

## THE MOST DOMINANT LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES IN LEARNING SPEAKING ENGLISH OF THE MIDWIFERY STUDENTS

**Adriani Jihad**

Universitas Negeri Makassar  
adrianijihadja@gmail.com

### **ABSTRACT**

*This research aims: to investigate the most dominant language learning strategies used by successful and unsuccessful students, and to find out the differences of using language learning strategies between successful and unsuccessful students in their speaking. The researcher applied descriptive quantitative method. The population of this research was the fourth semester students of midwifery study program at Universitas Indonesia Timur in academic year 2012/2013. The sample was the fourth semester students of Midwifery Study Program at Universitas Indonesia Timur, class E.11 which consist of 50 students. This research used cluster random sampling technique. This research used 2 kinds of instruments; they were speaking test and questionnaire. The data were collected through speaking tests and SILL questionnaire. The data from speaking test were analyzed by Heaton's criteria level, whereas the data from questionnaire were analyzed by SPSS 17.00 and Likert scale. The result of the descriptive quantitative data through speaking test showed that (1) the most dominantly used language learning strategies among the successful students is affective strategies and the most frequently used language learning strategies among unsuccessful students choose metacognitive strategy, (2) there is a difference in using language learning strategies between successful students and unsuccessful students. The six language learning strategies usually employed by the students in speaking; the successful students employ all kinds of language learning strategies while the unsuccessful students only employ four kinds of language learning strategies.*

**Keywords:** Learning Strategies and English Speaking.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Speaking as a productive skill is an important aspect in language learning. By speaking, the students can convey information and ideas, express opinions and feelings, share experiences and negotiate, and maintain social relationship by communicating with others. Speaking is being a part of learning skill.

In order to help students become more effective and successful communicators, Faculty of Midwifery has extended the English education early from first semester until fourth semester. For this subject, lecturer always tries to use various methods as many as possible to attract student's interest in speaking English and also enhance students' communicative ability, in order to facilitate their learning (Chang, 2002).

The researcher found that students are reluctant in speaking because they feel shy, lack of vocabulary, and worried to make mistakes and it was also found that the students are lack of strategy used when speaking in completing a language task. As the result students are lack of interest in

participating speaking activities in classroom. Meanwhile speaking English fluently and accurately and communicating orally in target language is always a grand task for foreign language learners since effective oral communication requires the ability to use the language appropriately in social interactions (Shumin in Atik, 2006: 3).

Concerning to the problem faced by the third students of midwifery UIT Makassar in the previous observation, then the researcher interested in identifying the students with learning strategies relates to speaking skill. Underlying every learning task is at least one strategy (Nunan, 1999). In speaking most of the students are unaware of the strategies underlying the learning tasks in which they are engaged. According to Nunan (1999: 171) knowledge of strategies is important, because the greater awareness you have of what you are doing, if you are conscious of the processes underlying the learning that you are involved in, then learning will be more effective.

To support the students in improving their speaking skill, students should be taught

using strategies in learning. Strategies refer to specific methods of approaching a problem or task, modes of operation for achieving a particular end, planned design for controlling and manipulating certain information (Brown, 1994: 104). Stern adds that strategy expresses the intentionality of language learning. In applying these strategies, the learner engages in certain activities, uses particular procedures, or employs specific techniques (1992: 261). Oxford argues that strategies are important for two reasons. In the first place, strategies “are tools for active, self-directed involvement, which is essential for developing communicative competence”. Secondly, learners who have developed appropriate learning strategies have greater self-confidence and learn more effectively (1990: 1). Oxford adds that language learning strategies contribute to main goal, communicative competence; allow learners to become more self-directed; expand the role of teachers; are problem oriented; are specific actions taken by the learner; involve many actions taken by the learner, not just the cognitive; support learning both directly and indirectly; are not always observable; are often conscious; can be taught; are flexible and are influenced by a variety of factors (1990: 9). According to O’Malley and Chamot, strategies in speaking are crucial because they help foreign language learners in negotiating meaning where either linguistic structures or sociolinguistic rules are not shared between a second language learner and a speaker of the target language (1990: 43).

