

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings of investigation and discussion related to the problem of this research.

4.1 Finding

The findings are to answer the first and second problems of this study. This part will be divided into some actions: the application of language learning strategies by different proficiency students, high, intermediate and low students and the correlation between language learning strategies and English proficiency.

4.1.1 Language Learning Strategy Applied by High English Proficiency

Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistic of language learning strategies applied by high English proficiency students

No	Language Learning Strategies Variables	Mean	Rank Order of Usage
1	Metacognitive	3.75	1
2	Compensation	3.74	2
3	Cognitive	3.52	3
4	Social	3.46	4
5	Affective	3.28	5
6	Memory	3.04	6
7	Overall	3.46	

Based on the table above, it is shown that high English proficiency students are in medium level with mean score 3.46. Memory variable has mean score 3.04 that fall into sixth rank of usage. For cognitive variable, the mean score is 3.52 as the third rank of usage. Then, compensation variable is in the second rank of usage that has

mean score 3.74. Next is metacognitive variable with mean score 3.75 as the first rank of usage. Then, fifth rank of usage is affective variable which has mean score 3.28. The last is social variable as the fourth rank of usage that has mean score 3.45.

4.1.2 Language Learning Strategy Applied by Intermediate English Proficiency

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistic of language learning strategies applied by intermediate English proficiency students

No	Language Learning Strategies Variables	Mean	Rank Order of Usage
1	Compensation	3.33	1
2	Metacognitive	3.26	2
3	Memory	3.07	3
4	Cognitive	3.07	3
5	Affective	3	4
6	Social	2.91	5
7	Overall	3.10	

Based on the table above, it is shown that intermediate English proficiency students are in medium level with the score 3.10. Memory variable has mean score 3.07 as the third rank of usage. For cognitive variable, it has mean score 3.07 which is similar to memory variable which fall into third rank of usage. Then, compensation variable falls into first rank of usage that has mean score 3.33. Next is metacognitive variable as the second rank of usage whose mean is 3.26. Affective variable as the fourth rank of usage has mean score 3.00. The last is social variable as the fifth rank of usage that has mean score 2.91.

4.1.3 Language Learning Strategies Applied by Low English Proficiency

Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics of language learning strategies applied by low English proficiency students

No	Language Learning Strategies Variables	Mean	Rank Order of Usage
1	Affective	3.22	1
2	Metacognitive	3.19	2
3	Cognitive	3.15	3
4	Compensation	3.09	4
5	Memory	2.94	5
6	Social	2.72	6
7	Overall	3.05	

Based on the table above, it is shown that low English proficiency students are in medium level with mean score 3.05. The fifth rank of usage is memory variable with mean score 2.94. For cognitive variable, it has mean score 3.15 as the third rank of usage. Then, compensation variable is in the fourth rank of usage with mean score 3.09. Next is the second rank of usage, metacognitive variable whose mean is 3.19. Then, affective variable has mean score 3.22 fall into the first rank of usage. The last is social variable that has mean score 2.72 is the sixth rank of usage.

From those explanations, it can be explain more detail as shown on the table of comparison below:

Table 4.4 comparison of high, intermediate and low English proficiency students

No	Level of Proficiency	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social	Overall
1	High	3.04	3.52	3.74	3.75	3.28	3.45	3.46
2	Intermediate	3.07	3.07	3.33	3.26	3	2.91	3.10
3	Low	2.94	3.15	3.09	3.19	3.22	2.72	3.05

From table 4.4, it can be concluded that high, intermediate and low English proficiency students are in medium level. The results score are related to their level of proficiency. Although they are in the same level, but the highest score belongs to high English proficiency students with score 3.46 followed by intermediate English proficiency students with score 3.10 and the lowest score is 3.05 that belongs to low English proficiency students. Metacognitive strategies are the most frequently used strategies for high English proficiency students, while intermediate students use compensation strategies and low English proficiency students use affective strategies more frequently.

