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**Abstract**

This research was conducted to find out: (1) The most dominant learning strategies used by students at English Education Study Program of Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University. (2) The differences of learning strategies used by students with different academic achievement. (3) The specific Language Learning Strategies (LSS) used by high achiever students and low achiever students.This research used QUAN-Qual model, explanatory mixed method design. The subject of this study was the sixth semester sudents at English Education Study Program of Dayanu Iksanuddin University Baubau consisted of 199 students for quantitative data and 10 students for qualitative data.This research used total sampling technique in quantitative and purposive sampling in qualitative. There are three kinds of instruments: SILL, diary/journal and documentation.Quantitative data showed that (1) The most frequently learning strategies used by students at English Education Study Program of Dayanu Ikhsanuddin Baubau was metacognitive strategies.(2) The most dominant learning strategies used by high achiever students and medium achiever students were metacognitive strategies. On the other hand, the strategies frequently used by low achiver students were compensation strategy. The least frequently used by high achiever, medium achiever and low achiever students were memory strategies. (3) Qualitative data showed that high achiever students dominantly used metacognitive strategies meanwhile, low achiever stu dents dominantly used compensation strategies.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Mastering English is not easy because English is not Indonesian mother tongue. Many researchers try to find what makes learners successful at learning a foreign language, and why some people are more successful at learning than others. It can be only answered by investigating learning strategies (Williams & Burden, 1997: 144). By investigating learning strategies, one can find the effective way in learning a foreign language and also help student increase their English ability. Therefore, the use of language learning strategies appropriately can make students easier in mastering English and increase the ability of students in learning a language, it is based on Green and Oxford (1995: 265).

Language learning strategies are among the main factors that help to verify competency and how our students learn a foreign language. Understanding of what students do in language learning process and how it affects language success is important in assisting students in learning English. In other word, language learning strategies have an important role in students’ learning activities; it can help students to solve their problem in learning foreign language.

In line with the statement as previously stated, Chamot (2004) states that the learners use learning strategies to accomplish a learning goal. Moreover, he stated that an open discussion of reasons why students use the strategies can help teachers understand cultural and contextual factors that may be influencing their students.

Classroom language learning is not equally successful for all students of English Educational Study Program of Teacher training and Education Faculty at Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University in Baubau. Some learners have a talent for language learning, it seems, while others are quite hopeless at it. Gardner (1997) stated that despite the fact that sometimes circumstances appear very similar, there are often wide variation in the level of proficiency attained in a second language, even by students in the same class (Dick Alwright and Judith Hanks, 2009: 80).

Based on phenomena in teaching and learning process especially students of English Study Program at English Education Study Program of Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University that the students have various academic achievement, the researcher decides to conduct a research about learning strategies at Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University especially for the sixth semester students.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

According to Oxford (1990b:7-8) “Strategy” comes from the ancient Greek term *strategia* refers to generalship or the art of war. In a more specific sense, strategy entails the optimal management of troops, ships or aircraft in a planned campaign. “Tactics” is different but related to strategies which are tools to achieve the success of strategies. Moreover, the two expressions share some basic concepts: planning, competition, conscious manipulation and movement toward a goal. In non-military settings, the concept of strategy has been applied to the non-adversarial situations, where it has come to mean a plan, step or an action is taken for achieving a specific objective. In addition, Oxford stated that expands the definition of learning strategies and defines them as specific actions taken by the leaner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations.

Rubin(1987: 22) stated that learning strategies are strategies which contribute to the development of the language system which the learner constructs and affect learning directly. Weinstein and Mayer(1986) defined that learning strategies are the behaviors and thoughts that a learner engages in during learning that are intended to influence the learner’s encoding process. In line with this, O’Malley and Chamot (1990: 1) defined learning strategies as the special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information.

Schemeck (1988: 5) stated, strategy is “the implementation of a set procedure (tactics) for accomplishing something” and learning strategy is “a sequence of procedures for accomplishing learning”. Weinstein and Mayer (1986):315) proposed learning strategies as “behaviours and thoughts that a learner engages in during learning and that are intended to influence the learner’s encoding process”. More detail, Rigney (1978:165) defined learning strategies as “cognitive strategy” which is “used to signify operations and produces that the student may use to acquire, retain, retrieve different kinds of knowledge and performance”.

**METHOD**

**Design and subject**

This research used QUAN-Qual model (the second type of mixed methods). The subjects of this research were the sixth semester students at English Education Study Program of Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University. The total of research subjects was 199 students for quantitative data while 10 students for qualitative data. The students spread in five classes at English Education Study Program of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University.