Language learning strategies are believed to play a vital role in learning a L2 as they assist learners in mastering the forms and functions required for reception and production in the L2 and thus affect achievement (Bialystok, 1981). There have been studies that study the relationship between language learning strategy use and proficiency as well as achievement (O’ Malley&Chamot, 1990; Oxford &Nyikos, 1989). The use of appropriate language learning strategy plays a significant role in L2/FL learning, due to the fact that language learning strategies can help learners to facilitate the acquisition, storage, retrieval or use of information and increase self-confidence (Chang, Ching-Yi & Liu, Shu-Chen & Lee, Yi-Nian, 2007: 236). In other word, language learning strategies have an important role in students’ learning activities; it can help students to solve their problem in learning a foreign language. In addition, Vann

& Abraham (1990: 177) stated that successful learners used strategies more appropriately in different situations than unsuccessful learners, and used a large range of strategies in language learning more frequently and appropriately. Thus, language learners who use language learning strategies more than others generally achieve greater language proficiency.

Therefore, understanding what kinds of language learning strategies (LLS) and communication strategies (CS) students employ to develop their oral performance are of crucial importance. According to Rubin (1975), she suggested that knowing more about the strategies “successful learners” select may be helpful. The reason is that unsuccessful learners can adopt those strategies which are regarded as useful and valid by successful learners. In this way, unsuccessful learners can enhance their success record.

Since the early seventies, there has been a great concern in learner characteristics rather than the methods of teaching in the field of second language learning and teaching (Wenden, 1987). Most researchers began to notice that it is a must to identify the characteristics of successful language learners and distinguish the differences of strategy use between successful language learners and unsuccessful ones. Owing to the differences in the frequency and types of strategy use, language learners are divided into various levels of language performers.

## RESEARCH METHOD

The method in this research used descriptive quantitative. Gay (2006: 159) stated that Descriptive method is used to determine and describe the way things are test analysis. Descriptive quantitative method is the data analysis using statistical calculation. Gay (2006: 332) stated that the value will be calculated for a sample drawn from a population which is referred to as statistics. In this case, the researcher used quantitative analysis of the questionnaire by using the SPSS (Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences) version 17.0 through the following statistical methods. The values that calculated for an entire population are referred to as parameters. The researcher took self-report research which requires the collection of standardized, quantifiable information from all members of a population or sample. To obtain comparable data from all participants, the researcher must ask each of them with the

same questions. A written collection of self-report questions to be answered by a selected group of research participants is called questionnaire (Gay, 2006: 163).

The sample of the research is determined by cluster random sampling. In cluster sampling, intact groups are randomly selected (Creswell, 2008: 153; Gay, et al. 2006: 106). The researcher used cluster random sampling to select groups. After selecting randomly, the class E.11 which has 50 students was chosen as a sample. Successful students were 23 students, and unsuccessful students were 7 students.

There were two kinds of instruments were used in this research. They are speaking test and questionnaire. Speaking test was administered in oral interview which consists of three questions. The speaking test was administered to assess students' speaking skills in terms of accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. The other types of speaking tests were applied in this research are: monologue speaking test which is also called the presentation. In this type, students were asked to perform some tasks such as; show and tell where they talk about anything they choose. This is considered a chance to give students an opportunity to make a small presentation. The speaking test of monologue in medical picture presentation was used to assess students' speaking skills in terms of content, language, and eye contact. The second type is dialogue speaking test which is also known as the interview. It is an open-ended test where the students lead a discussion with the teacher, and students in that kind of test are required to use conversation skills that they have learned throughout the course. The speaking test with dialogue in medical conversation was administered to assess students' speaking skills in terms of comprehensibility, pronunciation, fluency, and ability to explain an idea.

This research was also carried out by using a questionnaire survey. The questionnaire of SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) developed by Rebecca Oxford (1990) was used in this research to obtain information and to act as a stimulus for ideas about language learning strategy on speaking. The development and reliability of the questionnaire for investigating students' learning strategy use to improve their English speaking skills are for equal importance. It appears that SILL is the most often used strategy scale around the world, and the only

language learning strategy instrument that has been checked for reliability and validated in multiple ways (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995). In addition, strategy descriptions on the SILL are drawn from a comprehensive taxonomy of language learning strategies that systematically covers the four language skill areas of listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Oxford, 1989).

