

## Language Learning Strategy Used among Secondary School ESL Students

Aqeela Ahmad Kamiri, Nurul Kamilah Malip, Bazriah Syad  
Hameed, Peremalatha Govindasamy, Ahmad Syahir Nekmat,  
Harwati Hashim

Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v12-i3/10426>

DOI:10.6007/IJARBSS/v12-i3/10426

**Published Date:** 25 March 2022

### Abstract

The role of English as a Second Language in Malaysia has prompted ESL learners to explore multi techniques and strategies in learning. However, popular strategies applied by secondary students in Malaysia are not much known. Hence, this study aims to identify the language learning strategies employed by successful language learners among secondary school students in Malaysia. This research employs a survey research design that encompasses the strategy inventory for Language Learning (SILL) It includes the six strategies proposed by (Oxford, 1989). About 38 secondary school students from different states were selected through a purposive sampling technique to answer the survey for the data collection. For the finding, it is revealed that the secondary school students use metacognitive strategies the most, followed by cognitive and memory strategies, which are considered the least used among learning learners. As a result, even though all the three strategies are being employed in their language learning process, it appears that the metacognitive strategy is the one that stands out the most thus confirming its interrelations with successful language learners. Therefore, the language learners strategies practised among secondary school varies from metacognitive as the most preferable one, followed by cognitive, and lastly memory strategies hence reflecting their proficiency level as good language learners.

**Keywords:** Language Learning Strategies, English as a Second Language (ESL), Secondary School

### Introduction

Learning a language requires determination and continuous effort since it is devoted to the understanding of a target language system. The analysis report by the Ministry of Education Malaysia (MOE), surprisingly reported that the English subject has stated as the highest improvement from other core subjects in the 2019 Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia (SPM) examinations (Ministry of Education, 2019). The percentage of a passing grade in the subject has lifted tremendously from 80.5 percent in 2019 SPM to 79.4 per cent in 2018 (Murniati, 2020). This is something to ponder since it takes the requirements of being good language

learners to successfully learn the language. Even though this subject matter sounds so familiar and regularly discussed, it is crucial to note that the roles of learners were relatively neglected (Larsen-Freeman, 2001). Hashim et al (2018) further explained that the successful adult learners' learning techniques in SLA remain concealed. Therefore, this paper is interested in identifying the learning strategies employed by successful language learners among secondary school students in Malaysia. Speaking of the language learning strategy, the common concept including Wenden 1987a as cited in Hardan (2013), learning strategies are multiple techniques that are applied by learners in the learning process to increase understanding. Language learners are used as a way to facilitate language acquisition and use the knowledge they get, keeping it and recall (Hardan, 2013). It is also notable that different individuals are believed to employ different strategies towards becoming skilled in their second language acquisition and choices that are considered effective for an individual may not work the same for the others. This is congruent with Hashim et al (2018) study which highlighted that there is no one particular strategy that can cater for the needs of every single learner.

In this paper, the researchers adopted the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by (Oxford, 1989). Initially, SILL includes the six strategies: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. Since much prior research has been revolving about the six elements this paper intended to give it a little twist by concentrating on the three strategies specifically memory, cognitive and metacognitive. The reason is to explore more on the brain activity and mental process despite other strategies that relate to outside factors like social, affective, and compensation. O'Malley et al (1985) put forth that good language learners are keen on practising metacognitive to monitor their learning. This is parallel with the target participants categorized as above high achiever language learners. Another motivation to choose these three strategies is because they are also believed to interrelate with one another. A popular cognitive view stated that language learning acquires process and action upon the knowledge and learners' role are rather crucial in implementing multiple techniques during that process (Griffiths, 2003).

Looking at metacognitive, it comprises the skill to manage own learning by staying aware of the process itself and mostly revolving around the process of thinking about thinking. It deals with learner higher-order cognitive process. Meanwhile, another part is the cognitive strategy that recounts further memorisation and integration. Here, we could see that some part of the memorization process is also involved. A cognitive strategy frequently deals with the effort to figure out and comprehend some information that they received (Hashim et al., 2018). The third strategy is the memory strategy, where learners enter information into their storage and retrieve it when needed. Since this study involves good language learners, the frequency of application of the three strategies expected to be able to identify their preferences of mental processes.

