

LINGUA, JURNAL BAHASA & SASTRA, VOLUME 20, NOMOR 1, DESEMBER 2019

## The Correlations between Language Learning Strategies and English Achievement of the Undergraduate Students of English Education Study Programs

Nurul Fitriyah Almunawaroh<sup>1)</sup>  
nurul@unitaspalembang.ac.id

**Abstract:** Language learning strategies (LLS) is one of important factors in learning process. The aim of this study is to investigate the correlation between students' LLS and students' English achievement (EA) and to find the influence of students' LLS to students' EA. Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) was administered to 103 student at Sriwijaya, Muhammadiyah, and Tamansiswa universities. Students' EA was gained from their grade point average (GPA). Metacognitive strategy, affective strategy and EA had negative significant correlations. Furthermore, compensation strategy positively and significantly correlated with EA of the students in Sriwijaya-Muhammadiyah Universities. Meanwhile, affective strategy and EA of the students in Sriwijaya-Muhammadiyah, Sriwijaya, and Taman Siswa Universities were negatively and significantly correlated. Additionally, metacognitive, affective and EA of the students in Sriwijaya-Muhammadiyah Universities negatively and significantly correlated. The influence of each of the six on EA was 8.6%, 9.4%, 35.3%, 15.1%, 13%, 3.5% for affective, and 7.8% for compensation.

**Keywords:** *Language learning strategies, English achievement, undergraduate students*

**Abstrak:** Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa (SPB) merupakan salah satu faktor penting dalam proses pembelajaran. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menyelidiki hubungan korelasi antara SPB mahasiswa dan prestasi Bahasa Inggris (PBI), dan untuk mengetahui pengaruh SPB mahasiswa terhadap PBI mahasiswa. Angket *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning* (SILL) didistribusikan ke 103 mahasiswa di Universitas Sriwijaya, Muhammadiyah, dan Tamansiswa. PBI mahasiswa diperoleh dari indeks prestasi kumulatif (IPK). Strategi metakognitif, afektif, dan PBI memiliki korelasi negatif dan signifikan. Selanjutnya, strategi kompensasi berkorelasi positif dan signifikan dengan PBI mahasiswa di Universitas Sriwijaya-Muhammadiyah. Sementara itu, strategi afektif dan PBI mahasiswa di Universitas Sriwijaya-Muhammadiyah, Sriwijaya, dan Taman Siswa berkorelasi negatif dan signifikan. Selain itu, metakognitif, afektif dan PBI mahasiswa di Universitas Sriwijaya-Muhammadiyah berkorelasi negatif dan signifikan. Pengaruh masing-masing dari keenam strategi terhadap PBI mahasiswa adalah 8,6%, 9,4%, 35,3%, 15,1%, 13%, 3,5% untuk afektif, dan 7,8% untuk kompensasi.

**Kata-kata kunci:** *Strategi pembelajaran bahasa, prestasi bahasa Inggris, mahasiswa sarjana.*

---

<sup>1)</sup>Lecturer of Universitas Tamansiswa Palembang

English learning is beneficial for college students in that it can make them keep in touch with the latest development in their majors and prepare them for future jobs (Wang, 2008). However, language mastery is not an instant outcome of teaching and learning a language. Learners' achievement will vary according to a variety of factors. Internal and external factors, for example, tend to influence learners' English achievement. Ellis (1994) mentions that there are three kinds of factors of successful second language learning. One of the internal factor is language learning strategies.

As the matter of fact, there are still many problems faced by students to accomplish the target of being successful English learners. According to Annex (2010) in PISA 2009 Ranking, some Asian countries including Indonesia, have low reading achievements based on the OECD average. There are no statistically significant differences between those countries reading achievement with OECD average (493). Unfortunately, the average of Indonesia reading achievement is 402 which is lower than the average of Thailand reading achievement that is 421. Furthermore, Hadriana, Ismail, and Mahdum (2013) find out that English achievements of 120 students from 10 secondary high schools in Indonesia are in the level of Medium low. Similarly, Efrizal (2012) states that the speaking achievement of the students of the Islamic School in Bengkulu is in a very low level. Therefore, it can be concluded that English achievement of the learners in Indonesia is still in the level of medium-low.