4.1.4 Overall use of Language Learning Strategies

Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistics of overall use of language learning strategies

Language Learning Strategies	Mean	Rank Order of Usage
Compensation	3.38	1
Metacognitive	3.35	2
Cognitive	3.18	3
Affective	3.08	4
Memory	3.05	5
Social	2.99	6
Overall	3.17	

Based on the table above, it is shown that 11th grade students are in medium level whose mean is 3.17. The first rank of usage is compensation strategies whose mean is 3.38. Then, second rank of usage fall into metacognitive strategies whose mean is 3.35. Third rank of usage is cognitive strategies whose mean is 3.18. Then, affective strategies whose mean is 3.08 fall into the fourth rank of usage. Fifth rank of usage is memory strategies whose mean is 3.05. The last is social strategies whose

mean is 2.99 fall into the sixth rank of usage. So, it can be seen that all 11th grade students applied all six types of language learning strategies. Meanwhile, the strategies most frequently used by the students are compensation strategies, while the strategies rarely used are social strategies.

4.1.5 The Significance difference among high, intermediate, and low English proficiency students

To investigate the significant difference among high, intermediate, and low English proficiency students, the writer calculated the data using One Way ANOVA. The result is there is a significance difference of language learning strategies among high, intermediate, and low English proficiency students. It is proven by the significance value of ANOVA is 0.009 which is < 0.05 .

4.1.6 The Correlation between English Proficiency and Language Learning Strategy

As mentioned in chapter 3, to investigate the correlation between English proficiency and language learning strategy, the writer tested the data using *Pearson Product Moment Correlation*.

4.1.6.1 The Correlation between English Proficiency and Language Learning

Strategy used by High English Proficiency of 11th Grade Students

The correlation between high English proficiency and language learning strategies are explained in the table below:

Table 4.6 correlation between high English proficiency and language learning strategies

High Proficiency Students	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social
Pearson Correlation	.131	.377	.207	.406*	.275	.376
Sig. (2-tailed)	.543	.069	.333	.049	.194	.070
N	24	24	24	24	24	24

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The correlation table above shows that memory has $r = .131$ means that memory strategy has very low positive correlation with high proficiency. For cognitive, it has $r = .377$ means that cognitive strategy has low positive correlation with high proficiency. Compensation has $r = .207$ means that compensation strategy has low positive correlation with high proficiency. For metacognitive, it has $r = .406$ means that metacognitive strategy has sufficient low correlation with high proficiency. Affective has $r = .275$ means that affective strategy has low positive correlation with high proficiency. For social, it has $r = .376$ means that social strategy has low positive correlation with high proficiency. According to the significant value, metacognitive variable has positive significant correlation with high proficiency. It is

known from the value of Sig. (2-tailed) correlation between metacognitive and high proficiency is 0.049 which is $< \alpha$ ($\alpha = 0.05$). For memory, cognitive, compensation, affective, and social variables which have no significant correlation with high proficiency are known from value of Sig. (2-tailed) correlation of each variable and high proficiency for 0.543, 0.069, 0.333, 0.194, and 0.070 which are $> \alpha$ ($\alpha = 0.05$). It means that metacognitive strategies are the only strategies that give the positive influence significantly to high English proficiency students in their language learning process while other strategies including memory, cognitive, compensation, affective and social strategies do not give influences to their learning process. In other words, if students use more metacognitive strategies in their language learning process, their English proficiency will increase significantly.

4.1.6.2 The Correlation between English Proficiency and Language Learning Strategy used by Intermediate English Proficiency of 11th Grade Students

The correlation between intermediate English proficiency and language learning strategies are explained in the table below:

Table 4.7 correlation between intermediate English proficiency and language learning strategies

Intermediate Proficiency Students	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social
Pearson Correlation	-.084	.072	.193	.146	-.041	-.019
Sig. (2-tailed)	.431	.499	.068	.170	.700	.862
N	90	90	90	90	90	90

The correlation table above shows that memory has $r = -.084$ means that memory strategy has very low negative correlation with intermediate proficiency. Cognitive has $r = .072$ means that cognitive strategy has very low positive correlation with intermediate proficiency. Compensation has $r = .193$ means that compensation strategy has very low positive correlation with intermediate proficiency. Metacognitive has $r = .146$ means that metacognitive strategy has very low positive correlation with intermediate proficiency. Affective has $r = -.041$ means that affective strategy has very low negative correlation with intermediate proficiency. Social has $r = -.019$ means that social strategy has very low negative correlation with intermediate proficiency. According to the significant value, all independent variables do not have significant correlation with intermediate proficiency which are known from the value of Sig. (2-tailed) correlation of all independent variables and intermediate proficiency which are $> \alpha$ ($\alpha = 0.05$). It means that all strategies including memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social strategies do not give any significant influence in their language learning process.