## **Literature Review**

### *Language Learning Strategies*

In acquiring the language, the implementation of learning strategies is among the crucial mechanisms that help language learners in their learning tasks. Shakarami et al (2017) asserted that learning strategies are often applied by language learners for several purposes including to enhance their knowledge and comprehension, also to be adequate towards the

target language. From the past studies, many experts and researchers defined language learning strategies from several perspectives. The first emergence of language learning strategies in the literature of the second language was in 1975 and it alluded to the particular behaviours, activities, methods and also approaches applied by learners to acquire language (Rubin, 1975). Other than that, Gagné (1985) perceived learning strategies as the cognitive activities that aim to serve learners with various methods starting on how to understand the questions till the way to provide the answers. Language learning strategies are also described from various features including the behaviours towards language learning, cognitive theory and the affective views (Wenden, 1987a). Furthermore, according to Allwright (1990); Little (1991) language, learning strategies focus on strengthening learners' self-reliance, self-determination, and persistence.

Looking from the previous researches, the definition of language learning strategies from Oxford (1990) has been found to be the most frequently cited in studies regarding language learning strategies. Oxford (1990) elucidated language learning strategies as "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations" (p. 8). It is indeed the thought and idea on what learners destine to execute in internalizing the knowledge that they have learnt and how they apply it in real-life situations. Hence, this is aligned with the definition of language learning strategies from O'Malley & Chamot (1990), which described language learning strategies as the thoughts and behaviours implemented by learners in a conscious state intended to assist the manoeuvre of language learning tasks and to customize the language learning process. In the same vein, language learning strategies are also defined as a practice of personal cognitive skills that are executed by learners in the educational milieu (Beltran, 1993).

In addition, Cohen (2014) indicates language learning strategies as the approaches and processes that assist learners' knowledge acquisition and target language competence development. In another aspect, language learning strategies are related to learners' behaviour that they employed in coping and handling language learning difficulties. Furthermore, according to Monereo et al (2001), language learning strategies direct to the coequal procedures and methods that are utilized by learners in receiving new information and obtaining recent content effectively. All language learning strategies have the same concepts which contribute towards student-centred learning. This is also stated by Rose (2012) that language learning strategies are related and affiliated with students' independence, self-control and self-regulation.

#### *Features of Language Learning Strategies*

According to Oxford (2003), A strategy is considered as helpful and useful for students' learning if "(a) the strategy relates well to the L2 task at hand, (b) the strategy fits the particular student's learning style preference to one degree or another, and (c) the student employs the strategy effectively and links it with other relevant strategies". (p. 8) Different learning strategies have to be implemented by students depending on the situation and problems that they are facing. Hence, learning strategies are also problem-oriented according to Oxford's studies. In connection with that, Oxford (1990) has recognised twelve key features of language learning strategies as follows:

The fundamental features of language learning strategies by Oxford (1990) are (1) It must be goal-oriented, (2) more to self-directed learning by the learners, (3) enlarge teachers' contribution, (4) can be taught, (5) have to be problem-oriented, (6) particular methods employ by learners to assist their learning, (7) require learners to include various (not only cognitive), (8) involve both, directly and indirectly, learning, (9) are not always been noticed (10) always be purposeful (11) can be modified and (12) affected by many strands.

In addition, recently Macaro (2004) also proposed other features of learning strategies that are necessitated in identifying and describing a strategy. This is due to the reason that language strategies are salient to link the subconscious mental activity with the cognitive processes. Apart from that, learning strategies also have the capabilities and potential to be executed according to the learning situations. Therefore, Macaro (2004) described fourteen features of learning strategies as follows:

The features of learning strategies as presented by Macaro (2004) are (1) the description of a strategy should be irreducible, (2) should have a clear goals, (3) should be transferable according to the situations, (4) have the elements of mental action, (5) strategy must align and follow its algorithm which is: if in a learning situation X, and the learning goal is Y, then try mental action Z, (6) have different level of correspondence, (7) have different level of automaticity and proceduralization, (8) language learning strategy and component of the language content must be different and separable, (9) the potential strategy that involve with language learning process must be proposed, even if only at the level of hypothesis, (10) not necessarily utilize by all learners, (11) require appropriate levels of linguistic knowledge, (12) strategy cluster which is by combining it with other strategies, (13) Strategy clusters include the series of metacognitive strategies, and (14) strategy clusters also interact with cognitive processes.