Language learning strategies are needed to be considered in solving the problem. Ihsan & Diem (1997) explain that the internal factors, learning style and learning strategy, need to be considered when analyzing why English seems difficult to learn. Furthermore, Language learning strategies can be defined as thoughts and actions used by the students to achieve learning goals (Chamot, 2004). Six basic types of language learning strategies (metacognitive, cognitive, memory, compensation, social, and affective strategies) are classified by Oxford (1990). The students apply different learning strategies in their learning to accomplish the objectives of study. A student also may apply a number of language learning strategies. Anderson (2005) argues that the students who use a number of learning strategies will be more proficient language learners. Furthermore, the students' awareness of existing strategies

and the choices of strategies will help them to solve problems and complete tasks easily (Abhakorn, 2008). Therefore, language learning strategies give positive contributions to students' English achievement.

Considering the positive influence of English language learning strategies to the students' academic achievement and due to the medium-low level of students' academic achievement, the researcher was interested in conducting a correlational study of language learning strategies, and students' English achievement. Some studies were conducted on the correlation between LLS and academic achievement or between LLS and English proficiency rather than on the correlation between LLS and English achievement. A study done by Farooq, Chaudhry, Shafiq, & Berhanun (2011), for example, focused on the correlation between LLS and students' academic achievement. Similarly, a study done by Dhanapala, Kagamiyama, Hiroshima (2007) studied the correlation between LLS and students' English proficiency. Therefore, the current study focused on the correlation between LLS and the undergraduate students' English achievement at English Education Study Programs, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education of three universities in Palembang – Sriwijaya University, Muhammadiyah University, and Taman Siswa University.

This study was carried out to provide answers for these questions: 1) Are there any significant correlations among language learning strategies the factors of language learning strategies of the students and their English Achievement?; 2) Do language learning strategies the factors of language learning strategies of the students influence their English achievement? Therefore, the objectives of this study in particular are to investigate whether or not: 1) there are any significant correlations among language learning strategies the factors of language learning strategies of the students and their English Achievement. 2) Language learning strategies the factors of language learning strategies of the students influence their English achievement.

## **METHOD**

### **Sample**

Probabilistic sampling, multi stage cluster sampling, was used in this research because the researchers cannot easily identify the population or the population is extremely too large (Creswell, 2005). The sample that

was in second, fourth, and sixth semesters, was selected based on Arikunto's rules of sampling (2002) that is if the population of the study is too large, 10-15% or 20-25% or more students can be included as the sample. In order to have representative from each university: Sriwijaya, Muhammadiyah, and Taman Siswa Universities, the writer selected 18%, 15%, and 48% students, from each university respectively. Therefore, 103 students participated in the study. A number of 44 students were from Sriwijaya University, 41 students were from Muhammadiyah University, and 18 students were from Taman Siswa University.

### **Instrumentation**

SILL (Strategies Inventory of Language Learning) by Oxford (1990) and students' English achievement GPA transcript, were used to collect the data in this current study.

### **Strategies Inventory of Language Learning (SILL)**

The SILL was originally developed by Oxford (1990) and it was designed to assess students' learning strategies and students' learning styles. The SILL consists of 50 items, which Oxford (1990) divided it into six categories. In SILL there are 6 parts. Part A consists of nine statements refer to memory strategies, part B consists of fourteen statements refer to cognitive strategies, part C consists of 6 statements refer to compensation strategies, part D consists of nine statements refer to metacognitive strategies, part E consists of six statements refer to affective strategies, and part F consists of six statements refer to social strategies. The external validity of SILL questionnaire was measured by using content validity.

The SILL questionnaire was piloted to 25 undergraduate students of English education study program of PGRI University. There were 10, 6 and 9 students of the sixth, fourth, and second semesters respectively in the pilot study. Cronbach alpha coefficients in SPSS 17 were used to analyze the data. The SILL questionnaire was considered reliable if the alpha score must be more than 0.70 (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1990). The result showed that the reliability of the SILL questionnaire was 0.92 higher than alpha score 0.70. It showed that the SILL questionnaire is reliable.

