EFL Learning Strategy Use by Junior High School Students

Diah Wulansari Hudaya and Asdar
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
diahwulanhudaya@student.upi.edu

ABSTRACT: Some students are less successful than the others in learning English and research has found that one factor causing the different success of those students was not only attributed to the fewer use of learning strategies but also the appropriateness of the used strategies. This study investigates the frequency of the LLS used by EFL learners in a junior high school. There were 30 participants taking a translated 50-item Oxford's strategy inventory for language learning (SILL) with two open ended questions. The quantitative data of the SILL were quantified by means of descriptive statistics and the qualitative results from the open-ended questions were translated, summarized, and analyzed. It was found that the participants, especially the more proficient users of English, used metacognitive strategies more frequent. Also, there were some strategies that were not appropriate to Indonesian situation. Thus, teachers can use the SILL to identify their students' learning strategies but need an adaptation to Indonesian situation

Keywords: language learning strategies; junior high school students; proficiency level

INTRODUCTION

English is one of the most important subjects in many schools around the world (Lee & Oxford, 2008; Garniwa, 2013) in every level of education. Yet, the most recent curriculum in Indonesia does not include English as a mandatory subject in elementary school (Fabelia, 2016). Thus, English is taught since junior high school. Moreover, English has been one of the subjects being tested in the National Examination in high schools and entrance test in universities. However, some people are more successful than others in learning a second language (Rubin, 1975; Harmer, 2007a). We think it applies the same for learning a foreign language because "learning a foreign language is difficult, complicated, and time consuming" (Swann, 2008, p.262). So, how can these learners become more successful than the others? Some students seem to struggle in learning English and they tend to be less successful than the others.

During our teaching experience, it is common to see some students who have very positive traits in the classroom, sometimes get low score or even fail in their achievement test. Presumably, the reason of students' failure in the achievement tests relates to the learning strategies they use. Green and Oxford (1995) defines language learning strategies as specific actions that students' use, often intentionally, to improve their progress in developing L2 skills. It is believed that successful language learners used a wide variety of strategies and used them in ways that helped them complete language task, otherwise, less successful students not only had fewer strategy types but also frequently used strategies that were not suitable to the task (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990. This issue leads to the objective of this research which is to find out the learning strategy use by

the students in learning English. Rubin (1975) suggests that if we knew more about what the successful learner' did, we might be able to teach these strategies to low achievers to enhance their achievement.

Brown (2006) defines strategies as the specific 'attacks' that learners create on a given problem, and that vary significantly within each individual. Learning strategies are steps taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferrable to new circumstances (Oxford, 1990). She also proposes two major classes of strategies, direct and indirect strategies. Direct strategies deal with the new language and work with the language itself in a variety of specific tasks and situations. There are three groups that belong to direct strategies. They are (1) memory strategies for remembering and retrieving new information, such as grouping, imagery, rhyming, and structured reviewing, (2) cognitive strategies for understanding and producing the language, such as reasoning, analyzing, summarizing (all reflective of deep processing), as well as general practicing, and (3) compensation strategies for using the language despite knowledge gaps, such as guessing meaning from the context in reading and listening and using synonym and gestures to convey meaning when the precise expression is not known.

Indirect strategies deal with the management of learning. The strategies consists of (1) metacognitive strategies for coordinating the learning process, such as paying attention, consciously searching for practice opportunities, planning for language tasks, self-evaluating one's progress and monitoring errors, (2) affective strategies for regulating emotions, such as anxiety reduction, self-encouragement, and self-reward, and (3) social strategies for learning with others, such as asking questions, cooperating with native speakers of the language and becoming culturally aware.

However, students' learning strategies may vary from one another. Every student uses strategies, but some strategies are more suitable than others to a certain task and to the students' own learning style, such as visual, auditory, hands on; introverted, extroverted, and so on (Oxford, 1996).