### *Good Language Learners*

The world of teaching is shifting from being teacher-centred to more student-centred. Gone are the days when teachers were expected to do mindless exercises and bore half the students. Times have changed and trends in teaching have also changed. Today, students should be more autonomous in their studies. Strategic learners understand their thinking and learning methods and can write strategies that best suit their learning advantages, (Tigarajan et al., 2016). Students must learn to apply strategies based on strategies that are useful to them in learning various skills of the language, and then teachers play a role in teaching students to understand their learning strategy preferences.

According to the findings of Zare (2012), no matter what teaching methods or techniques teachers use, some students seem to be good language learners, while other students cannot succeed. As a result, the study characterises exceptional language learners in terms of personal traits, learning styles, and techniques. Excellent language learners are motivated to learn and think that they can do so. They handle uncertainty well, are patient with themselves, are aware of their learning styles, are aware of successful learning techniques, and are not afraid to ask questions or make mistakes. The majority of these kids have strong organisational abilities and are open to recommendations on how to improve their organisation. Good language learners can swiftly record, retain, and recover new knowledge or abilities, and they can easily identify opportunities to put them to use.

Thu (2009) mentioned several good language learners characteristics based on Rubin & Thompson (1982) that they will find their way and control their learning. They determine the most suitable method as an individual learner and learn from others and try different methods. The next step is for good language learners to synchronise their language learning with knowledge about the language they are studying. Good language learners are creative and imaginative, and they understand that language is creative as well. They play around with languages, experimenting with syntax, vocabulary, and sounds. Inside and outside of the classroom, excellent language learners generate their opportunities to practise the language. Good language learners, on the other hand, learn to live amid ambiguity by concentrating on what they can comprehend rather than panicking, and by continuing to talk or listen even if they do not understand every word. To recall what they are learning, they employ mnemonics and other memory techniques. These students make blunders that benefit them rather than harm them. When learning a second language, good language learners apply their previous knowledge of the language, including their first language expertise. They tend to use contextual cues to help them understand the language. They take full advantage of the full potential context of the language of interest to improve understanding. Good language learners learn many languages as a whole and formal routines that help them improve their skills. For instance, they can learn idioms, proverbs, or other phrases to understand the meaning of the entire phrase without having to understand the individual part. They will learn some conversation skills and certain production skills, which can also fill in the disparities in their abilities. Lastly, excellent language learners will learn different styles of spoken or written language to change their language according to the condition.

However, not all of these "good language learners" possess all of these characteristics at the same time, but most of them have developed over time. Good language learners can learn without the guidance of a teacher, but when there is a teacher, they can use the teacher as a resource and benefit from this relationship. These students do not view the teacher as an "all-knowing" person who will never be questioned but as a facilitator or equal partner. When studying a second language in an internal or external environment, students can apply and modify the techniques they employed in their first language and other skill areas. The Good Language Learner, according to Sykes (2015), refers to someone who tries to apply and expand on classroom language in both formal and casual situations. Other methods may be introduced to ensure a clearer, more successful, and more enjoyable learning experience once students are worried about their learning style and analyse the tactics they are currently familiar with.

## **Research Methodology**

### *Research Design*

This research employed a quantitative design using survey questions to answer the research question. To ensure the reliability of the research, all of the participants were required to answer all questions given, giving their perception and opinions towards the language learning strategy in terms of memory, cognitive, and meta-cognitive strategy. They were also needed to provide their demographic profile i.e. gender, age, and location as well as their level of proficiency in English.

### *Population*

The participants in this research were 38 students, and there were 12 male students which represented 31.6% and 26 female students which represented 68.4% of the research population. The students were randomly chosen from four different secondary schools in Selangor, Negeri Sembilan, and Melaka. From the findings, there were 17 students (44.7%) who are 16 years old, while the remaining 21 students or 55.3% are 17 years old. These students were from upper secondary Science streams and Arts streams, and all of them were exposed to the current syllabus of Common European Framework for References (CEFR) when they were in Form One. The research was aimed at high-level proficiency students. Different schools were chosen to identify the strategy used by both genders in language learning. The participants learn English as a second language under the requirement from the Ministry of Education Malaysia.