The scoring of each item of the SILL questionnaire (Oxford, 1990) was done based on a five-point Likert scale. Each point represents the level of the participants' lev-

el of agreement, namely, 1-never true of me, 2-usually not true of me, 3-Somewhat true of me, 4-usually true of me, 5-always true of me. The following are the key and scale to understand the use of SILL (Oxford, 1990):

1. High:  
Always or almost always used 4.5 to 5.0; Usually used 3.5 to 4.4
2. Medium: Sometimes used 2.5 to 3.4
3. Low:  
Generally not used 1.5 to 2.4;  
Never or almost never used 1.0 to 1.4

### **Data Analysis**

Data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine language learning strategies and English achievement of the students. The score were transferred into scales based on the categories discussed in the instrumentations part. Pearson Product Moment Correlation in SPSS 17 was applied in this study in order to investigate whether significant correlations existed between the predictor variables (language learning strategies) and the moderator variable (students' English achievement, i.e., their GPA in four English skills). The following interpretations are the value of the correlation coefficients by Cohen and Manion (1994) (as cited in Cresswell, 2005, p.333-334):

$r = .20 - .35$  is considered a weak relationship.

$r = .35 - .65$  is considered a moderate relationship.

$r = .66 - .85$  is considered a strong relationship.

$r = .86 -$  above is considered a very strong relationship.

To gain deeper understanding on the correlation between LLS and students' EA, the data of students' LLS and EA were analyzed in several ways as follows:

1. the analysis on LLS and EA of students in all universities;
2. the analysis on LLS and EA of students in each university;
3. the analysis on the combination of LLS and EA of students in Sriwijaya and Muhammadiyah universities;
4. the analysis on the combination of LLS and EA of students in Sriwijaya and Muhammadiyah Universities;
5. the analysis on the combination of LLS and EA of students in Tamansiswa and Muhammadiyah Universities.

Regression analysis was conducted to complement correlation coefficient analysis.

The F-test was used to test the significance. If the value of F-obtained exceeds the value of F-table, it suggests that the predictor variables (language learning strategies) significantly determine the moderator variable (students' English achievement). On the other hand, if the value of F-table exceeds the value of F-obtained, it means that parents' socioeconomic status and language learning strategies do not significantly determine the students' English achievement.

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

To study the nature of the data distribution, descriptive statistics was conducted. Table 1, 2, and 3 presented the descriptive results of the three instruments: the SILL and English

achievement of the students.

The data of students' language learning strategies showed that in all universities (N=103), the students generally used metacognitive strategies in which 66% students usually used it in learning. Meanwhile, in Sriwijaya University (N=44), the students generally used compensation strategies in which 63.6% students usually used it in learning. Furthermore, in Muhammadiyah (N=41) and Taman Siswa Universities (N=18), the students generally used metacognitive strategies in which 78.04% students of Muhammadiyah University and 44.4% students of Taman Siswa university usually used it in learning.

**Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Language Learning Strategies**

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	High	Medium	Low		
			Always or Almost Always used	Usually Used	Sometimes Used	Generally Not Used	Never or Almost Never Used
<b>All Universities</b>							
Metacognitive	3.9159	.58845	14.5%	66%	16.5%	2.91%	-
<b>Sriwijaya</b>							
Compensation	3.7348	.60288	9.09%	63.6%	22.7%	4.54%	-
<b>Muhammadiyah</b>							
Metacognitive	4.1409	.44098	17.07%	78.04%	4.87%	-	-
<b>Tamansiswa</b>							
Metacognitive	3.9383	.64364	33.3%	44.4%	22.2%	-	-

The students from whole universities in this study generally used metacognitive strategies. They tended to compensate for missing knowledge, i.e. trying to link already known material with a new material, arranging and planning learning. The students mostly used metacognitive strategies probably because they feel and agree that they did notice their mistakes in English and they learnt from their mistakes, they paid attention to someone who were speaking English, they planned their schedule to practice English. Those strategies or actions belong to metacognitive strategies. The next preferred strategies used by samples in this study were affective strategies. The students used affective strategies as the second favorable strategies to use was due to the students' feeling. They felt and agreed that they did the affective strategies in learning such as lowering their anxiety in learning

by trying to relax whenever they feel afraid of using English, encouraging themselves to speak English although they are afraid of making mistakes, and rewarding themselves when they can complete task. Therefore, the students used metacognitive and affective strategies as their strategies due to their agreement and their feeling that they more often used metacognitive and affective strategies than the other strategies in learning. These results were consistent with the finding of Shmais (2004) showing that metacognitive strategies are used more frequently.