**Instruments**

In the research, the researcher used three instruments they are questionnaire, diary/journal and documentation. Questionnaire used to get quantitative data about students learning strategies. The participants filled out a questionnaire consisting of 50 items. This questionnaire was filled at the time of the activities in the classroom. Diary/journal used for collecting students’ strategies in a more detail way each day in a month. Qualitative data used to support the data that the researcher got from questionnaires. Documentation used to get students’ grade point average.

**Data Analysis**

Data from the SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) by oxford (1990) were analyzed using descriptive analysis. It provides mean, average, of responses and level category.The data processed by statistical package for the social science (SPSS) 20. Descriptive statistics used to investigate the most dominant learning strategies used by sixth students at English Education Study program of Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University. The One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure used to see if there is significant difference between high achievement students and low achievement students in employing learning strategies (in term of types and number of learning strategies). The 0.05 level of statistical significance

To determine the level of frequency of Language Learning Strategies, researcher use categories based on Oxford (1995).

Table 1 . Level of Frequency Rating for Strategy Use

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Frequency of Use | Responses | Mean Scores | Score of Response | Category |
| High | Always or almost always Used | 4,5 to 5,0 | 5 | Highest |
| Usually used | 3,5 to 4,4 | 4 | High |
| Medium | Sometimes used | 2,5 to 3,4 | 3 | Medium |
| Low | Generally not used | 1,5 to 2,4 | 2 | Low |
| Never or almost never used | 1,0 to 1,4 | 1 | Lowest |

In addition, the qualitative data from diary/journal used to support the data that the researcher got from questionnaire in which the researcher analyze the students’ activities in organizing their learning strategies in learning English used interactive data analysis methods developed by Miles and Huberman (1994). There are three elements of interactive data analysis those are data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing or verification.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

1. **The Overall Students’ Language Learning Strategies**

The mean scored for all six categories of LLS as well as individual strategy used by students of English Educational Study Program at Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University Baubau were calculated. Oxford (1990) devided learning strategies into two main groups : direct strategies (memory,cognitive and compensation strategies) and indirect strategies (metacognitive, affective and social strategies). For this research, respondents were reported to use indirect strategies more than direct strategies.

Table 2. Overall mean score and Frequency of LLS

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strategy | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Frequency of use | Rank of use |
| Memory | 199 | 2.8375 | .442 | MEDIUM | 6 |
| Cognitive | 199 | 3.1582 | .519 | MEDIUM | 4 |
| Compensation | 199 | 3.2590 | .517 | MEDIUM | 3 |
| Metacognitive | 199 | 3.5058 | .571 | HIGH | 1 |
| Affective | 199 | 2.9006 | .571 | MEDIUM | 5 |
| Social | 199 | 3.2893 | .668 | MEDIUM | 2 |
| Overall | 1194 | 3.1584 | .602 | MEDIUM |  |

Table 2. Shows that the overall strategy used is M=3, 1584. It indicates that sixth semester students of English study Program at Dayanu Ikhsanuddin Univesity Baubau are medium strategy users. The most frequently used language learning strategies were metacognitive strategies (M=3,5058). As for the least frequently used, memory strategies showed the lowest mean scores with (M=2,8375). The rank of use between categories based on decending order is metacognitive strategies, social strategies, compensation strategies, cognitive strategies, affective strategies, and memory strategies. Furthermore, by using score gain in SILL, data analysis by using analysis of variance for overall strategy.

Table 3. Analysis of variance for overall strategies

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SILL | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 63,162 | 5 | 12,632 | 40,613 | ,000 |
| Within Groups | 369,521 | 1188 | ,311 |  |  |
| Total | 432,683 | 1193 |  |  |  |

In the table above shows that there are differences in the use of six strategies used by F value of 40.613 these differences have a significance level 0.00. Therefore, differences in the use of six strategies are at a significant level.

1. **Strategy Used Based on Students’ Academic Achievement.**

Table 4. The used of each strategy by different academic achievers

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strategy | **High**  **(N=61)** | | **Medium**  **(N=124)** | | **Low**  **(N=14)** | |
| Mean | Rank | Mean | Rank | Mean | Rank |
| Memory | 3.00 | 6 | 2.81 | 5 | 2.39 | 6 |
| Cognitive | 3.49 | 3 | 3.07 | 4 | 2.43 | 5 |
| Compensation | 3.46 | 4 | 3.18 | 2 | 3.11 | 1 |
| Metacognitive | 3.87 | 1 | 3.41 | 1 | 2.76 | 2 |
| Affective | 3.16 | 5 | 2.81 | 5 | 2.60 | 4 |
| Social | 3.67 | 2 | 3.17 | 3 | 2.68 | 3 |

From the table 4 above it appears that based on the average score of each strategy, the most frequently used language learning strategies by High achiever students were metacognitive strategies. As for the least frequently used strategies were memory strategies. The rank of use based on descending order is metacognitive strategies, social strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, affective strategies, and memory strategies.