4.1.6.3 The Correlation between English Proficiency and Language Learning

Strategy used by Low English Proficiency of 11th Grade Students

The correlation between high English proficiency and language learning strategies are explained in the table below:

Table 4.8 correlation between low English proficiency and language learning strategies

Low Proficiency Students	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social
Pearson Correlation	-.459*	-.030	-.368	-.263	-.278	-.398
Sig. (2-tailed)	.042	.898	.110	.263	.236	.082
N	20	20	20	20	20	20

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The correlation table above shows that memory has $r = -.459$ means that memory strategy has negative sufficient correlation with low proficiency. Cognitive has $r = -.30$ means that cognitive strategy has very low negative correlation with low proficiency. Compensation has $r = -.368$ means that compensation strategy has low negative correlation with low proficiency. Metacognitive has $r = -.263$ means that metacognitive strategy has low negative correlation with low proficiency. Affective has $r = -.278$ means that affective strategy has low negative correlation with low proficiency. Social has $r = -.398$ means that social strategy has low negative correlation with low proficiency. According to the significant value, there is significant negative correlation between memory and low English proficiency which has sig. (2-tailed) 0.042 which is $< \alpha$ ($\alpha = 0.05$). Other independent variables such as cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social strategies do not have significant correlation with low proficiency which are known from the value of Sig. (2-tailed) correlation of all independent variables and low proficiency which are $> \alpha$

($\alpha = 0.05$). It means that low English proficiency students who use more memory strategies in their language learning process will get their proficiency lower.

4.2 Discussion

4.2.1 Language Learning Strategies Applied by High, Intermediate and Low English Proficiency Students

As table 4.1 presents students in high English proficiency level use more metacognitive strategies than other strategies. It is supported by mean score 3.75 as the highest number and the first rank of usage than others. They use more metacognitive strategies to improve their English skills. As Oxford (1990) states that metacognitive strategies help learners to regulate their learning. The examples of metacognitive strategies focus on the lesson during the class, have good plans in learning, always seek opportunities in practicing language and have self-monitoring, etc. In other words, high English proficiency students tend to make up their knowledge impairment and manage their own learning by doing metacognitive strategies more frequently than other strategies.

High English proficiency students intend to do all their activities tidily by having plan and preparation in learning language. It can be figured out from their efforts in SMAN 3 submission test that require the applicants to have high ability in English. It indicates that the students have already had metacognitive strategies in their language learning process.

The character of high English proficiency students is reflected in Chamot's statement (2004, p.14) that strategic learners have metacognitive knowledge about their own thinking and learning approaches, a good understanding of what a task entails, and the ability to orchestrate the strategies that best meet both the task demands and their own learning strengths.

What students in high English proficiency do is reflected in Kato's (2005) study result that students in non-English speaking countries who always practice and seek opportunities to improve their knowledge in English will be more successful than students who just study English at their desk or in the classroom.

The second rank strategy used by high English proficiency students is compensation strategy. It is supported by mean score 3.74. The third rank is cognitive strategy whose mean is 3.52. The fourth rank is social strategy whose mean is 3.45. The fifth rank is affective strategy whose mean is 3.28. The last rank fall into memory strategy whose mean score is 3.04.

It is similar with Zhao's study and Kato's study that ranked memory strategies as the last rank. The result of high English proficiency is the same with Albuainain's study (2010) on English majors at Qatar University that metacognitive strategies have the higher percentage than other strategies. Besides, it is also similar with Kato's findings (2005) on Japanese University students which mentioned that more proficient learners used metacognitive strategies more often than other strategies. As Oxford (1990, p.136) states that metacognitive strategies provide a way for learners to coordinate their own learning process.

From those statements, it can be concluded that metacognitive strategies are excellent strategies to improve student's proficiency in learning new language. It is proven by students with high English proficiency.

Next level is intermediate English proficiency as presented in table 4.2. The table shows that the highest mean is 3.33 that compensation strategies fall into first rank. It means that students in this level are applying more compensation strategies such as guessing intelligently or using gestures when they could not say certain English words.

Oxford (1990, p.90) states that the compensation strategies help learners to overcome knowledge limitation in all four skills and for beginning and intermediate learners, these strategies might be among the most important used.