The data of students' English achievement (N=103) showed that, the students (59.1%) who use all LLS strategies generally had very satisfactory English achievement. Meanwhile the fewer the strategies the students used in learning English, the lower their English achievement.

**Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of LLS and English Achievement of Students**

Students' LLS	English Achievement	
	Satisfactory	Very Satisfactory & Cum Laude
6 Strategies	17.47%	55.3%
5 Strategies	2.91%	20.37%
4 Strategies	3.88%	2.91%
3 Strategies	0.97%	0.97%
2 Strategies	-	0.97%

The results of language learning strategies and English achievement explained that the students who used more strategies had higher English achievement compared to the students who used less strategies. In line with Green and Oxford's (1995) finding showed that more successful language learners use greater language learning strategies. Furthermore, Anderson (2005) finds out that the students who use a number of learning strategies are more proficient language learners compared to students who use less learning strategies. Therefore, it is advisable to the students of current studies to use more strategies in learning English in order to help them in learning and overcome the problem as well as to be better language learners.

**The Results of Correlation between LLS and English Achievement of Students**

The results on correlation analysis showed that there was a significant negative correlations between metacognitive strategies and

English achievement, and affective strategies and English achievement of students in all universities (N=103) ( $r = -0.197, -0.293$ , respectively,  $p < 0.05, p < 0.01$ ). Furthermore, there were significant negative correlations between affective strategies and English achievement of students in Sriwijaya (N=44) ( $r = -0.306, p < 0.05$ ), Taman Siswa (N=18) ( $r = -0.594, p < 0.01$ ), in Sriwijaya-Muhammadiyah (N=85) ( $r = -0.223, p < 0.05$ ), Sriwijaya-Taman Siswa (N=62) ( $r = -0.360, p < 0.01$ ), and Taman siswa-Muhammadiyah Universities (N=59) ( $r = -0.291, p < 0.05$ ). In addition, a significant correlation between metacognitive strategies and English achievement of students existed in Sriwijaya-Taman Siswa Universities (N=62) ( $r = -0.260, p < 0.05$ ). A positive significant correlation only existed between compensation strategies and English achievement of students in Sriwijaya-Muhammadiyah Universities (N=85) ( $r = 0.279, p < 0.01$ ).

**Table 3. Correlation between LLS and English Achievement of Students**

	LLS	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social
English Achievement	-.079 .426	-.091 .363	.024 .809	.172 .082	-.197* .046	-.293** .003	.018 .854
(All Universities)							
English Achievement	-.155 .316	-.021 .892	.050 .750	-.182 .237	-.231 .132	-.306* .043	-.166 .281
(UNSRI)							
English Achievement	.172 .281	.032 .841	.103 .521	.243 .126	.303 .054	-.013 .937	.012 .939
(UMP)							
English Achievement	-.199 .428	-.117 .643	.167 .507	-.315 .203	-.280 .261	-.594** .009	.165 .513
(TAMSIS)							
English Achievement	-.037 .735	-.103 .349	.020 .852	.279** .010	-.187 .086	-.223* .040	.061 .579
(UNSRI-UMP)							
English Achievement	-.140 .279	-.075 .562	.100 .439	-.149 .249	-.260* .041	-.360** .004	.012 .925
(UNSRI-TAMSIS)							
English Achievement	-.055 .678	.009 .943	.017 .901	.079 .550	.021 .877	-.291* .025	-.125 .344
(TAMSIS-UMP)							

\* TAMSIS= Tamansiswa University \* UNSRI= Sriwijaya University \* UMP= Muhammadiyah University

The factors of language learning strategies (metacognitive and affective strategies) in the analysis of whole samples in whole universities ( $N=103$ ) were significantly and negatively correlated with students' English achievement. The results suggested that the high the students used metacognitive strategies and affective strategies, the lower English achievement they had. This finding is in line with Green and Oxford's (1995) finding showed,

"The only strategy showing negative variation (more use by less successful students) was item 42 in affective strategies, noticing tension or nervousness, and this is a strategy the learners might be expected to use more frequently than their peers" (2013, p.287).