### *Sample*

This study used purposive sampling and students selected were from intermediate and advanced level students. This study consists of 38 students from three states. There were eleven students from SMK Saujana Impian, Selangor, ten students from SMK Batu Kikir, Negeri Sembilan, nine students from SMK Banting, Selangor and eight students from SMK Munshi Abdullah, Melaka. All of these students were selected by the researchers that matched the required criteria – the level of proficiency and the location of the school.

### *Instrument*

The questionnaire used to gather the data was adapted from Oxford's SILL (1990) to measure the frequency of language learning strategies used by foreign and second language (L2) learners and was divided into six parts based on Oxford's (1990) classification of language learning strategies. For this study, to suit the purpose of the study, only three parts of SILL will be focussed on.

The inventory used in this survey comprises 3 aspects under language learning strategy: memory, cognitive and meta-cognitive. The memory strategy was measured through items that measure the effectiveness of extracting information from their memories. The cognitive part focuses on students' abilities in understanding the language. The meta-cognitive part focuses on participants' abilities in developing stronger language learning skills.

The cognitive aspects focused on the strategy the participants used in learning the language. The last aspect of the survey focused on the participants' metacognitive strategy in adopting their specific learning attitude. For this study, students are required to indicate their agreement or disagreement, using the five-scale Likert point. The statements used are varied, from nine to fourteen positive and negative statements. The statements were arranged randomly to avoid bias where the participants might tend towards agreeing to every statement. Apart from that, it is also meant to maintain participants' alertness in answering all questions.

### Data Collection

All 38 students answered the survey via Google Form link and were sent to their respective English teachers to distribute it among the students. The respondents were given specific instructions by their teachers. The link to the questionnaire was closed after three days. The online survey was chosen due to several reasons – all of the respondents were from different locations, the current situation of the Covid-19 pandemic where students were restricted from attending school and need to have online classes from home, and it is relatively low costs (Teo, 2013). The Statistical Package for Social Sciences or SPSS was used to analyze the data collected, and to identify whether it answered the research question quantitatively.

### Findings and Discussion

#### Introduction

The method of analysis that has been carried out in this study was examined in this chapter. Thus, by using the data that has been collected, the descriptive analysis was conducted. Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 23 has been used to analyze the data to fulfil the objectives. There is one research objective achieved in this study, which is to identify the learning strategies employed by successful language learners among Secondary School students in Malaysia. The results of this study are presented in tables.

#### Demography of Respondents

Table 4.1 to Table 4.4 showed the demographic distribution of the respondents. The results of the study found that most of the respondents were female (68.4%), while the remaining 31.6% were male.

Table 4.1 Gender

	Frequency	Percentage
Male	12	31.6
Female	26	68.4




Figure 4.1 Gender

Furthermore, the profile of respondents according to age showed that 17 people (44.7%) were 16 years old and the remaining 21 people (55.3%) were 17 years old.

Table 4.2 Age

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
16 years old	17	44.7
17 years old	21	55.3




Figure 4.2 Age

Next, the findings in Table 4.3 showed that a total of 10 people (26.3%) stated that English was difficult to learn, while a total of 28 people (73.7%) stated that English was not difficult to learn.

Table 4.3 English Is Difficult To Learn

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	10	26.3
No	28	73.7



Figure 4.3 English Is Difficult To Learn

The results in Table 4.4 showed that 10 people (26.3%) rate their proficiency as "high" which means that they "scores high in all class practices". A total of 27 people (71.1%) rated themselves as "intermediate" which means they "scores averagely well in all the class



practices”, and only one person (2.6%) rated themselves as “low” which means they “scores below average in all the class practices”.

Table 4.4 Rate Your English Proficiency Level

	Frequency	Percentage
High - scores high in all the class practices	10	26.3
Intermediate - scores averagely well in all the class practices	28	73.7




Figure 4.4 Rate Your English Proficiency Level

#### Reliability Analysis

Table 4.5 showed the reliability range of the strategy inventory for language learning from the aspects of using memory strategy, using cognitive strategy and using metacognitive strategy were between 0.718 to 0.938. Whereas, Cronbach's alpha for the whole was 0.946 (31 items). Thus, Cronbach's alpha showed that the instruments used had high reliability.