SMAN 3 Malang guides students in their learning process by applying KTSP (*Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan*) curriculum. This curriculum demands students to be creative, independent and active in learning. That is the reason why compensation strategies are the most frequently used strategies for students' language learning process to improve their skills in English.

The second rank strategies used by intermediate English proficiency students fall into metacognitive strategy whose mean is 3.26. Next, cognitive strategy whose mean is 3.077 fall into third rank. The fourth rank is memory strategy whose mean score is 3.07. The fifth rank is affective strategy whose mean is 3. The last (sixth rank) is social strategy with mean score 2,91.

The results are almost the same with Zhao's study (2009) on Chinese undergraduate students in Assumption University Thailand that the ranking of the six strategy categories in the SILL according to the frequency of use are compensation, metacognitive, cognitive, affective, social, and memory strategies. The difference is Zhao's study ranked memory strategies as the sixth rank while this study found social strategies as sixth or the last rank.

The last was low English proficiency level as presented in table 4.3. The table showed that the highest mean is 3.22. It means that students in this level are more often applying affective strategy that helps them to control their emotions, motivations, and attitudes when they are making mistakes while learning a language. Those are using progressive relaxation, deep breathing or meditation, using music to soothe the soul, using laughter, making positive statements to be more confident, taking risks wisely by willing to make mistakes to learn and rewarding themselves by having vacation.

Students with low English proficiency use affective strategies to improve their skills and proficiency. Perhaps, they use more affective strategies because they prefer doing activities that need less concentration and contain fun such as listening to music, having vacations, etc. then studying which needs more concentration.

Next, low English proficiency students use metacognitive strategies that fall into second rank with mean 3.19. Next is cognitive strategy which fall into third rank with mean score 3.15. The fourth rank is compensation strategy with mean score 3.09. Memory strategy is in the fifth rank with mean score 2.94. The last is social

strategy as the sixth strategy used by the students at low proficiency level with mean score 2.72.

The results of low English proficiency students that use more affective strategies must be combined by other strategies that need more focus and concentration on lesson. However, affective strategies are important as Oxford (1990, p.140) states that good language learners often control the emotions and attitude about learning.

For low English proficiency students, affective strategies cannot be the only main source for learning new language, but they should apply other strategies to complete their learning process and to improve their proficiency in English.

Related to the previous studies, Al-Buainain's (2010) study found out that the students preferred to use more metacognitive strategies than other strategies while Zhao's (2009) study found out that the most strategy frequently used was compensation strategies. The result of Al Buainain's study has similarity with this study especially in the strategies of high English proficiency students who use more metacognitive. While Zhao's finding is similar with the result of this study especially in strategies of intermediate English proficiency students who use more compensation strategies in their language learning. On the other hand, the different results from those previous studies are found in this study especially in strategies of low English proficiency students who use more affective strategies in their language learning.

From the results, it is clearly stated that metacognitive strategies can bring the students into high English proficiency level. Therefore, students who are classified

into intermediate and low English proficiency level do not get high score because they do not apply much metacognitive strategies in their language learning process.

As table 4.4 shows high English proficiency students use strategies more frequently than intermediate and low English proficiency students. It is proven by score of the use of strategies is 3.46 which is higher than intermediate English proficiency students with score 3.10 and low English proficiency students with score 3.05.

The study results accept the hypothesis that high English proficiency students use strategies more frequently than intermediate and low English proficiency students.

From the result of One Way ANOVA test, it is clearly stated that there is a significance difference of using language learning strategies among high, intermediate, and low English proficiency students. It is proven by the significance value is 0.009 which is lower than 0.05.

4.2.2 The Correlation between English Proficiency and Language Learning Strategies

The correlation between high English proficiency and language learning strategy is presented in table 4.6. The table presents that there is a significant sufficient positive correlation between metacognitive strategy and high English proficiency. It is known that correlation value is $r = .406$ and the significant value is $0.049 (< 0.05)$, while other strategies such as memory, cognitive, compensation,

affective and social strategies do not have any significant correlation with high English proficiency. It is known from the significant values which are higher than 0.05. Therefore, those other strategies do not give any influence to high English proficiency in their language learning process.