Therefore, it was concluded that negative significant correlation appeared due to the highly preference of one strategies chosen by the students.

Meanwhile, memory, cognitive, compensation, and social strategies did not significantly correlate with students' English achievement. This finding is in contrast with the result of similar study conducted by Tam showed that compensation, cognitive and social strategies had significant correlations with English proficiency of the students, while metacognitive and affective strategies did not significantly correlated with English proficiency of the students (Tam, 2013). Furthermore, another reason of the absence of significant correlations and the negative significant correlations among variables was due to the semester the students were at. In this current study the samples that were selected from the second, fourth, and sixth semesters. Green and Oxford' finding (1995) showed that intermediate level students used greater compensation, metacognitive, and social strategies compared to basic level students, and basic level students used greater compensation, metacognitive, and social strategies compared to pre-basic level students. Furthermore, Ihsan and Diem (1997) find out that semesters even though did not influence male students' memory strategy, but it affected female students' use of the compensation strategy, visual preference only affected male's memory and affective learning strategies, and for female it affected metacognitive and social learning strategies. And auditory preference, tactile preference, and semester contribute to the use of language learning strategies in

female students. In addition, the students who were motivated to use a strategy might fail to do so because of the interference from other variables such as task, anxiety, situation, attitude, self-confidence, goals, and motivation (MacIntyre, 1994 as cited in Green & Oxford, 1995). Therefore, it was concluded that the absence and the negative significant correlations among variables of language learning strategies and English achievement of the students in this current study cannot be separated from the effects of the interference of other variables such semester, gender, and strategies preference.

The negative significant correlations were also found between affective strategies and students' English achievement in Sriwijaya University ( $N=44$ ) and in Taman Siswa University ( $N =18$ ). It means the more the students used affective strategies, the lower English achievement they had. The negative correlation happened due to the highly preference of one strategies chosen by students, semesters, and gender of the students that had been explained before. Furthermore, in using metacognitive strategies, the students are required to link the new knowledge to the previous knowledge, organize and set goals and objectives of their learning, identify the purpose of their learning, and evaluate their learning (Brown, 2007, p.141). It meant negative correlation also appeared because of the lack of knowledge in how to use the strategies appropriately. Therefore, Greener and Oxford (2013) noted that the strategies used involved active use of the target language, with a strong emphasis on practice in natural situations. It implied that the students were suggested to use a number of strategies with practice. Meanwhile, memory, cognitive, and social strategies did not significantly correlate with students' English achievement. This finding is in contrast with the result of similar study conducted by Tam and Ketabi showed that compensation, cognitive and social strategies had significant correlations with English proficiency of the students, while metacognitive and affective strategies did not significantly correlated with English proficiency of the students (Tam, 2013; Ketabi, 2012).

Furthermore, statistically negative significant correlations were found between affective strategies and English achievement in Tamansiswa – Muhammadiyah Universities, between metacognitive strategies and students' English achievement, and between affective strategies and students'

English achievement in Sriwijaya–Taman Siswa Universities, and between affective strategies and English achievement in Sriwijaya–Muhammadiyah Universities. The results implied that affective strategies and metacognitive strategies gave negative contribution to the changes of students’ English achievement in Taman Siswa–Muhammadiyah Universities, in Sriwijaya–Taman Siswa, and in Sriwijaya–Muhammadiyah Universities. In line with the findings of studies conducted by Ketabi (2012) showed that there were significant correlations among subsystem of language learning strategies and English proficiency. The negative correlation indicated that the more the students used affective and metacognitive strategies the lower English achievement they had. The reasons of the existence of negative correlations among affective strategies, metacognitive strategies and English achievement of the students were because different number of the sample when the analyses were conducted in whole sample of whole universities, in the analysis in sample of each university, and in the analysis in the combination sample of two universities. The additional reasons of the existence of negative correlations among affective strategies, metacognitive strategies and English achievement of the students were due to their