Table 4.5 Reliability Analysis

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	N of items
Using Memory Strategy	0.718	8
Using Cognitive Strategy	0.917	14
Using Metacognitive Strategy	0.938	9
<b>Overall (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning)</b>	<b>0.946</b>	<b>31</b>

#### Strategy Inventory for Language Learning

The results of this study were to answer the research objective, which was to identify the learning strategies employed by successful language learners among Secondary School students in Malaysia. The descriptive analysis was used to obtain the frequency, percentage, the mean and standard deviation to clearly describe the distribution of the data obtained. To give a clearer picture, the descriptive analysis was shown in Table 4.8 to Table 4.

*Using Memory Strategy*

In this study, using memory strategy was measured by 8 items. Table 4.8 showed six items had moderate scores, while the other two items had low scores. The results of this study showed item A1 which was "I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English" recorded the highest mean (mean = 3.16, SD = 0.886), followed by the item A4 that was, "I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used" (mean = 3.08, SD = 1.260) and item A2 which was, "I use new English words in a sentence so that I can remember them" (mean = 3.03, SD = 1.078). Meanwhile, item A5 that was "I use rhymes to remember new English words" recorded the lowest mean (mean = 2.37, SD = 1.025). Next by imagining the vivid picture in their will allow students to remember better when there are no physical stimuli. Lastly, the least usage of rhymes may be due to the fact it is more synonym to younger learners like children since they are more attracted to songs and fancy chants. On the whole, the score using memory strategy (mean = 2.84, SD = 0.637) among the Secondary School students in Malaysia was at a moderate level.

Table 4.8 Using Memory Strategy

No	Statements	Mean	SD	Level
A1	I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English	3.16	.886	Moderate
A2	I use new English words in a sentence so that I can remember them	3.03	1.078	Moderate
A3	I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help remember the word	2.74	1.005	Moderate
A4	I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used	3.08	1.260	Moderate
A5	I use rhymes to remember new English words	2.37	1.025	Low
A7	I physically act out new English words	2.84	1.326	Moderate
A8	I review English lessons often	2.66	.878	Low
A9	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board or on a street sign	2.84	1.242	Moderate
<b>Overall</b>		<b>2.84</b>	<b>.637</b>	<b>Moderate</b>

[Level: Very low = 1.00 – 1.89, Low = 1.90 – 2.69, Moderate = 2.70 – 3.49, High = 3.50 – 4.29, Very high = 4.30 - 5.00] Izani & Yahya (2014)

*Using Cognitive Strategy*

In this study, using cognitive strategy was measured by 14 items. Table 4.9 shows five items had high scores, while the other nine items had moderate scores. The results of this study showed item B6 which was, "I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to the movies spoken in English" recorded the highest mean (mean = 3.92, SD = 1.075), followed by item B3 which was, "I practice the sounds of English" (mean = 3.68, SD = 1.093) and item B9, which was "I first skim-read an English passage (read over the passage quickly), then go back and read carefully" (mean = 3.58, SD = 1.244). The students tend to choose to learn in ways that give them more pleasure and less formal compared to formally prepared

to learn the language. Meanwhile, item B12 that was "I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand" also recorded the lowest mean (mean = 2.92, SD = 1.148). On the whole, the score of using cognitive strategy (mean = 3.30, SD = 0.775) among the Secondary School students in Malaysia was at a moderate level. Dividing the words into parts would cause them to put more effort into the mental part to comprehend the meaning thus making it the least preferable one.