Of the 50 items in the SILL, only 34 items were chosen to comprise 6 categories: Memory (4 statements), Cognitive (9 statements), Compensation (4 statements), Metacognitive (7 statements), Affective (5 statements), and Social strategies (5 statements). The SILL uses a 5-point Likert scale for which the learners are guided to respond to a strategy description, and the criteria used for evaluating the degree of strategy use frequency are: low frequency use (1.0-2.49), moderate frequency use (2.5-3.49), and high frequency use (3.5- 5.0).

The quantitative analysis used the primary instrument, included thirty-four items of statements which was adapted from Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL: 50-ITEM Version 7.0 for ESL/EFL). In order to ensure that every participant with different English proficiency levels can adequately understand all the statements, the questionnaire conducted by using the SPSS version 17.0 through the following statistical methods.

## **FINDINGS & DISCUSSION**

### *1. The Most Dominant Language Learning Strategies Used by the Students*

In this research, the researcher aimed to classify the students into two categories which are successful and unsuccessful students in speaking. In order to obtain data about it, the researcher conducted three kinds of speaking test. They are oral test, monologue in medical picture presentation, and dialogue in medical conversation. Over 50 students, there are 23 students which are categorized as successful students in speaking (included as high achiever) and there are 7 students which are categorized as unsuccessful students in speaking (included as low achiever).

**Table 1.LLS’s Used by the Successful Students in Speaking Skill (High Achiever Classification)**

NO	Student’s Name	Dominant LLS’s					
		Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social
1	DS	2.25	<b>3.33</b>	2.75	3.28	2.2	2.4
2	LKM	4.25	3.77	4.75	4.43	<b>4.8</b>	3.8
3	RM	3.0	2.44	2.75	2.71	<b>3.4</b>	3.0
4	MEP	1.25	2.0	2.25	2.42	1.6	<b>2.8</b>
5	IP	2.5	<b>3.88</b>	2.75	3.86	3.4	2.6
6	NM	2.5	3.22	4.0	<b>4.29</b>	3.2	3.6
7	WVB	3.5	<b>4.0</b>	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.2
8	MP	2.25	2.22	2.0	3.0	<b>3.2</b>	2.2
9	MKD	3.0	3.33	2.25	3.0	<b>3.4</b>	3.0
10	FL	<b>3.75</b>	3.33	2.5	3.71	2.6	2.4
11	NW	1.75	2.33	2.0	2.29	2.4	2.4
12	RLP	3.25	3.67	3.0	4.14	3.6	1.8
13	KIB	3.5	<b>3.67</b>	3.5	3.29	2.2	2.8
14	YD	3.75	3.78	3.5	3.86	<b>4.4</b>	4.2
15	SW2	3.5	3.44	3.5	3.71	<b>4.8</b>	3.6
16	SW3	2.75	3.0	2.75	<b>4.14</b>	3.6	3.6
17	CB	<b>3.75</b>	3.44	3.5	3.29	3.6	3.2
18	MPR	3.5	3.33	<b>4.0</b>	3.86	3.6	3.0
19	SA	2.25	2.33	<b>3.0</b>	2.29	2.4	2.0
20	RAK	<b>4.25</b>	3.22	3.25	3.57	4.0	3.0
21	PAM	<b>4.5</b>	4.11	3.75	3.0	3.6	2.8
22	AUN	2.75	2.78	3.75	<b>4.71</b>	3.4	3.6
23	NU	4.0	3.3	3.5	<b>4.29</b>	2.2	3.6
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>
		<b>STUDENTS</b>	<b>STUDENTS</b>	<b>STUDENTS</b>	<b>STUDENTS</b>	<b>STUDENTS</b>	<b>STUDENT</b>

There are 7 successful students among 23 successful students used affective strategies in speaking. Metacognitive strategies used by 5 successful students ranked as the second mostly used strategies. Memory strategies and cognitive strategies were used by 4 successful

students for each strategy. The least strategies used by the successful students was compensation strategies followed by social strategies which only used by 1 successful students.