Language learning strategies have an explicit goal of assisting learners in improving learners' knowledge in a target language (Cohen, 1996). Furthermore, introduction of these strategies into language classes by teachers would help students to become more efficient learners (Samida, 2012). Thus, teachers should be trained to instruct the strategies to their language learners (Gharbavi & Mousavi, 2012).

There are some suggestions for teachers to encourage effective language learning strategy use by Oxford (2002): (1) identify about students' learning strategies, such as using surveys and strategy diaries, (2) help students understand the whole range of strategies, (3) select learning strategies teacher might teach to their students to move them closer to the profile of 'good language learner', (4) study the effectiveness of the certain learning strategies that students use and realize which strategies are most useful for which kinds of language task, (5) teach students to manage their strategies use by asking them systemically combine and use strategies suitable to the task, (6) help students understand that for most language learners, the systematized use of learning strategies is more essential than the low frequency of strategy use, and (7) explicitly guide the students about strategy use and offer practice in transferring strategies to new condition and tasks. Therefore, a teacher should be skilled in identifying his/ her students' learning strategies and help them to maintain their strategies to be good language learners.

Furthermore, Oxford (1996) suggests that one of the most predominant ways to assess the use of language learning strategies is to use a questionnaire and the strategy questionnaire most often used around the world at this time is the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL, Oxford, 1989-1990). It was first designed for assessing the frequency of the use of language learning strategies by students at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center in Monterey, California.

During the last two decades, there have been many research conducted related to learning strategies using the SILL. How learners process new information and the kinds of strategies they use to learn, understand or remember has been the major interest of the second or foreign language researchers (Zarafshan, & Ardeshiri, 2012). Although LoCastro (1994) found that the respondents of 28 successful language learners are only medium or average users of strategies because they generally found that the SILL is not

suitable in that there are no strategies specifically addressing listening as ways to learn, after that, there are many research indicates the opposite.

Since many research are concerning about successful and less successful language learners, there are many studies about relationship and comparison between strategies use and language proficiency. Some of them use real proficiency score, while some of them use proficiency self-rating. Research indicates that appropriate use of language learning strategies results in improved L2 proficiency overall, or in specific language skill areas (Oxford, 2002). Some research also found a correlation between the engagement of different strategies and proficiency levels, the more proficient students are, the greater the number of strategies they use (Mochizuki, 1999; Peacock & Ho, 2003; Qingquan, Chatupote & Teo, 2008; Griffiths ,2008; Lee & Oxford, 2008; Gharbavi & Mousavi, 2012; Zarafshan, & Ardeshiri, 2012; Alhaisoni, 2012; Suwanarak, 2012; Tam, 2013).

Interesting evidence that language learners actually involve in metacognitive knowledge and processes is described in most of the research on language learning strategies (Chamot, 2005). It was metacognitive strategies that were most frequently used by EFL learners Takeuchi, 2003; Zarafshan, & Ardeshiri, 2012; Bonyadi, Nikou, & Shahbaz, 2012; Suwanarak, 2012; Vidal, 2012; Javid, Al-thubaiti, & Uthman, 2013). Moreover, having positive beliefs in metacognitive and regulating their language learning strategies may result learners to obtain higher scores (Nosratini, Saveiy, & Zaker 2014). Additionally, some research also indicates that factors influencing the L2 students' choice of learning strategies include motivation, career/ academic specialization, sex, cultural background, nature of task, age, and stage of language learning (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989, Oxford, 2002).

Virtually, large number of studies from the 1970s was looking at what makes a good language learner, what characteristics that go to make up a good language learner (Johnson, 2008). Thus, it comes to a question, what good language learners do to achieve their goal in the target language? What learners do to achieve their goal in the target language is referred to learning strategies. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate the use of learning strategies by the students related to their proficiency level or their achievement.

The purpose of this study is to find out (1) what the most and the least frequent learning strategy used by the students is, (2) the difference of the use of learning strategy between proficient leaners and less proficient learner, and (3) what strategy students use that is not listed in the SILL.