strategies preference, semesters, and gender that had been discussed. On the other hand, a positive significant correlation only existed on the correlation between compensation strategies and students’ English achievement in Sriwijaya–Muhammadiyah Universities. The result showed that the more students used compensation strategies, the better English achievement they had. This result was in line with the finding of the study conducted by Tam (2013) showed that compensation strategies significantly associated with the students’ English proficiency. It implied that compensation strategies, one of the direct strategies, allowed the students to use linguistic clues in guessing intelligently when they were answering vocabulary test, and also allowed the students to overcome the problems that they faced in speaking and writing by switching to the mother tongue, using mime or gesture, using synonym, and many else. Those conditions resulted in students’ deeper understanding about the material (see Brown, 2007, p.141).

**Prediction of Students’ English Achievement by LLS Factors**

The results of regression analyses revealed which variables were important in predicting students’ English Achievement.

**Table 4. Regression analysis for LLS and English Achievement of the Students**

Model	Predictor	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	F Change	df	Sig. F Change
All students (N=103)	Affective Strategies	.239	.086	.077	9.507	1	.003
Students in Sriwijaya University (N=44)	Affective Strategies	.306	.094	.072	4.338	1	.043
Students in Taman-siswa University (N=18)	Affective Strategies	.594	.353	.312	8.723	1	.009
Students in Sriwijaya & Muhammadiyah Universities (N=85)	Compensation Strategies	.279	.078	.067	6.995	1	.010
Students in Sriwijaya & Muhammadiyah Universities (N=85)	Affective Strategies	.388	.151	.130	7.063	1	.009
Students in Sriwijaya & Tamansiswa Universities (N=62)	Affective Strategies	.360	.130	.115	8.940	1	.004
Students in Taman-siswa & Muhammadiyah Universities (N=59)	Affective Strategies	.291	.085	.069	5.288	1	.025

Affective strategies in all universities (N=103), Sriwijaya (N=44), Tamansiswa (N=18), Sriwijaya-Muhammadiyah (N=85), Sriwijaya-Taman Siswa (N=62), and Tamansiswa-Muhammadiyah universities could predict students' English achievement by explaining 8.6%, 9.4%, 35.3%, 15.1%, 13%, and 8.5% respectively of the changes in students' English achievement. Additionally, compensation strategies in Sriwijaya-Muhammadiyah Universities (N=85) could predict students' English achievement by explaining 7.8% of the changes in students' English achievement.

The results of regression analysis revealed that affective strategies were the best predictor of the changes in the students' English achievement in the analysis of the sample in each university. While, language learning strategies, the factors of language learning strategies did not affect the students' English achievement in Muhammadiyah University (N = 41). This happened due to the score of English achievement in Muhammadiyah University. It was found out that students' English achievement in Muhammadiyah University was the lowest English achievement compared to the other two universities in this current study. Additionally, compensation strategies were the best predictor on the changes of the students' English achievement in Sriwijaya-Muhammadiyah Universities

## CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the results of the study it can be concluded that there is no significant correlation between students' language learning strategies<sub>(total)</sub> and students' English achievement. Therefore, language learning strategies<sub>(total)</sub> fail to affect the students' English achievement. Whereas, some strategies can affect the students' English achievement and some cannot. It happens due to the interference from other variables such as strategies preference, gender, anxiety, situation, attitude, self-confidence, goals, practice and motivation. significant correlations exist between metacognitive strategies and students' English achievement; and between affective strategies and students' English achievement. But, it has to be noted that the correlation between metacognitive strategies and students' English achievement; and between affective strategies and students' English achievement are negative. Metacognitive strategies and affective strategies give negative contribution to the

