
The Autonomous Learners' Language Learning Strategies at Senior High Schools in Coastal Areas of Riau Province - Indonesia

Fakhri Ras

English Lecturers at Universitas Riau - Indonesia
fakhriras@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between language learning strategies used by autonomous learners of senior high schools in coastal areas based on type of school, and academic factors. In addition, this study is also to identify the strategies used by the respondents to learn English in general, four language skills, vocabulary, and structure. The population of the study are all autonomous learners from senior high schools in the coastal areas. As big as 3000 students. The sample size is taken randomly as big as 10 % or 300 students out of the population. The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (Oxford; 1989) is used to get the quantitative data and interview is conducted to 60 selected students taken from the sample in order to have the qualitative data. Descriptive and inferential statistics are applied to analyze the data on the use of the language learning strategies (SILL). One-Way Anova is taken to determine the differences of language learning strategies usage based on academic, and type of school. The findings show different language learning strategies among the students based on type of school, and academic factors. The students used social strategy (mean: 4.02) as the most effective strategy. The implication of the study is that language learning strategies should be well informed and discussed thoroughly in the classroom.

Key words: Language learning strategies, and autonomous learners.

Introduction

Dumai, Bengkalis, and Selatpanjang (coastal areas) are directly abutted on two nearest-neighbouring countries (Malaysia and Singapura) where the status of English is as a second language in these countries. Those countries use English as a language for official as well as trade, legal, and social affairs.. The society who live around the border area are connected each other in various activities either a formal state agenda or daily activities. Therefore, English as an international language is chosen as a way of communication.

High school students, as a part of society who live in the seaboard of Riau Province

(Dumai, Bengkalis, and Selat Panjang), play an important role in term of association between various cities in Riau province with the communities in the two neighboring countries. In this case, autonomous learners whose English achievements are up to eight until ten are basically able to communicate in English even though they have various difficulties in organizing words into sentences, choosing appropriate words, and setting the sentence intonation.

Language learning strategies have been used by the autonomous learners to solve their learning difficulties and to improve their capability of four language skills, vocabulary, and grammar in school. The

students often do some common ways like: a. seriously following the procedures of learning process, b. asking further explanation for any unclear materials, c. completing various tasks related to the topic, d. intensifying group discussions (Fakhri Ras; 2012), e. using new vocabulary in context, f. correcting errors made by classmates, g. sharing ideas in composing texts, h. accumulating important ideas before writing the texts.

Based on the above phenomena, language learning strategies used by autonomous learners must be thoroughly identified by using a valid measurement. In this case, strategy inventory for language learning (SILL) (Oxford; 1990) was used as an effective test (quantitative data). The obvious and measured recognition of language learning strategies can influence on autonomous learners' language achievement. To identify the relationship between the strategies and the achievement, weak students' language learning strategies are used as comparison. Besides, the use of SILL is empowered by some questions in interview section (qualitative data). The combination between those two kinds of data collection techniques is expected to obviously identify the strategies used by the autonomous learners in this research area dealing with the insight of language learning strategies, relation definitions have been formulated.

Tarone (1983) bases her definition on the context of the use of communication strategies, in which two interlocutors agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared. Then she differentiates communication strategy from production strategy, in which one linguistic system is used efficiently and clearly. She also clarifies the distinction between

communication and learning strategy, by which linguistic and socio-linguistic competence in the target language was developed.

Rubin (1975) defines language learning strategies as the techniques or devices that learners use to acquire second language knowledge. Stern (1975) calls them some general order of higher approaches to learning which govern the choice of specific techniques. Chamot (1987) defines LLS as techniques, approaches, or deliberate actions that students take in order to facilitate the learning and recall of both linguistic and content area information. Naiman et al. (1978) define LLS as more or less deliberate approaches to learning. Rubin (1987) states that LLS are sets of operations, steps, plans, and routines of what learners do to facilitate the acquisition, storage, retrieval, and use of information to regulate learning. Wenden & Rubin (1987) refers to them as behaviours, where learners engage in and regulate the learning of a second language. Lan (2005) sees language learning strategies as terms applied to various behaviours used in learning: things people do that are relatively easy to change, vary according to their learning style, are effective or ineffective for specific situations, and are frequently under some level of conscious control. Some learning strategies are specific to each of the four language skills. Ellis (1994) focuses on skills and language learning. Those two aspects are crucial in language learning strategies.