By answering the proposed research questions, this study is expected to give some meaningful contribution in recognizing students' language learning strategies that can help students to perform better in the target language. For teachers, this study is expected to help them in identifying and if possible in teaching and developing students' learning strategies to improve students' performance. For students, this study can be guidance for them to identify their own learning strategies in which they are weak and strong. Moreover, this study is expected to be a reference for other researchers who are interested to conduct a study with similar topic.

METHOD
Design
This study was a survey research that primarily used quantitative method to gain the information on the frequency of EFL learners' strategies use in junior high school. A structured survey using 5-point Likert scale as the main instrument of this study can be objectively scored and analyzed. Oxford (1990) suggests that more-structured survey, like using the SILL, is easier to summarize the results for a group and objectively diagnose problems of individual students. In addition to the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) as the main questionnaire, open ended-questions to provide the qualitative data about the students' use of strategies and questionnaire items about students' background were added.

Participants
The participants were chosen using purposive sampling with the consideration that the students should be actively using English both inside and outside classroom. Thirty students around 13-14 years old of the ninth grade were participated in this study.

The students belong to integrated Islamic boarding school whose one of the mission is to create students with global concept by mastering Arabic, English, and technology (SMP IT Nurul Islam, 2016). In the boarding

school, they have to use English in certain days whether inside or outside classroom. Thus, we believed that the students tend to use learning strategies frequently since they have more chances in using English.

Instrumentation

There are three parts of the questionnaire used in this study. Fifty items of version 7.0 of the SILL (Oxford, 1990) was used as the main questionnaire. The next part is two open ended questions to provide the qualitative data. The third part of the questionnaire is eight items of background questionnaire.

It is stated that the most extensively used questionnaire still remains the SILL by Oxford (Chamot , 2005, Tragant, Thompson, & Victori, 2013). The SILL covers six groups of strategy system (Oxford, 1990). They are 9 items of memory strategies, 14 items of cognitive strategies, 6 items of compensation strategies, 9 items of metacognitive strategies, 6 items of affective strategies, and 6 items of social strategies. Students responded each strategy item using a Likert scale of 1 through 5 to reveal the frequency of strategy that students use with 1 representing never used, 2 for rarely used, 3 for sometimes used, 4 for usually used, and 5 for always used. The language use is divided into three levels of high, medium, and low usage. The mean of high usage varies between 4.5 to 5 or usually used with a mean of 3.5 to 4.4. The mean of medium usage varies between 2.5 to 3.4. And the mean of low usage varies from 1.5 to 2.4 or 1.0 to 1.4.

The two items of open ended questions were adapted from Lee & Oxford (2008). These items were added to find strategies than are not listed in the SILL and strategies that should be revised or changed according to the characteristics or characteristics of the students.

The background questionnaire was adapted from Oxford's (1990) background questionnaire. Although this part is optional, the information helps teachers and students better understand the SILL results in context. The original questionnaire was 15 items, but the researcher deleted some irrelevant questions. Thus, there were 8 items of background questionnaire. The items concerned students' age, gender, mid-term test score, how long they have learned English, self-rated proficiency level compared with other students, the importance of learning English, reason or motivation of learning English, students' perception in learning English

whether it is enjoyable or not, and their interesting experience in learning English. However, from these all items of background questionnaire, we chose to use students' self-rated proficiency level as one of the variables affecting the use of learning strategies because there are many studies that relate students' proficiency with the use of learning strategies. Moreover, we chose self-rated proficiency level rather than students' mid-term tests scores because sometimes they didn't always give the real image of students' proficiency level and not all of the students wanted to tell their scores to other people. Grades can merely reflect students' performance rather than their true competence (Suwaranak & Photongsunan, 2008). Sometimes students are just lucky in guessing, especially if the test is multiple choice form. Thus, we would focus on students' self-rated proficiency level, while other information about students background data would be used as supporting data and to help us better understand the SILL results in context.