Table 4.9 Using Cognitive Strategy

No	Statements	Mean	SD	Level
B1	I say or write English words several times	3.42	1.130	Moderate
B2	I try to talk like native English speakers	3.55	1.032	High
B3	I practice the sounds of English	3.68	1.093	High
B4	I use English words I know in different ways	3.45	1.179	Moderate
B5	I start conversations in English	3.05	.957	Moderate
B6	I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to the movies spoken in English	3.92	1.075	High
B7	I read for pleasure in English	3.50	1.084	High
B8	I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English	2.95	1.064	Moderate
B9	I first skim-read an English passage (read over the passage quickly), then go back and read carefully	3.58	1.244	High
B10	I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English	3.16	1.151	Moderate
B11	I try to find patterns in English	2.97	1.174	Moderate
B12	I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand	2.92	1.148	Moderate
B13	I try not to translate word by word	3.08	1.217	Moderate
B14	I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English	3.03	1.052	Moderate
<b>Overall</b>		<b>3.30</b>	<b>.775</b>	<b>Moderate</b>

[Level: Very low = 1.00 – 1.89, Low = 1.90 – 2.69, Moderate = 2.70 – 3.49, High = 3.50 – 4.29, Very high = 4.30 - 5.00] Izani & Yahya (2014)

#### *Using Metacognitive Strategy*

In this study, using metacognitive strategy was measured by 9 items. Table 4.10 showed seven items had a high score, one item had a moderate score and another item had a low score. The results of this study showed item C3 which was, "I pay attention when someone is speaking English" recorded the highest mean (mean = 3.92, SD = 0.912), followed by item C9 which was, "I think about my progress in learning English" (mean = 3.82, SD = 0.926) and item C4 which was, "I try to find out how to be a better learner of English" (mean = 3.79, SD = 1.094). Paying attention and caring about one's learning progress are the characteristics of successful language learners. Meanwhile, item C5 was, "I plan my schedule so that I will have enough time to study English" recorded the lowest mean (mean = 2.68, SD = 1.068). It is undeniable that planning to study based on schedule requires commitment more than the first two items. On the whole, the score of using metacognitive strategy (mean = 3.54, SD = 0.845) among the Secondary School students in Malaysia was at a high level.

Table 4.10 Using Metacognitive Strategy

No	Statements	Mean	SD	Level
C1	I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English	3.53	1.059	High
C2	I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me to do better	3.66	1.047	High
C3	I pay attention when someone is speaking English	3.92	.912	High
C4	I try to find out how to be a better learner of English	3.79	1.094	High
C5	I plan my schedule so that I will have enough time to study English	2.68	1.068	Low
C6	I look for people I can talk English	3.32	.989	Moderate
C7	I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English	3.53	1.179	High
C8	I have clear goals for improving my English skills	3.58	1.004	High
C9	I think about my progress in learning English	3.82	.926	High
<b>Overall</b>		<b>3.54</b>	<b>.845</b>	<b>High</b>

[Level: Very low = 1.00 – 1.89, Low = 1.90 – 2.69, Moderate = 2.70 – 3.49, High = 3.50 – 4.29, Very high = 4.30 - 5.00] Izani & Yahya (2014)

#### *Strategy Inventory Formulation for Language Learning*

Based on Table 4.11, it could be seen that using metacognitive (mean = 3.54, SD = 0.845) had the highest score for the learning strategies employed by successful language learners among the Secondary School students in Malaysia, followed by using cognitive strategy (mean = 3.30, SD = 0.775) and using memory strategy (mean = 2.84, SD = 0.637). Based on the result, this study confirms quite several previous studies which claims that metacognitive strategies are the most common one to be practised by successful language learners compared to cognitive and memory. This is parallel to a previous study from Ang et al. (2017), which claimed that the most frequently used strategy in language learning is metacognitive strategies, then followed correspondingly by other strategies including memory, social, compensation, cognitive, and affective strategies that are perceived as the least used strategies among successful language learners. Since this research has been focusing on successful language learners, it is not surprising that memory strategies were at the moderate level since the straightforwardness of doing it is believed to give more impact to the less proficient language learners.

Table 4.11 Summary of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning

	Mean	SD	Level
Using memory strategy	2.84	.637	Moderate
Using Cognitive Strategy	3.30	.775	Moderate
Using Metacognitive Strategy	3.54	.845	High

[Level: Very low = 1.00 – 1.89, Low = 1.90 – 2.69, Moderate = 2.70 – 3.49, High = 3.50 – 4.29, Very high = 4.30 - 5.00] Izani & Yahya (2014)