changes of the students' English achievement which means the more the students use metacognitive and affective strategies, the lower English achievements they have. These phenomenon happen due to some other factors affecting the use of the strategies, for example strategies preference, gender, anxiety, situation, attitude, self-confidence, goals, and motivation that cause the negative contribution given by metacognitive and affective strategies. Meanwhile, memory, cognitive, and social strategies did not significantly correlate to students' English achievement. Some other factors (practice, semester, and sample size) became the answer why there were no significant correlations among those variables. The last is a significant positive correlation between compensation strategies and students' English achievement exists in Sriwijaya-Muhammadiyah Universities. It shows that compensation strategies influence the changes on the students' English achievement. By using compensation strategies, the students are allowed to use other clues in learning, switch to the mother tongue, get help, use mime or gesture, and use synonym in learning and in overcoming problems in studying English. The negative correlation between metacognitive strategies and students' English achievement, affective strategies and students' English achievement appeared because the students lacked of knowledge in how to use the strategies appropriately and the students had different English proficiency level, semesters, and strategies preference. Therefore, it is suggested to the students to use strategies actively to the target language, with a strong emphasis on practice in natural situations. It is also advisable to the students of current studies to use more strategies in learning English in order to help them in learning and overcome the problem as well as to be better language learners. Additionally, in order to avoid negative results of using language learning strategies and to let the students know their learning strategies that can help them perform better in learning, it is better if language learning strategies become one of the subjects taught in teacher training programs.

Affective and compensation strategies give the most contribution to the changes of students' English language achievement. Therefore, it is suggested that further study regarding the use of both of the strategies in English language learning is highly suggested to be conducted in experiment study to see



whether or not the strategies significantly give positive effect to students' English achievement.

## REFERENCES

- Abhakorn, J. (2008). The implications of learner strategies for second or foreign language teaching. *ARECLS*, 5, 186-204.
- Anderson, N. J. (2005). L2 strategy research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp.757-772). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Annex (2010). *PISA 2009 ranking by mean score for reading, mathematics and science*, Ontario: EQAO. Retrieved from <http://www.moe.gov.sg/media/press/files/2010/annex-pisa-2010.pdf>
- Arikunto, S. (2002). *Prosedur penelitian suatu pendekatan praktek*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in language learning strategy research and teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 1(1), 14-26.
- Cohen, A. D. (2005, July). *Coming to terms with language learner strategies: What do strategy experts think about the terminology and where would they direct their research?* (Issue Brief No. 12). Minnesota, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). New Jersey, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Dhanapala, K. V., Kagamiyama, & Hiroshima, H. (2007). Focus on language learning strategies of advanced learners in Japan and Sri Lanka. *Journal of International Development and Cooperation*, 13(1), 153-164.
- Efrizal, D. (2012). Improving students' speaking through communicative language teaching method at Mts Ja-alhaq, sentot ali basa Islamic boarding school of Bengkulu, Indonesia. *International Journals of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(20), 153-164.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farooq, M. S., Chaudhry, A. H., Shafiq, M., & Berhanun, G. (2011). Factors affecting students' quality of academic performance: A case of secondary school level. *Journal of Quality and Technology Management*, 7(2), 1-14.
- Fraenkel, J. & Wallen, N. (1990). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, l2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 261-297.
- Hadriana, Ismail, M. A., & Mahdum. (2013). The relationship between motivations and self-Learning and the English language achievement in secondary high school students. *Asian Social Science*, 9(12), 36-43.
- Ihsan, D. & Diem, C. D. (1997). The learning styles and language learning strategies of the EFL students at tertiary level. *The Journal of Education*, 4, 319-332.
- Ketabi, S. (2012). Can learning strategies predict language proficiency? A case in Iranian EFL context. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4(4), 407-418.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1994). Toward a social psychological model of strategy use. *Foreign Language Annals*, 27, 185-195.
- Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers
- PIRLS. (2005). *Progress in international reading literacy study PIRLS 2006 learning to read survey*: Massachusetts, MA: IEA.
- Shmais, W. A. (2004). The English language learning strategies of an-najah national university EFL majors. *Journal of the Islamic University of Gaza*, 12(1), 51-75.
- Tam, K. C. (2013). A study on language learning strategies (LLSs) of university students in Hong Kong. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics*, 11(2), 1-42.
- Wang, F. X. (2008). Motivation and English achievement: An explanatory and confirmatory factor analysis of a new measure for Chinese students of English learning. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 10(3), 633-646.