The questionnaire items were translated into Indonesian through some steps. First, the questionnaire was translated independently by three people. They are a post graduate students of English education whose profession is an English teacher, a graduate of master program of English education whose profession is a teacher and writer, and me myself. The results, then, were compared to each other to identify discrepancies and to make sure that the translation was as faithful as possible to the English version.

Procedures

The questionnaires were distributed to two English teachers who administered them to their students in the ninth grade during their free time since they stay in the boarding school. Before that, we gave the teachers a guideline to help them administer the questionnaires and they told their students that the result would not affect their grades. In addition, the students responded the open ended questions voluntarily. So, those students who did not wish to respond them did not have to do so.

Data Analysis

The quantitative data from the SILL usage were analyzed by means of descriptive statistics in terms of frequency distribution, percentage, mean, and standard deviation using the IBM *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS) version 21. The overall average or the mean

indicates how often the learner tends to use learning strategies in general, while averages for each part of the SILL indicate which strategy groups the learner tends to use most frequently. The 5-point of Likert scale strategy-use items on the SILL were used to interpret the means: 3.5 to 5.0, high use; 2.5 to 3.4, medium use; and 1.0 to 2.4, low use (Oxford, 1990). The qualitative results from the open ended questions were translated from

Indonesian to English, summarized and analyzed to find out students' comments in using the strategies.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
Overall Strategy Use

Minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation were calculated to summarize the participants' responses to the strategy items.

Table 1. Overall Strategy Use

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
SILL	30	1.93	4.28	3.13	.56
Valid N (list-wise)	30				

The responses of participants have been brought in the table. As can be seen from Table 1, junior high school EFL learners in the Integrated Islamic boarding school were medium users of strategies with the mean of overall strategy use from six categories is 3.13 (SD= .56).

Table 2. Overall Group of Strategies Use

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Memory	30	1.22	4.22	2.71	.70
Cognitive	30	1.14	4.50	3.03	.77
Compensation	30	2.00	4.33	3.31	.65
Metacognitive	30	1.22	4.78	3.44	.84
Affective	30	1.50	4.17	3.02	.75
Social	30	1.33	4.67	3.26	.87
Valid N (listwise)	30				

Table 2 shows that that metacognitive strategies for organizing and evaluating students' learning were used the most frequently (mean = 3.43, SD= .84, medium use range) of six categories. The other strategy categories in order of frequency of use were as follows: compensation strategies (mean = 3.31, SD= .65, medium use range), social strategies (mean = 3.26, SD= .87, medium use range), affective strategies (mean = 3.02, SD= .75, medium use range), cognitive strategies (mean = 3.03, SD= .77, medium use range), and memory strategies (mean = 2.71, SD= .70, medium use range).

There were also an interesting finding that the most popular strategies among the students (mean around 3.9) also belong to the group of cognitive strategies, like noticing their English mistakes and use that information to help them do better, paying attention when someone is speaking in English, setting clear goals for improving their English skills, and other strategy was trying to relax whenever they feel afraid of using English which belong to affective strategy (mean= 4.13).

The findings above indicate that students frequently coordinate their own leaning process through the action of metacognitive strategies. There is a lot of recent research suggesting that metacognition is very essential for academic success in general, not only in language learning (Johnson, 2008). Thus, it is a good thing that these students tended to use these strategies the most frequently. Nevertheless, the less frequently usage of other strategies means that students need to improve the use of those strategies because all of the strategies are important. Indirect strategies are the counterpart of the direct strategies. Thus, these results can be information for the teachers that students need to enhance their use of some strategies to be successful in language learning.

Strategy Use and Language Proficiency Level

According to the self-rated proficiency level comparing with their friends in their classroom, a student (3 %) categorized herself with excellent proficiency level, 12 (40 %) students with good proficiency level, and 17 (57 %) students with fair proficiency level.