Wenden (1987) classifies language learning strategies into at least six elements: (a) specific actions or techniques, (b) observable activities, (c) problem-oriented characteristic, (d) direct or indirect contribution to learning, (e) automatic application after prolonged and repeated

usage, and (f) behaviours that are amenable to change. Similarly, Lessard-Clouston (1997) created four reference criteria: (a) learner-generated activities (steps taken by the learners), (b) learner-enhanced language learning or help in developing language competence, (c) learners' visible actions (behaviours, steps, techniques, etc.) or unseen things (thought and mental processes), and (d) the involvement of information and memory of the learners. Bialystok (1978) created two broad LLS categories, each of which has two subcategories. The first, formal strategies, covers observation and formal training; and the second, functional strategies, includes inference and functional training. Bialystok (1981) said that observation strategy is used to increase the skill of language pattern (identifying the language mistakes). O'Malley & Chamot (1990) divide language learning strategies into three categories: metacognitive, cognitive, and socio-affective. Metacognitive strategies refer to the executive skills required in planning for learning, thinking about the ongoing learning processes, monitoring one's production or comprehension, and evaluating one's learning after.

According to Oxford (1990b), language learning strategies (a) contribute to the main goal of communicative competence, (b) allow learners to become self-directed, (c) expand the role of teachers, (d) are problem-oriented, (e) are specific actions taken by the learner, (f) involve many aspects of the learner, not just the cognitive, (g) support learning directly or indirectly, (h) are not always observable, (i) are often conscious, (j) can be taught, (k) are flexible, and (l) are influenced by various factors. Cohen (1996) suggests that language learning strategies (a) have the explicit goal of assisting learners in

improving their knowledge; (b) include cognitive processing strategies, strategies for solidifying newly acquired language patterns, and strategies to determine the amount of cognitive energy needed; (c) encompass language performance and communication strategies; and (d) can be further differentiated into cognitive, metacognitive, affective, or social.

Several models of language learning strategies have been formulated by the experts. Lots of elements that are related to the language learning have been discussed in the models. Oxford (1990b) provides the most extensive classification of LLS developed so far, although it is not radically different from the other models. In fact, Oxford's taxonomy overlaps with that of O'Malley (1990) to a great extent. For instance, the cognitive strategies category in O'Malley's classification seems to cover both the cognitive and memory strategies in Oxford's. Moreover, while O'Malley puts socio-affective strategies in one category, Oxford splits them into two. A significant difference in Oxford's classification, however, is the addition of compensation strategies, which do not appear in any of the previous major classification systems. Oxford's taxonomy consists of two main categories: direct and indirect strategies. Direct strategies are behaviours that involve the use of the target language, which directly facilitates language learning.

a. Quantitative Findings

Ho 1; There is no significant difference of language learning usage by Academic Stream.

Table 1: The Distribution of Respondents by Academic Background

No	Academic Stream	Frequency	Percent
1	Natural Science	105	35.0
2	Social Science	105	35.0
3	Language Science	90	30.0
Total		300	100.0

Table 2: The Distribution of Respondents by Type of School

No	Type of School	Frequency	Percent
1	State School	150	50.0
2	Private School	150	50.0
Total		300	100.0

Descriptive and inferential statistics are used to analyze the data on the use of the language learning strategies (SILL). The descriptive statistics is used to present the language learning strategies used by the autonomous learners. The inferential statistics, in this case, One-Way Anova is

used to determine the differences of language learning strategies usage based on academic stream and type of schools. Then, the collected qualitative data is presented in the form of list of preferred activities to learn English in general, four language skills, vocabulary, and structure.

Table 3: One-Way ANOVA of Academic Stream across Language Learning Strategies

Dependent Variable	Stream	Mean	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Memory	Natural	3.49	Between Groups	1.406	2	.703	8.448	.000
	Social	3.41	Within Groups	33.044	397	.083		
	Language	3.56	Total	34.450	399			
	Total	3.48						
Cognitive	Natural	3.73	Between Groups	.805	2	.403	5.924	.003
	Social	3.68	Within Groups	26.979	397	.068		