The most frequently used language learning strategies by medium achievers were metacognitive strategies. The least frequently used strategies were memory strategies. The rank of use based on descending order is metacognitive strategies, social strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies then, affective strategies and memory strategies.

The most frequently used language learning strategies by low achievers were compensation strategies. The least frequently used strategies were memory strategies. The rank of use based on descending order is compensation strategies, metacognitive strategies, social strategies, affective strategies, cognitive strategies, and memory strategies.

1. **Specific Language Learning Strategies used by High Achievers and Low Achievers**

Specific Language Learning strategies Used by high achievers and low achiever students was obtained from recording journal/diary for a month. In recording diary, there were more activities and efforts done by high achievers than low achievers. This result consistent with the result of simsek (2010) indicated that successful students used more varied and better learning strategies than unsuccessful students.

1. Language Element

High achievers used various strategies in their learning. In learning pronunciation, the strategies used were 7 activities that included in 3 sub-categories of cognitive strategies (practicing naturalistically, using resources for receiving messages, formally practicing with sounds) and one activity that included in 1 sub-category of metacognitive strategies (self-monitoring). In learning grammar, the strategies used were 8 kinds of activities that included in 4 sub-categories of metacognitive strategies (Finding out about learning, seeking practice opportunities, linking with already known material, delay speech production to focus on listening). In learning vocabularies, the strategies used were 5 activities that included in 3 sub-categories of cognitive strategies (practicing naturalistically, using resources for receiving messages, and translating), 6 activities included in 2 sub-categories of metacognitive strategies (finding out about language learning and planning for a language task) and one activities that included in 1 sub-categories of compensation strategies (guessing).

The Language Learning strategies used by low achiever students in learning pronunciation used two activities that included in 2 sub-categories of compensation strategies (getting help and avoiding) and one activities that included in 1 sub-categories of cognitive strategies (formally practicing with sounds). In learning vocabularies, low achievers used various strategies namely, one activities that included in one activity that included in 1 sub-category of memory strategies (reviewing well), one activity that included in 1 sub-category of social strategies (cooperating with peers), one activity included in 1 sub-category of cognitive strategies (using resources for receiving messages), and one activity included in 1 sub-category of compensation strategies (getting help). In learning grammar, they used one strategy that included in 1 sub-category of cognitive strategy (using resources for receiving messages) and one activity that included in 1 sub-category of compensation strategies (getting help).

1. Language skills

The Language Learning Strategies used by high achiever students in learning listening were 4 activities that included in 2 sub-categories of metacognitive strategies (paying attention and finding out about language learning) and 4 activities that included in 1 sub-category of cognitive strategies (practicing naturalistically). In learning speaking used 12 activities that included in 1 sub- categories of metacognitive strategies (seeking practice opportunities). In learning writing, they used 5 activities of 1 sub-category of metacognitive strategies (planning for a language task) and 3 activities of 1 sub-category of cognitive strategies (practicing naturalistically). In learning reading used 7 activities that included in 1 sub-topic of metacognitive strategies (Identifying the purpose of a language task).

The language learning strategies used by low achiever students in learning learning listening were 2 activities that included in 1 sub-category of compensation strategies (getting help) and one activities that included in 1 sub-category of cognitive strategies (using resources for receiving messages). In learning speaking, the strategies used were 3 activities that included in 2 sub categories of compensation strategies (switching to the mother tongue and avoiding communication partially or totally) and one activities that included in 1 sub-category of social strategies (cooperating with peers). In learning writing were one activity that included in 1 sub-category of social strategies (asking for correction from a friend) and 1 activity of 1 sub-category of cognitive strategies (using resources). In learning reading, the strategies used were one activity of 1 sub-category of cognitive strategies (using resources) and one activity that included in 1 sub-category of social strategies (cooperating with other).