Table 3. Overall Strategies Use by Different Level of Proficiency

Strategy Use Means (1 to 5)			
Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
2.952	3.380	2.965	-
(N=1)	(N= 12)	(N= 17)	

Table 3 shows the learning strategy use on different self-rated proficiency level. Evidence from the means shows the significantly higher use of strategies by the students who rated themselves as good proficiency level among their friends. However, there was a student who rated herself with excellent proficiency level but the use of her learning strategy tended to be lower than those whose proficiency level are good and fair. After looking at her motivation and her perception of the importance of learning English, it was found that she learned English because she was interested in the language and its culture, she had friends who speak the language, and she wanted to be looked cool because she was able to speak an international language (these reasons are almost the same with her friends), yet, she considered that learning English was not so important.

Another interesting finding is that this learner was a low user of memory strategy (mean= 2) and affective strategy (mean= 2.667), medium user of cognitive strategy (mean= 2.786), compensation strategy (mean= 3), and metacognitive strategy (mean= 3), but she used social strategies the most frequently. She was a high user of social strategy with mean = 4.333 (from scale 1-5) from 5 items questionnaire of social strategies. The finding from the 5 questionnaire items of social strategy indicates that whenever she did not understand something in English, she always asked the other person to slow down or say it again; she always asked the English speaker (the teacher, for example) to correct her when she talked, she always practiced English with other students, she always asked for help from English speaker whenever she had difficulties in learning the language, she always asked questions in English, and she tried to learn about the culture of English native speaker which was related to her motivation in learning English.

After discussing the result of the overall strategy from different proficiency levels, let's take a look at the result for each strategy in the following table.

Table 4. Group of Strategies Use by Different Level of Proficiency (F=fair, G=good)

Group Statistics					
Strategy group	Prof.	N	Mean	SD	SE
Memory	F	17	2.54	.67	.16
	G	12	3.01	.65	.19
Cognitive	F	17	2.93	.77	.19
	G	12	3.18	.79	.23
Compensation	F	17	3.23	.64	.16
	G	12	3.50	.63	.18
Metacognitive	F	17	3.20	.81	.19
	G	12	3.81	.83	.24
Affective	F	17	2.95	.71	.17
	G	12	3.14	.86	.25
Social	F	17	2.99	.76	.18
	G	12	3.56	.93	.27

In all group of strategies in Table 4, learners with fair proficiency level tended to use the strategies less frequently than learners with good proficiency level. Learners with good proficiency level tend to use metacognitive strategies (mean= 3.81, SD= .83, high use range) most frequently than other strategies. Learners with fair proficiency level tended to use compensation strategies (mean= 3.23, SD= .64, medium use range) most frequently than other strategies. Yet, both of the group (mean fair= 2.54, SD= .67, mean good=

3.03, SD= .66) used memory strategies the least frequently than other strategies.

According to the questionnaire items of memory strategy, the finding indicates that in all questionnaire items, students with good proficiency level had lower mean than students with fair proficiency level. Although in almost all items they were medium user of strategies, in some items, students with fair proficiency level were low users, they rarely connected the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word and remember new English words by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used. However, the two groups rarely used rhymes to remember new English words and flashcards to remember new English words.

The use of cognitive strategies by the learners with good proficiency level (mean= 3.18, SD= .77, medium use range) was higher than the learners with fair proficiency level (mean= 2.93, SD= .77, medium use range). The use of affective strategies among the learners with good proficiency level (mean= 3.64, SD= 1.63 high use range)   was also higher than the learners with fair proficiency level (mean= 3.08, SD= .67, medium use range). Lastly, the use of social strategies among the learners with good proficiency level (mean= 3.58, SD= .91, high use range)   was higher than the learners with fair proficiency level (mean= 2.82, SD= .77, medium use range).