	Language	3.79	Total	27.785	399			
	Total	3.73						
Compensation	Natural	3.71	Between Groups	.357	2	.179	1.440	.238
	Social	3.67	Within Groups	49.259	397	.124		
	Language	3.74	Total	49.616	399			
	Total	3.70						
Metacognitive	Natural	3.95	Between Groups	1.865	2	.932	6.939	.001
	Social	3.90	Within Groups	53.338	397	.134		
	Language	4.07	Total	55.202	399			
	Total	3.97						
Affective	Natural	3.66	Between Groups	.109	2	.055	.431	.650
	Social	3.67	Within Groups	50.331	397	.127		
	Language	3.70	Total	50.440	399			
	Total	3.68						
Social	Natural	4.00	Between Groups	.044	2	.022	.192	.825
	Social	4.03	Within Groups	45.457	397	.115		
	Language	4.02	Total	45.501	399			
	Total	4.02						
LLS	Natural	3.75	Between Groups	.642	2	.321	7.052	.001
	Social	3.71	Within Groups	18.060	397	.045		

Language 3.81	Total	18.701	399		
Total 3.75					

Table 3 presents the result of One-Way ANOVA of academic stream. The findings show that there is no significant difference by academic stream in memory ($F = .707$, $sig. = .588$ [$> .05$]), kompensasi ($F = .833$, $sig. = .505$ [$> .05$]), metacognitive ($F = .999$, $sig. = .408$ [$> .05$]), affective ($F =$

1.600 , $sig. = .173$ [$> .05$]), and social strategy ($F = .605$, $sig. = .659$ [$> .05$]). However, there are significant differences by academic stream in cognitive strategy ($F = 2.736$, $sig. = .029$ [$< .05$]) and overall language learning strategies ($F = 2.638$, $sig. = .034$ [$< .05$]). Thus, H_0 is rejected. Post-Hoc test results are displayed in table 4.

Tabel 4

Post-Hoc Test of One-Way ANOVA on the Differences in Language Learning Strategies between Students according to Academic Stream

Dependent Variable	(I) Stream	(J) Stream	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Memory	Natural	Social	.07714*	.03448	.026
		Language	-.06998	.03589	.052
	Social	Natural	-.07714*	.03448	.026
		Language	-.14712*	.03589	.000
	Language	Natural	.06998	.03589	.052
		Social	.14712*	.03589	.000
Cognitive	Natural	Social	.04807	.03116	.124
		Language	-.06349	.03243	.051
	Social	Natural	-.04807	.03116	.124
		Language	-.11156*	.03243	.001
	Language	Natural	.06349	.03243	.051
		Social	.11156*	.03243	.001
Metacognitive	Natural	Social	.05250	.04381	.231
		Language	-.11482*	.04560	.012
	Social	Natural	-.05250	.04381	.231

		Language		-.16732*	.04560	.000
	Language	Natural		.11482*	.04560	.012
		Social		.16732*	.04560	.000
LLS	Natural	Social		.03671	.02549	.151
		Language		-.06236*	.02653	.019
	Social	Natural		-.03671	.02549	.151
		Language		-.09907*	.02653	.000
	Language	Natural		.06236*	.02653	.019
			Social		.09907*	.02653

Table 4 shows significant differences in memori strategy between social, natural (DF = -.07714, sig. = .026 [$<.05$])and language students (DF = -.14712, sig. = .000 [$<.05$]). Besides, a significant difference also occurs in cognitive strategy between social and language students (DF = -.11156, sig. = .001 [$<.05$]). Moreover, the language students use metacognitive strategy more often than natural students (DF = -.11482, sig. = .012 [$<.05$])and

social students (DF = -.16732, sig. = .000 [$<.05$]). Similarly, the language students use overall strategy more often than the natural (DF = -.06236, sig. = .019 [$<.05$])and social students (DF = -.09907, sig. = .000 [$<.05$]). Therefore, Thus, Ho1 is rejected. In addition Ho 2; There is no significant difference of language learning usage by Type of School.

Table 5: One-Way ANOVA of Type of School across Language Learning Strategies

Variable	Type of School	Mean	Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Memory	State	3.47	Between Groups	.029	1	.029	.330	.566
	Private	3.49	Within Groups	34.421	398	.086		
	Total	3.48	Total	34.450	399			
Cognitive	State	3.74	Between Groups	.042	1	.042	.609	.436
	Private	3.72	Within Groups	27.742	398	.070		

	Total	3.73	Total	27.785	399			
Compensation	State	3.68	Between Groups	.284	1	.284	2.288	.131
	Private	3.73	Within Groups	49.333	398	.124		
	Total	3.70	Total	49.616	399			
Metacognitive	State	3.94	Between Groups	.312	1	.312	2.266	.133
	Private	4.00	Within Groups	54.890	398	.138		
	Total	3.97	Total	55.203	399			
Affective	State	3.61	Between Groups	1.797	1	1.797	14.703	.000
	Private	3.74	Within Groups	48.643	398	.122		
	Total	3.68	Total	50.440	399			
Social	State	4.03	Between Groups	.098	1	.098	.856	.355
	Private	4.00	Within Groups	45.403	398	.114		
	Total	4.02	Total	45.501	399			
LLS	State	3.74	Between Groups	.068	1	.068	1.444	.230
	Private	3.77	Within Groups	18.634	398	.047		
	Total	3.75	Total	18.701	399			