**Table 1. LLS’s Used by Unsuccessful Students in Speaking Skill (Low Achiever Classification)**

NO	Student’s Name	Dominant LLS’s					
		Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social
1	RAJ	2.0	2.11	2.0	<b>3.14</b>	2.4	2.4
2	YM	2.5	2.67	2.75	<b>3.0</b>	2.4	2.8
3	BNS	3.0	3.67	3.75	<b>3.86</b>	3.4	3.8
4	RA	<b>2.5</b>	2.0	2.25	2.29	2.2	1.6
5	AP	2.5	2.56	2.75	<b>3.71</b>	2.2	2.6
6	MM	3.5	3.33	3.75	4.0	4.4	2.6
7	EW	2.75	2.78	3.25	2.14	2.4	<b>3.6</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
		<b>STUDENT</b>	<b>STUDENT</b>	<b>STUDENT</b>	<b>STUDENTS</b>	<b>STUDENT</b>	<b>STUDENT</b>

The unsuccessful students in metacognitive strategies of the 50 students, 4 students choose the strategies, followed by affective strategies, only 1 student chose the

strategies, followed by social strategies, only 1 student in the strategies, 1 student in memory strategies, and there were no students in compensation and cognitive strategies.

So, it can be concluded of the 7 unsuccessful students in speaking test, 4 unsuccessful students choose metacognitive strategy. In this case metacognitive strategy was the most dominant language learning strategy for all the students in the class E.11 at the midwifery study program at Universitas Indonesia Timur.

2. *The Differences of Language Learning Strategies Employed by Successful and Unsuccessful Students.*

In order to see whether there are any differences of Language Learning Strategies which are employed by successful and unsuccessful students table 3 presents their differences.

**Table 3. Language Learning Strategies Used by Successful and Unsuccessful Students.**

No	LLS's	Successful Students	Unsuccessful Students
1.	Memory Strategies	√	√
2.	Cognitive Strategies	√	-
3.	Compensation Strategies	√	-
4.	Metacognitive Strategies	√	√
5.	Affective Strategies	√	√
6.	Social Strategies	√	√

The successful students employ all kinds of language learning strategies while the unsuccessful students only employ four kinds of language learning strategies. The four language learning strategies used by the unsuccessful students are memory strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies. The information on the table 4.6 shows that successful students tend to use both kinds of direct and indirect strategies while unsuccessful students only tended to use indirect strategies rather than direct strategies.

The researcher found that successful students used more, varied, and better learning strategies than unsuccessful students. It can be seen from the data gained from the students' speaking test result. Mostly successful students who learn using affective strategies is succeed in speaking test. It might be happened because midwifery students are train to use more affection, feeling, persuasive approach, and create a positive feeling to their patients.

Meanwhile, the unsuccessful students who used metacognitive strategies were not succeed in speaking test. These findings related to Watanabe (1993) who found that one of his sample from a prestigious university used dominantly affective strategies than other strategies. Rao (2006) investigated also about the language learning strategies of two hundred and seventeen Chinese university students in Jianxi and illustrated data from cultural and educational perspective. The results of data indicated that the most preferred strategies were Affective strategies. So, the most dominant language learning strategy here is affective strategies for successful student and metacognitive strategies for unsuccessful students.

This research also examined the relationship between learning strategies and speaking performance of midwifery students at Universitas Indonesia Timur. The subjects of this research were successful students and unsuccessful students based on their grade point average. This research found that successful students used affective strategies most dominantly, followed by memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive and social the least used. Meanwhile, unsuccessful students used affective strategies most dominantly, followed with compensation, cognitive, memory, social and metacognitive, the least used. The result of this research indicated that there is a significant different in using language learning strategies between successful students and unsuccessful students. The more the learning strategies used, the higher the student performance was. This result is consistent with the results of Simsek and Balaban (2010) indicating that successful students used more, varied, and better learning strategies than unsuccessful students.

