategies: What every teachers should know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Oxford, Rebecca L., (Ed.) (1996). *Learning strategies around the world; Cross Cultural Perspectives*: Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Prabhu, N. S., (1989). *New pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rubin, J., (1975). *What the "good learner" can teach us*. TESOL Quarterly. 41-51.
- Stern, H.H., (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. 7<sup>th</sup> impression, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tarone, E., (1983). *Some thoughts on the notion of 'communication strategy' in C. Faerch and G. Kasper (Eds.). Strategies in inter-language communication*. New York: Longman.
- Tarone, E., (1987).
- Tomlinson, B., (1990). *Managing change in Indonesian high schools*. ELT Journal Vol. IV No. 1 pp 24-37.
- Wenden, A., & Rubin, J., (Eds.).(1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. Englewood Cliffs. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