Table 5 displays the result of One-Way ANOVA of type of school. The findings show that there is no significant difference by both state and private school in memory ($F = .330$, $sig. = .566$ [$> .05$]), cognitive ($F = .609$, $sig. = .436$ [$> .05$]), compensation ($F = 2.288$, $sig. = .131$ [$> .05$]), metacognitive ($F = 2.266$, $sig. = .133$ [$> .05$]), social ($F = .856$, $sig. = .355$ [$> .05$]), and overall language strategies ($F = 1.444$, $sig. = .230$ [$< .05$]).

However, there is a significant difference by type of school in affective strategy ($F = 14.703$, $sig. = .000$ [$< .05$]). ($F = 2.736$, $sig. = .029$ [$< .05$]). The private school students use affective strategy more often than the state school students. Therefore, H_0 is rejected.

b. Qualitative Findings

English is generally learnt by autonomous learners by using various strategies. Table 6 displays the strategies used by autonomous

learners of senior high schools in Dumai, school which were listed through interview
 Bengkalis, and Selatpanjang (coastal areas) section.
 based on academic stream and type of

Table 6: Strategies used by autonomous learners to learn English in General

Factor	Indicator	Strategy
Academic Stream	Natural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussing lessons with English teacher and friends by using English language • Joining an English course
	Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussing lessons with English teacher and friends by using English language • Trying to improve writing, reading, listening, speaking, vocabulary, and grammar skills of English • Being active in various activities of English language learning
	Language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussing lessons with English teacher and friends by using English language • Practicing English in the Classroom • Keep Studying English outside of school as well as inside • Joining an English course • Forming a group of English studying
Type of School	State	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussing lessons with English teacher and friends by using English language • Keep Studying English outside of school as well as inside
	Private	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practicing English in the Classroom • Joining an English course • Forming a group of English studying • Trying to improve writing, reading, listening, speaking, vocabulary, and grammar skills of English • Being active in various activities of English language learning

Table 7: Strategies used by autonomous learners to four language skills, vocabulary, and structure by Academic Stream

Variable	Strategy by Academic Stream		
	Natural science	Social science	Language science
Listening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentrating to the spoken text • Doing exercise at home • Giving suggestion and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doing exercise of listening materials • Finding the speaker's idea • Taking notes while 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following tests of English listening (TOEFL, TOEIC, Etc) • Concentrating to the spoken text

	<p>critics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listening to the English songs 	<p>listening to the speakers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taking notes while listening to the speakers • Preparing vocabulary as many as needed • Watching movies
Speaking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enriching Vocabulary • Joining English Club • Following teachers instruction • Practicing speaking with native speaker 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practicing speaking with native speaker • Joining conversation course of English • Trying to speak English as often as possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practicing speaking with native speaker • Speaking English everyday • Take an English course • Practicing speaking English in front of a mirror • Keep studying English pronunciation
Reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading English Novel • Answering questions based on the texts • Discussing reading tasks in group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answering questions based on the texts • Consulting to a dictionary for unfamiliar words • Writing small notes of vocabulary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussing reading tasks in group • Answering questions based on the texts • Asking teachers for appropriate techniques of comprehending texts • Reading English book • Underlining difficult words in the text
Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing Diary by using English • Making an article of fun story using English • Writing English sentences ever day 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing short story of English • Enriching vocabulary mastery • Learning how to make good sentences, paragraphs, and essays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing Diary by using English • Making an article of fun story using English • Writing English sentences ever day • Correcting errors of essay writing
Vocabulary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memorizing at least 10 new vocabularies everyday • Finding the meaning of unfamiliar words • Reading English texts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading English texts as many as possible • Practicing English vocabulary with friends • Writing notes of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finding the meaning of unfamiliar words • Memorizing at least 10 new vocabularies everyday