It can be concluded that metacognitive strategies are the only strategies which give positive influence to high English proficiency students in their language learning process. Metacognitive strategies are successful to bring students in high English proficiency level into good result. It means they can improve their learning by using metacognitive strategies if they want to improve their skills in learning new language.

The result is also similar with Zhao's study (2009) on Chinese undergraduate students that the strongest correlation is between metacognitive strategies and English grades. The positive correlation found in his research indicated that the better grades used the strategy more frequently.

Next is the correlation analysis between intermediate English proficiency and language learning strategies that is shown in table 4.7. The finding shows that all strategies such as memory, cognitive, compensation, affective and social strategies have the significant values which are higher than 0.05. It means that those strategies have insignificant correlation with intermediate English proficiency students. From the explanation, it can be concluded that all strategies do not give any positive or negative influence to intermediate English proficiency students in their language learning process.

The last is the correlation analysis between low English proficiency and language learning strategies. It is listed in table 4.8 that memory strategies have significant sufficient negative correlation with language learning strategies. It is known that correlation value is $r = -.459$ and the score of significant value is $0.04 (< 0.05)$. Meanwhile, other strategies such as cognitive, compensation, affective and social strategies have significant values which are higher than 0.05. It means, those other strategies do not have any significant correlation with low English proficiency.

From those explanations, it can be concluded that memory strategies give the negative influence to low English proficiency students in their language learning process. Students in low English proficiency should decrease of usage of memory strategies if they want to improve their proficiency. As Kato's (2005) findings state that learners who use more memory strategies are not successful in improving their English proficiency.

The negative correlation of memory strategies used by students with low English proficiency implies that memorization does not work for them. Perhaps, they should find other strategies that are suitable for them in learning a new language or they should combine the six strategies to make their learning not monotonous and make them feel more enjoyable with various strategies in learning new language. This assumption is equal to Flavell's study (1979, cited in Al-Buainain, 2010, p.97) which states that using a combination of strategies often had more impact than single strategy.

The results of this study accept the hypothesis that there is a significant correlation between language learning strategies and students of 11th grade at SMAN 3 Malang.

SMAN 3 Malang has variation of strategies among the students in learning language especially English. 11th grade students at SMAN 3 Malang with high English proficiency use metacognitive strategies most to improve their proficiency. It is different from the result of Al-Buainain's (2010) study which reported that more proficient students used more cognitive strategies than other strategies. Different from high English proficiency students, intermediate English proficiency students use more compensation strategies than other strategies. It is equal to two studies looking at students from Taiwan and the students from Republic of China (Klassen, 1994; Yang, 1994, cited in Oxford and Burry-Stock, 1995, p.9) which reported that compensation strategies as being the most frequently used, falling in the high range of use. Then, the results of this study also report that students with low English proficiency use more affective in learning new language. It is different from Al-Buainain's (2010) study results that less proficient students used more metacognitive strategies than other strategies.

Based on the level of use of the strategies, this study results are similar with Zhao's (2009) study which mentioned that Chinese undergraduate students in Thailand are in medium level of all strategies. Al-Buainain's (2010) study also found that Qatar University students are included into high to medium level of all strategies. However, Indonesian, Chinese and Qatar students have similarity on the use of

English. They use English as foreign language so that the results are almost the same.

They use strategies in medium level for all language learning strategies.

Al-Buainain (2010) states that the use of some individual strategies could be attributed to culture, individual characteristics and educational system in Qatar where some students have very limited opportunities to use functional practice strategies especially in large classes. Moreover, students are more concern with passing exams and responding to questions that directly related to the content in their textbooks. This statement is similar to the condition of SMAN 3 Malang that the students only learn English in the context of textbook without having adequate time for practicing English outside the class because they concern with the exams to improve their academic scores.

Students of 11th grade at SMAN 3 Malang who are included into three different levels of proficiency have different results of correlation. High English proficiency students have significant sufficient positive correlation with metacognitive strategies. Then, there is no significant correlation found between intermediate students and language learning strategies, while there is a significant sufficient negative correlation between low English proficiency students and memory strategies.

The results indicate that if students apply metacognitive strategies more frequently, it results in high English proficiency. Therefore, the low score of metacognitive strategies found in students with intermediate and low English proficiency. It means that intermediate and low English proficiency students should

apply more metacognitive strategies if they want to have good result like high English proficiency students did.