Junior High School Learners' Strategies
The result of the open ended question about strategies students used that were not listed in the SILL indicates that some participants using different kind of memory, cognitive, and metacognitive strategies from those on the SILL. Some strategies they use were (1) listen to English song and translate the lyric to memorize new words, (2) sing English song over and over again, (3) watch movies without subtitles, (4) listen how to pronounce new word correctly, (5) talk to her/ himself using English, (6) circle the words that we often use in the dictionary, (7) find the meaning of new words and write it down, and (8) practice more and study hard. Example of students' comments:

S1: *Listen to English songs and learn in Pare* (an English course).
S2: *Sing English songs and find the meaning.*

S3: *Watch English movies, repeat and memorize new words, watch English movies without subtitle.*
S4: *Watch English movies and listen to English songs.*
S5: *Circling we often use in the dictionary.*
S6: *Find difficult words and find the meaning.*
S7: *Learn English hard to be able to speak like native speaker of English.*
S8: *Talk to ourselves using English in the bedroom.*

However, there are some students who wrote some strategies that were already listed in the SILL, but with some additional, like: (1) *write new vocabulary and memorize it while in the bathroom* (same with Q.10, with additional 'bathroom'), and (2) *saying new words over and over again till we memorize it* (same with Q.10, with additional 'till we memorize it').

There were also some strategies in the SILL that students thought should be revised or changed and suited to Indonesian students.

In Q15, *'I watch English language TV shows spoken in English….'*. Students who only have regular TV program in their houses will not be able to do this because there are rarely TV shows using English in Indonesia, except movies.

In Q17, *'I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.'* A student wrote this because it is not suitable with their situation since in their level of education, it is rather difficult to do and they only use English in certain situation, like in the classroom, or when they have to use English in certain days.

In Q39, *'I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.'* It is better if it just 'I try to be relaxed in using English', because students are probably not afraid of using English, they just nervous because they didn't speak the language they don't use every day.

In Q47, *'I practice English with other students'*, but among the learners sometimes they find it is hard to start talking using English, so probably they think it is better if they can practice directly with the native speaker of English. Although it is possible to provide native speaker of English in such private school, it is rather difficult to provide native speakers of English in public schools.

In Q50, *'I try to learn about the culture of English speakers'*. Students might think that it is not necessary since they may not learn it

specifically, but they can learn it at the same time they learn the language in the classroom.

Despite the use of some strategies that are not listed in the SILL or some items that should be revised or changed, the strategies in the SILL are useful both for teachers and students.

Discussion

The findings show that the students were medium users of language learning strategies. Moreover, this findings support the previous studies (LoCastro, 1994; Gharbavi & Mousavi, 2012; Zarafshan & Ardeshiri, 2012); Nahavandi & Mukundan, 2014) that metacognitive strategies was the most frequently used by the students. There is a lot of recent research suggesting that metacognition is essential for academic success in general, not just in language learning (Johnson, 2008).

It was also found that students used memory strategies the least frequently. Oxford (1990) asserts that memory strategies involve meaning and reflect very simple principles, such as arranging things in order, making association, and reviewing. She also indicates that language learners have a serious problem remembering the large amounts of vocabulary necessary to achieve fluency and memory strategies help language learners to cope with this difficulty. With the finding of this study, it may be related to the characteristic of teens, that these older children have developed a greater capacity for abstract thought as they grow up (Harmer, 2007b), so they simply do not use memory strategy very much, especially beyond elementary levels of language learning (Oxford, 1990).

Some previous research also related proficiency level with the use of learning strategy. From this study it was found that in the self-rated proficiency level, none of the students categorized themselves with poor proficiency level. This was a good point because students must have self-confidence in learning a language. Virtually, sometimes students are underrated their own learning proficiency and do not have self-confidence about it. However, there was a student with excellent proficiency level but used the strategy less frequently than the mean of frequency usage of students with good and fair proficiency level. The possible reason might lie in her aptitude towards language learning. Harmer (2007a) states that learners with a wide variety of intellectual abilities can be successful

language learner. It was also found that she used social strategies the most frequently, which means that she was aware that "language is a form of social behaviour; it is communication, and communication occurs between and among people" (Oxford, 1990, p.144).