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> as many as possible • Correcting mistakes • Practicing English vocabulary with friends 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> important vocabulary • Finding antonym or synonym of difficult words 	
Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correcting Mistakes • Joining English course • Doing exercises of structure regularly • Finding sources of structure materials • Discussing structure lessons with English teachers and friends 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doing exercises of structure regularly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making sentences based on the correct structure of English language • Correcting Mistakes • Joining English course • Doing exercises of structure regularly • Finding sources of structure materials • Discussing structure lessons with English teachers and friends

Table 8: Strategies used by autonomous learners to four language skills, vocabulary, and structure by Type of School

Variable	Strategy by Type of School	
	State	Private
Listening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taking notes while listening to the speakers • Concentrating to the spoken text • Doing exercise at home • Giving suggestion and critics • Listening to the English songs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following tests of English listening (TOEFL, TOEIC, Etc) • Finding the speaker’s idea • Concentrating to the spoken text • Taking notes while listening to the speakers • Preparing vocabulary as many as needed • Watching movies
Speaking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enriching Vocabulary • Joining English Club • Following teachers instruction • Practicing speaking with native speaker 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practicing speaking with native speaker • Speaking English everyday • Take an English course • Practicing speaking English in front of a mirror • Keep studying English pronunciation • Joining conversation course of

		<p>English</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trying to speak English as often as possible
Reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading English Novel • Answering questions based on the texts • Discussing reading tasks in group • Consulting to a dictionary for unfamiliar words 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing small notes of vocabulary • Discussing reading tasks in group • Answering questions based on the texts • Asking teachers for appropriate techniques of comprehending texts • Reading English book • Underlining difficult words in the text
Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enriching vocabulary mastery • Learning how to make good sentences, paragraphs, and essays • Writing Diary by using English • Making an article of fun story using English • Writing English sentences ever day 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing Diary by using English • Making an article of fun story using English • Writing English sentences ever day • Correcting errors of essay writing • Writing short story of English
Vocabulary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memorizing at least 10 new vocabularies everyday • Finding the meaning of unfamiliar words • Reading English texts as many as possible • Correcting mistakes • Practicing English vocabulary with friends 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finding the meaning of unfamiliar words • Memorizing at least 10 new vocabularies everyday • Reading English texts as many as possible • Practicing English vocabulary with friends • Writing notes of important vocabulary • Finding antonym or synonym of difficult words
Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correcting Mistakes • Joining English course • Doing exercises of structure regularly • Finding sources of structure materials • Discussing structure lessons with English teachers and friends 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making sentences based on the correct structure of English language • Correcting Mistakes • Joining English course • Doing exercises of structure regularly • Finding sources of structure materials • Discussing structure lessons with English teachers and friends

Discussion

In this study, there are two factors that may influence the language learning strategies; academic background and type of school. It stands to reason, the discussion focuses on the language learning strategies by autonomous learners of Senior High Schools in Dumai, Bengkalis, and Selatpanjang (coastal areas) Riau Province based on the two related factors. In addition, this study also identifies the preferred activities of the respondents to learn English in general, four language skills, vocabulary, and structure.

The study employs both quantitative and qualitative methods. The population are all autonomous learners from 14 state senior high schools and 14 private senior high schools in Dumai, Bengkalis, and Selatpanjang (coastal areas) Riau Province. The number of the population is about 3000 students. Due to the homogenous character of the population in term of their academic background, the sample is taken randomly as big as 10 % out of the population, that is about, 300 autonomous learners. The quantitative data are collected by using Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (Oxford; 1989) while interviewing section is conducted to 60 selected students taken from the sample in order to get the qualitative data.

Based on the findings from the table 3 to table 5, they can be concluded that the autonomous learners' language learning strategies at high level (mean of LLS: 3.75). The students use different strategies viewed from academic and type of school factors. First of all there is no significant difference by academic stream among six strategies - memory cognition, compensation, metacognition, affection ,

and social. Academic major has received less attention in research on the use of learning strategies. On the whole, research has revealed relationships between academic major and LLS use. Politzer and McGroarty (1985) found that field of specification (engineering/science vs. social science/humanities) had significant effect on strategy choice of ESL students, with engineers avoiding strategies that were deemed "positive" for gaining communicative language proficiency. In the research done by Chamot et al. (1987), university major was shown to have a statistically significant influence on choice of L2 learning strategies, particularly in favor of humanities, social science, and education majors and to a lesser degree majors in computers, science, or math.