**Discussion***Using Memory Strategies*

According to the comparison of memory strategies with other two strategies as well as cognitive and Metacognitive strategies level of A1 statement in memory strategies is moderate because its Mean value is 3.16 and SD is .886 as well as in cognitive strategy B1 statement also has moderate value its Mean value is 3.42 and SD is 1.130 which is also moderate but in metacognitive strategies, the mean value of C1 statement is 3.53 And SD is 1.059 which is comparatively higher than the other two strategies. It can be seen in every table that the values of memory and cognitive strategies are moderate than Metacognitive strategies so it can be concluded that the Metacognitive strategies are more important and have higher values than the other two strategies that have been used during this research process. Based on the findings, it can be implied that memorizing new things and applying them to the new context is the commonest technique applied by the students. It could be due to its simplicity. As defined by Oxford (1990), memory strategies include easy philosophies like positioning items accordingly, thinking of relations and revising.

*Using Cognitive Strategies*

Similarly, as this study explained that all strategies have different levels like 1.00-1.89 its level is very low, between 1.90-2.69 it is low, within 2.70-3.49 it's moderate, the value of SD and mean is increasing between 3.50- 4.29 and the values of Mean and SD that lies between 4.30 and 5.00 considered high. But in some cases, like B2 "I try to talk like native English speakers" and B2 "I practice the sounds of English" the value of the cognitive mean is 3.55 and 3.68 respectively and SD in both cases is 1.032 and 1.093 respectively which shows high values as compared to the memory strategies which have moderate and low mean and SD values. So it is concluded that cognitive strategies have higher values than memory strategies but fewer values from metacognitive strategies in many cases.

*Using Metacognitive Strategies*

Meta-cognitive techniques, such as focus, are intended for search of training in the discovery, in the preparation of the courses, for self-esteem, and the promotion of the observation error. This technique is more important than the other two strategies as it can be seen throughout the quantitative analysis metacognitive strategies have high mean and SD value but in case C5 "I plan my schedule so that I will have enough time to study English" the value of mean is 2.68 and SD value is 1.068 and in case C6 "I look for people I can talk English" the Mean value is 3.32 and SD is .989 which is moderate but overall results show that the metacognitive strategies have high values than memory and cognitive strategies.

**Conclusion to the Discussion**

According to the research, Metacognitive processes include the learner's anticipation in the language learning, monitor their know-how and creativity, and assess how well they are doing to achieve the training goal. On the other hand, cognitive processes include the way students interact with the material to be studied to control the intellectual (for example, through the creation of a mental image or the reference to a new database recently acquired a set of ideas or options) or (e.g., in the collection of the things that are going to be studied at the significant classifications or took notes, and made notes. But memory strategies just focused on grouping, rhyming and structural reviews.

From this research, it is concluded that the metacognitive strategies have overall high values than memory and cognitive strategies and memory strategies have less and moderate values than the other two strategies but cognitive have less in some cases but also high in some cases as compared to the memory strategies but this strategy also have lesser mean and SD values than metacognitive strategies. So it can be concluded that in this study, metacognitive strategies are more important and effective in English language learning skills than the other two strategies.

### **Conclusion and Implications**

Based on the discussion of the paper, it has stated that compared to cognition and memory strategy, metacognitive strategies are the most widely used strategies for successful language learners. It has been shown that the respondents use more metacognitive strategies followed by cognitive and memory strategies, which are considered the least used among learning learners. Given that this research has focused on successful language learners, it is not surprising that memory strategies are at an intermediate level because it is believed that the openness of doing so will have a greater impact on less skilled language learners.

According to Balini & Jeyabalan (2018), memorization can be considered as a lower order of learning, which is not very useful for students. This is because the input from the memorization can be quickly erased from memory, and that information is rarely applied as well as there is no in-depth examination. However, the learning process is steady and necessary when it is based on comprehension and cognitive skills. This research paper offers the opportunity for learners, especially those who are learning language to review the different styles of strategies in language learning as well as the benefits that they gain by practising it and teachers to review the foresight to work on these tactics and include them into their teaching methods. Therefore, it would be important to research language learning strategies used among secondary school students.

Since it is known that metacognitive strategies are the one associated with successful language learners, thus the teachers can encourage more metacognitive strategies among less successful learners as it is proven to be effective. More modules encompassing this element can be developed in school to assist the learning process for the weaker students. As from the data collected the effect size is revealed, the cognitive and metacognitive appears to show not much differences in terms of preferences compared to memory that shows significant difference from the two mentioned.