In quantitative data showed that successful students who used affective more dominantly were succeed in speaking after getting some test in the form of oral test, monologue in medical picture presentation and dialogue in medical conversation. Whereas, The most dominant language learning strategy used by unsuccessful students in speaking was metacognitive strategies with the same form of speaking test in successful students. The data obtained that six learning strategies (memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies) were used by successful students but there were two

strategies that was not belong to the unsuccessful students from the six learning strategies, they were cognitive strategies and compensation strategies. In this respect, the successful students tend to use both kinds of direct and indirect strategies while unsuccessful students only tend to use indirect strategies rather than direct strategies.

## CONCLUSION & SUGGESTIONS

Based on the research findings and discussion above, the researcher concludes that:

1. The midwifery students of Universitas Indonesia Timur used six kinds of language learning strategies. Metacognitive strategies marked as the most frequently used strategies in speaking followed by affective, memory, cognitive, compensation and social the least used.
2. The most dominant language learning strategy is Affective Strategies for successful students and Metacognitive Strategies for unsuccessful students.
3. There is a difference in using language learning strategies between successful students and unsuccessful students. The more the learning strategies used, the higher the student performance was.

The researcher put forwards some suggestions and recommendations as follows:

1. It is suggested to the students to use the wide variety of learning strategies in order to obtain their satisfactory learning outcomes.
2. It is advisable for each language lecturer to detect the language learning strategies of their students and help them compensate the missing areas in their strategy preference and use.
3. Since this research only identified the learning strategies of university students, it is suggested for further research should examine what really happens if all students go through strategy training as early as possible in their educational experiences.

## REFERENCES

Atik, BurcayBurcu. 2006. The Effect of Strategies-Based Instruction on Speaking Skills of High School Students. *Published Research Report*. Adana: Cukurova University.

- Bialystok, E. 1981. The Role of Conscious Strategies in Second Language Proficiency. *Modern Language Journal*, 65, 24-35.
- Brown, Douglas H. 1994. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. United States of America: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Chang, S. J. 2002. A Preliminary Study of English Conversation Instruction at Universities in Taiwan. *English teaching & Learning*, 27(2), 17-50.
- Chang, Ching-Yi and Liu, Shu-Chen & Lee, Yi-Nan. 2007. *A Study of Language Learning Strategies Used by College EFL Learners in Taiwan*.
- Creswell, John. 2008. *Educational Research, Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*, Third Edition. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Gay, L.R., Mills, Geoffrey, E. & Airasian, Peter. 2006. *Educational Research*. Ohio: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Jihad, Adriani. 2013. *The Language Learning Strategies in Learning Speaking English of the Midwifery Students at Universitas Indonesia Timur*. Unpublished Thesis. Makassar: Universitas Negeri Makassar.
- Nunan, David. 1999. *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publisher.
- O'Malley, J.M. and Chamot, A.U. 1990. *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. 1989. *Use of Language Learning Strategies: A Synthesis of Studies with Implications for Strategy Training*. *System*, 17, 235-247.
- Oxford, R. L. 1990. *Language Learning Strategies: What Ever Teacher Should Know*. Boston, MA: Heinle Publishers.
- Oxford, R. L., and Burry-stock, J.A. 1995. Assessing The Use of Language Learning Strategies Worldwide with the ESL/EFL Version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System*, 23(1), 1-23.
- Oxford, R., and Nyikos, M. 1989. Variables Affecting Choice of Language Learning Strategies by University Students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(3), 291-300.

- Rubin, J. 1975. What the “Good Language Learner” Can Teach Us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9, 41-50.
- Shumin, Kang. 1997. Factor to Consider Developing of Speaking English. *Forum Journal* Vol 35 No. 3 Juli-September page 8.
- Simsek, Ali., and Blaban, Jale. 2010. *Learning Strategies of Successful and Unsuccessful University Students*. Contemporary Educational Technology. Anadolu University, Turkey, 1(1), (pp. 36-45).
- Stern, H. H. 1992. *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vann, R. J. and Abraham, R. G. 1990. Strategies of Unsuccessful Language Learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, (pp. 177-198).
- Wenden, A. L. 1987. Conceptual Background and Utility. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning* (pp. 3-13). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.