The frequency of students' use of strategies between different proficiency levels (good and fair) shows that students with good proficiency level tended to use the strategies more frequently than those with fair proficiency level. Even in some items, students with fair proficiency level were low users of the strategies. The findings also indicate that students with fair proficiency level used compensation strategies the most frequently. Compensation strategies enable learners to use the new language or either comprehension or production despite limitations in knowledge (Oxford, 1990, Tam, 2013). Thus, they could guess the right answer, words, or meaning in certain context even if they did not fully understand the details. This is probably why students with fair proficiency level tended to use this strategy the most frequently. Meanwhile, students with good proficiency level tended to use metacognitive strategies the most frequently than other strategies. Learners who have a high degree of metacognitive awareness seem better able to control and manage their learning in terms of understanding and storing new information as well as finding the best ways to practice and reinforce what they have learned (Goh in Johnson, 2008). Therefore, this group had higher proficiency level than the other group because they were better in planning and organizing their language learning and they were aware of their responsibility in their own learning. As result, it can be said that the use of language learning strategies tends to have an effect on students' proficiency level.

Another finding is about the use of SILL among the students. Even though the teacher could identify students learning strategies by using the SILL, there were some strategies that students used which were not listed in the SILL or not suitable with the students' situation. It means that the SILL may not cover all strategies which are used by the students. Thus, the use of SILL in teachers' classroom can be adapted or revised according to the students' need and situation.

CONCLUSION

This study was conducted to investigate the use of language learning strategies by 30 junior high school students in a boarding school. The finding from overall strategies indicates that the students used the language learning strategies in the medium level, which means that sometimes they used the strategies. Moreover, students used metacognitive strategies the most frequently and memory strategies the least frequently than other group strategies. It was also found that students with good proficiency level used more strategies than students with fair proficiency level. Hence, the use of language learning strategies tends to have an effect on students' success in learning a language. Also, there was a difference in the use of learning strategies between students with good and fair proficiency level. Students with good proficiency level used metacognitive strategies the most frequently, while students with fair proficiency level used compensation strategies the most frequently. Yet, both group of students used memory strategies the least frequently. In addition, there were some strategies that students used which were not listed in the SILL.

Finally, it is recommended for teachers to use the SILL to recognize their students' learning strategies and help them to improve their language proficiency by encouraging the students to use the appropriate strategy in certain tasks and how to apply it to the four language skills. To be better, the SILL can be adapted or suited to the situation in the Indonesian students' characteristic. The last, it is recommended to have further research about learning strategies in different context.

REFERENCES

Alhaisoni, E. (2012). Language learning strategy use of Saudi EFL students in an intensive English learning context. *Asian Social Science*, *8*(13), 115-127. doi:10.5539/ass.v8n13p115

Bonyadi, A., Nikou, F. R., & Shahbaz, S. (2012). The relationship between EFL learners' self-efficacy beliefs and their language learning strategy use. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(8), 113-121. doi:10.5539/elt.v5n8p113

Brown, H. D. (2006). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Pearson Education.

Chamot, A. U. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: Current issues and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *25*, 112-130.

Chen, M. L. (2014). Age differences in the use of language learning strategies. *English Language Teaching*, *7*(2), 144-151. doi:10.5539/elt.v7n2p144

Cohen, A. D. (1996). Verbal reports as a source of insights into second language learner strategies. Applied Language Learning, *7*(1), 5-24.

Fabelia. (2016, November 2). Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris di sekolah – Fakta dan dampaknya. Retrieved from Fabelia website http://www.fabelia.com

Garniwa, J. (2013). Potret pendidikan di Indonesia yang salah kaprah. Retrieved from Kompasiana website http://www.kompasiana.com

Gharbavi, A., & Mousavi, S. A. (2012). Do language proficiency levels correspond to language learning strategy adoption?. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(7), 110-122. doi:10.5539/elt.v5n7p110

Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly 9 (2)*, 261-297.