### **References**

- Allwright, D. (1990). *Autonomy in language pedagogy* (CRILE Working Paper 6. Centre for Research in Education). University of Lancaster, U.K. doi:10.1099/00221287-136-2-327
- Ang, S., Embi, M. A., & Yunus, M. M. (2017). Strategies of Successful English Language Learners among Private School Students. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 5(2), 47–57. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um030v5i22017p047>
- Aziz, N., Hashim, H., & Yunus, M. M. (2019). Using Social Media to Enhance ESL Writing Skill among Gen-Z Learners. *Creative Education*, 10(12), 3020–3027. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2019.1012226>
- Balini, M. A. I., & Jeyabalan, V. D. *ROLE OF MEMORY STRATEGY TRAINING IN LANGUAGE LEARNING*.

- Beltrán, J. (1993). Processes, strategies, and learning techniques. Madrid: Síntesis.
- Calon, K., Pendidikan, S. K., Kerajaan, S. A., Menengah, S., Negeri, A., Menengah, S., Rakyat, A., Swasta, S., & Keseluruhan, J. (n.d.). *No Title*.
- Cohen, A. D. (2014). Strategies in learning and using a second language. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833200>
- Gagné, R. M. (1985). The conditions of learning and theory of instruction (4th ed.). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Griffiths, C. (2003). The relationship between patterns of reported language learning strategy (LLS) use by speakers of other languages (SOL) and proficiency with implications for the teaching/learning situation. *University of Auckland*.
- Hardan, A. A. (2013). Language Learning Strategies: A General Overview. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 106, 1712–1726. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.194>
- Hashim, H. U., Yunus, M. M., & Hashim, H. (2018). Language Learning Strategies Used by Adult Learners of Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL). *TESOL International Journal*, 13(4), 39–48.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). Individual cognitive/affective learner contributions and differential success in second language acquisition. Breen, MP (Ed.), *Learner Contributions to Language Learning: New Directions in Research* içinde.
- Little, D. (1991). *Learner autonomy 1: Definitions, issues, and problems*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Macaro, E. (2004). *Fourteen features of a language learner strategy*. AIS St Helens, Centre for Research in International Education.
- Ministry of Education. (2019). Pengumuman dan Laporan Analisis Keputusan SPM 2019. <https://www.moe.gov.my/en/pemberitahuan/announcement/pengumuman-dan-laporan-analisis-keputusan-peperiksaan-spm-2019>
- Monereo, C., Castelló, M., Clariana, M., Palma, M., & Lluïsa Pérez, M. (2001). *Teaching strategies in education*. Barcelona: Editorial GRAO.
- Murniati, A. K. (2020). SPM2019 : Increase in passing percentage for English. *New Straits Times*. <https://www.nst.com.my/news/nation/2020/03/572014/spm2019-increase-passing-percentage-english>
- O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Kupper, L., & Russo, R. P. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. *Language learning*, 35(1), 21-46.
- 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*. Boston Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Oxford, R. L. (2003). *Language learning styles and strategies: An overview*. Retrieved from <http://www.education.umd.edu/EDCI/SecondLangEd/TESOL/People/Faculty/Dr.%20Oxford/StylesStrategies.doc>
- Rose, H. (2012). Language learning strategy research: Where do we go from here? *Studies in Self Access Learning*, 3(2), 137–148.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the 'good language learner' can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly* 9(1), 41-51. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586011>
- Shakarami, A., Hajhashemi, K., & Caltabiano, N. (2017). Compensation still matters: language learning strategies in the third millennium ESL learners. *Available at SSRN 3032963*.
- Sykes, A. H. (2015). The good language learner revisited: A case study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(4), 713.

- Thu, T. H. (2009). Learning Strategies Used by Successful Language Learners. *Online Submission*.
- Tigarajan, D., Yunus, M. M., & Aziz, A. A. (2016). What good language learners do to learn English language. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 5(2).
- Wenden, A. L. (1987a). Conceptual background and utility. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning*, 3-13. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Zare, P. (2012). Language learning strategies among EFL/ESL learners: A review of literature. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(5), 162-169.