Then, there is significant differences in using strategy among social, natural and language students. Rao Zhenhui (2005) state that consistent with results from similar studies examining influence on strategy use by academic major, this study found evidence for higher frequency of overall strategy use by the social science students (mean = 3.06) than that by the science students (mean = 2.96). Overall, the difference between them was statistically significant. As for the use of strategy categories, the social science students used two of the six strategy categories significantly more often than the science students: compensation and metacognitive. At the individual level, the social science students reported using 15 strategies significantly more often than the science students whereas the science students reported using 6 strategies significantly more often than the social science students.

Afterward, there is no significant difference by both state and private school in use of six strategies memory, cognitive,

compensation, metacognitive, social, and overall language strategies. Fakhri Ras (2016) state that the use of LLS usage by the successful students in Riau and Riau Archipelago Province based on the types of school. The mean score of state school (3.2770) is higher than that of private school (3.2524) of the successful students in Riau Archipelago Province. The mean score of private school (3.2694) is higher than that of state school (3.2460) of the successful students in Riau Province. In addition, they prefer various strategies to improve their ability of listening (following tests of English listening / TOEFL and TOEIC), speaking (practicing speaking with native speaker), reading (discussing reading tasks in group), writing (writing diary by using English), vocabulary (finding the meaning of familiar words), and structure (making sentences based on the correct structure of English language). Based on academic stream, language students use more strategies rather than the other two streams. Similarly, viewed from type of school, the state school students use language learning strategy differently to the private school students. The private students prefer more various strategies to improve their English than the state school students. These findings offer an important input to educators to be able to encourage more effective strategies for the social students as well as those in state schools. The findings also provide some insight for further researches to explore language learning strategies employed by high achievers in a more detailed manner.

Conclusion and Suggestion

The conclusion is that there is a similar category (medium) on the use of six strategies - memory cognition,

compensation, metacognition, affection, and social. On the other hand, there is a different usage of the strategies in term of state and private schools. In this context, it would be better to use the six strategies in English classroom by giving the learners clear explanation to use them properly.

Reference

- Bialystok, E. 1981. The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency. *Modern Language Journal* 62 :327-366.
- Chamot & O'Malley 1987. The cognitive academic language learning approach: a bridge to the mainstream. *TESOL Quarterly* 21:227-249.
- Cohen, A.D. 1996. Verbal reports as a source of insights into second language learner strategies. *Applied Language learning*, 7 (1&2): 5-24.
- Ellis, R. 1994. *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford:Oxford University Press.
- Fakhri Ras 2012. *The use of language learning strategies by Pekanbaru Senior High School students and their socio-economic, academic, and type of school*. Bangi:Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Fakhri Ras, dkk 2015. Language learning strategies used by successful students of senior high schools of Riau Province and Riau Archipelago Province – Indonesia and their socio – economic, academic, and type of school

- factors, Pekanbaru Universitas Riau.
- Fakhri Ras 2016. *The use of language learning strategies by Pekanbaru Senior High School students and their socio-economic, academic, and type of school.* Bangi:Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Lan, Rae L. 2005. *Language learning strategies profiles of EFL elementary school students in Taiwan.* Maryland: Department of Curriculum and Instruction University of Maryland.
- Naiman, N, Forhlich, M, Stern, H.H & Todesco, A. 1978. *The good language language learner.* Research in Education Series, 7 . Toronto:OISE.
- Nenden Sri Lengkanawati 2004. How learners from different cultural backgrounds learn a foreign language. *Asian EFL Journal*, 1-8.
- O'Malley & Anna Uhl Chamot. 1990. *Learning strategies in second language acquisition.* Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R & Nyikos, M. 1989. Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern Language Journal*, 73: 291-300.
- Oxford, R & Crookall, D. 1990. Research on language learning strategies worldwide with ESL/EFL version of the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL). *System*, 25 (1):4-23.
- Oxford, R.L. 1990a. Use of language learning strategies: a synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. *System*, 17: 235-247.
- Oxford, R. L. 1990b. *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know.* Boston:Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Rao Zhenhui. 2005. Gender, Academic Major, and Chinese Students' Use of Language Learning Strategies: Social and Educational Perspectives. *The Journal of Asia Tefl* Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 115-138.
- Rubin, J. 1987. Learners' strategies: theoretical assumptions, research history and typology. In. A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.). *Learner strategies in language learning*, 15-29.
- Rubin, J. 1975. What the "good learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41-51.
- Stern, H. H. 1975. What can we learn from the good language learners?. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31 (3): 304-318.
- Tarone, E. 1983. *Some thoughts on the notion of 'communication strategy' in C.Faerch & G.Kaspar (Eds.). Strategies in interlanguage communication.* New York:Longman.