Griffiths, C. (2008). *Lessons from good language learners*. Cambridge University Press.

Harmer, J. (2007a). *The practice of English language teaching*. Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited.

Harmer, J. (2007b). *How to teach English.* China: Pearson Education Limited.

Javid, C. Z., Al-thubaiti, T. S., & Uthman, A. (2013). Effects of English language proficiency on the choice of language learning strategies by Saudi English-major undergraduates. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(1), 35-47. doi:10.5539/elt.v6n1p35

Johnson, K. (2008). *An introduction to foreign language learning and teaching*. England: Pearson Education Limited.

Lee, K. R., & Oxford, R. (2008). Understanding EFL learners' strategy use and strategy awareness. *Asian EFL Journal*, *10*(1), 7-32.

LoCastro, V. (1994). Learning strategies and learning environments. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28* (2), 409-414.

Mochizuki, A. (1999). Language learning strategies used by Japanese university students. *RELC Journal, 30* (2), 101-113.

Nahavandi, N., & Mukundan, J. (2014). Language learning strategy use among

Iranian engineering EFL learners. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *5*(5), 34-45. Doi:10.7575/aiac.alls.v.5n.5p.34

Nosratinia, M., Saveiy, M., & Zaker, A. (2014). EFL learners' self-efficacy, metacognitive awareness, and use of language learning strategies: how are they associated?. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *4*(5), 1080-1092. doi:10.4304/tpls.4.5.1080-1092

O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Wadsworth: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Oxford, R. L. (1996). Employing a questionnaire to assess the use of language learning strategies. *Applied Language Learning*, *7*(1), 28-47.

Oxford, R. L. (2002). Language learning strategies in a nutshell: Update and ESL suggestions. In Jack C. Richards & Willy A. Renandya (Eds), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*, 124-132. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The Modern Language Journal*, *73*(3), 291-300.

Peacock, M., & Ho, B. (2003). Student language learning strategies across eight disciplines. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *13*(2), 179-200.

Qingquan, N., Chatupote, M., & Teo, A. (2008). A deep look into learning strategy use by successful and unsuccessful students in the Chinese EFL learning context. *RELC Journal*, *39*(3), 338-358.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9 (1), 41-51.

Samida, D. K. (2012). Language learning strategies. *TESOL Journal*, *159-164*.

SMP IT Nurul Islam. (2016, November 2). *Visi dan Misi*. Retrieved from SMP IT Nurul Islam website http://smpit-nurulislam.sch.id

Suwanarak, K. (2012). English language learning beliefs, learning strategies and achievement of Masters students in Thailand. *TESOL in Context S*, *3*, 1-15.

Suwanarak, K., & Phothongsunan, S. (2008). Attributions of high achieving Thai university students perceiving themselves as failure in English usage. *Annual Southeast Asian Association for Institutional Research (SEAAIR) Conference Proceedings*, *8* , 587-599.

Swann, M. (2008). Talking sense about learning strategies. *RELC Journal*, *39*(2), 262-273.

Takeuchi, O. (2003). What can we learn from good foreign language learners? A qualitative study in the Japanese foreign language context. *System*, *31*(3), 385-392.

Tam, K. C. H. (2013). A study on language learning strategies (LLSs) of university students in Hong Kong. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics*, *11*(2), 1-42.

Tragant, E., Thompson, M. S., & Victori, M. (2013). Understanding foreign language learning strategies: A validation study. *System*, *41*(1), 95-108. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2013.01.007

Vidal, R. T. (2012). Is there a correlation between reported language learning strategy use, actual strategy use and achievement?. *Revista Linguagem & Ensino*, *5*(1), 43-73.

Zarafshan, M., & Ardeshiri, M. (2012). The relationship between emotional intelligence, language learning strategies and English proficiency among Iranian EFL university students. *Journal of educational and instructional studies in the world*, *2*(3), 105-114.