From the explanation above, the strategies dominantly used by high achievers were metacognitive strategies. which deals with a way for learners to coordinate with their own learning process (oxford,1990). Such result also appears in other studies, for example Melor Md Yunus et.al. (2013) finding on Malaysian Gifted Students’ the highest of use metacognitive strategies and the lowest of use memory strategies, Dhanapala (2006). This indicates that metacognitive strategies are generally favoured by advance learner students, as they allows learner to control their own cognition by coordinating the planning, organizing, and evaluating the learning process while low achievers dominantly used compensation strategies. Such result also appears in previous studies, such as Dhanapala (2006) finding on Japanese(EFL) learners used compensation strategies most frequently. This indicated that this strategies help learners to use the target language for either comprehension or production in spite of the limitation in knowledge

**DISCUSSIONS**

The most frequently used language learning strategies were metacognitive strategies (M=3,5058) The least frequently used, memory strategies showed the lowest mean scores with (M=2,8375) The rank of use between categories based on decending order is metacognitive strategies, social strategies, compensation strategies, cognitive strategies, affective strategies, and memory strategies.

In term of strategies used in each level of students academic achievement that strategies dominantly used by high achievers and medium achievers were metacognitive strategies. On the other hand, the strategies frequently used by low achiver students were compensation strategies. The least frequently used by high achievers, medium achievers and low achiever students were memory strategies.

Qualitative data showed that in (1) Language element : High achievers, in learning pronunciation, the strategies used were 3 sub-categories of cognitive strategies (practicing naturalistically, using resources for receiving messages, formally practicing with sounds) and 1 sub-categories of metacognitive strategies (self-monitoring). In learning grammar, the strategies used were 4 sub-categories of metacognitive strategies (Finding out about learning, seeking practice opportunities, linking with already known material, delay speech production to focus on listening). In learning vocabularies, the strategies used were 3 sub-categories of cognitive strategies (practicing naturalistically, using resources for receiving messages, and translating), 2 sub-categories of metacognitive strategies (finding out about language learning and planning for a language task) and 1 sub-categories of compensation strategies (guessing). On the other hand, the Language Learning strategies used by low achiever students in learning pronunciation used 2 sub-categories of compensation strategies (getting help and avoiding) and 1 sub-categories of cognitive strategies (formally practicing with sounds). In learning vocabularies, low achievers used various strategies namely, 1 sub-category of memory strategies (reviewing well), 1 sub-category of social strategies (cooperating with peers), 1 sub-category of cognitive strategies (using resources for receiving messages), and 1 sub-category of compensation strategies (getting help). In learning grammar, they used 1 sub-category of cognitive strategy (using resources for receiving messages) and 1 sub-category of compensation strategies (getting help). (2) Language skills: The Language Learning Strategies used by high achiever students in learning listening were 2 sub-categories of metacognitive strategies (paying attention and finding out about language learning) and 1 sub-category of cognitive strategies (practicing naturalistically). In learning speaking used 1 sub- categories of metacognitive strategies (seeking practice opportunities). In learning writing, they used 1 sub-category of metacognitive strategies (planning for a language task) and 1 sub-category of cognitive strategies (practicing naturalistically). In learning reading used 1 sub-topic of metacognitive strategies (Identifying the purpose of a language task).

Meanwhile, the language learning strategies used by low achiever students in learning listening was 1 sub-category of compensation strategies (getting help) and 1 sub-category of cognitive strategies (using resources for receiving messages). In learning speaking, the strategies used were 2 sub categories of compensation strategies (switching to the mother tongue and avoiding communication partially or totally) and 1 sub-category of social strategies (cooperating with peers). In learning writing were 1 sub-category of social strategies (asking for correction from a friend) and 1 sub-category of cognitive strategies (using resources). In learning reading, the strategies used were 1 sub-category of cognitive strategies (using resources) and 1 sub-category of social strategies (cooperating with other).

**Conclusions**

Based on the findings and discussion, the researcher puts forward conclusion as follows :

1. The result of the study show that metacognitive strategies marked the highest usage or the most frequently used by students at English Education Study Program of Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University Baubau.
2. The result show that high achiever students employed diffrent Language Learning Strategies to low achiever students. Strategies dominantly used by high achiever and medium achiever students were metacognitive strategies. On the other hand, the strategies frequently used by low achiver students were compensation strategy. The least frequently used by high achiever, medium achiever and low achiever students were memory strategies.
3. The diary/journal showed that high achiever students used metacognitive strategies meanwhile, low achiever students used compensation strategies.

**B.Suggestions**

Considering the conclusion above, the researcher gives some suggestion as follows :

1. It requires a specific skill or understanding set from educators in teaching a language to the students with various academic achievement in the same class.
2. Students are expected to focus on why and to what extent successful students use different strategies than unsuccesful students.
3. Since this study only identified the learning strategies of university students, it is suggested for further resesarch to examine what really happens if all students go through strategy training as early as possible in their educational experiences.
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