

PERCEIVED USE OF LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES BY
SUBURBAN SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN BETONG

CATHARINA STEPHEN

A Master's Project submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Education

Faculty of Education and Languages
Open University Malaysia

2011

DECLARATION

Name : **CATHARINA STEPHEN**

Matric Number : **CGS00065806**

I hereby declare that this project is the result of my own work, except for quotations and summaries which have been duly acknowledged.

Signature

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Catharina Stephen', written over a dotted line.

Date : 11 JANUARY 2011

ABSTRACT

The school defines the basic framework of education; and secondary school education is where the conversion of information to knowledge becomes possible when students are able to perceive the use of learning strategies in their language classrooms. Thus, this study aims to investigate the perceived use of language learning strategy among 325 students in a suburban secondary school by means of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). 162 (76 male and 86 female) students from Form 1, 2 and 3 represent the lower secondary level while 163 (81 male and 82 female) students from Form 4 and 5 represent the upper forms. The findings reveal that secondary school students perceived metacognitive strategies as best used in their language learning while perceiving memory strategies as the least favourite. A significant difference exists in the use of compensation strategies among the male students in lower forms; and that significant difference also exists in the use of memory, compensation and metacognitive strategies among the females in the lower forms. Statistical results also indicate the existence of significant difference in the use of memory strategies among the upper secondary female students. However, there is no significant difference in the use of all the learning strategies among the males in the upper forms. The reasons for these differences in strategy use by suburban secondary school students are discussed and implications as well as recommendations for the future language learning strategy training and English teaching are put forward.

ABSTRAK

PENGGUNAAN STRATEGI PEMBELAJARAN BAHASA YANG DITERIMAPAKAI OLEH PELAJAR-PELAJAR SEKOLAH MENENGAH SUBBANDAR DI BETONG

Sekolah mentakrifkan rangka kerja asas pendidikan; dan pendidikan sekolah menengah adalah di mana penukaran maklumat kepada pengetahuan menjadi munasabah bila pelajar-pelajar mampu menerimapakai penggunaan strategi-strategi pembelajaran di dalam kelas bahasa mereka. Maka, matlamat kajian ini adalah untuk menyiasat penggunaan strategi pembelajaran bahasa yang diterimapakai di antara 325 pelajar sekolah menengah subbandar dengan menggunakan *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning* (SILL). 162 (76 lelaki dan 86 perempuan) pelajar dari Tingkatan 1, 2 dan 3 mewakili peringkat sekolah menengah rendah manakala 163 (81 lelaki and 82 perempuan) pelajar dari Tingkatan 4 dan 5 mewakili peringkat sekolah menengah atas. Dapatan kajian mendapati pelajar-pelajar sekolah menengah menerimapakai strategi metakognitif sebagai yang terbaik digunakan dalam pembelajaran bahasa mereka manakala melihat penggunaan strategi memori sebagai pilihan mereka yang terakhir. Satu perbezaan signifikan wujud dalam penggunaan strategi kompensasi di kalangan pelajar-pelajar lelaki menengah rendah; dan begitu juga wujudnya perbezaan yang signifikan dalam penggunaan strategi memori, kompensasi dan metakognitif di kalangan pelajar-pelajar perempuan di menengah rendah. Keputusan statistik juga menunjukkan terdapatnya kewujudan perbezaan signifikan dalam penggunaan strategi-strategi memori dikalangan pelajar perempuan menengah atas. Bagaimanapun, tiada perbezaan signifikan yang terdapat dalam penggunaan semua strategi-strategi pembelajaran di kalangan pelajar lelaki menengah atas. Sebab-sebab wujudnya perbezaan yang terdapat dalam penggunaan strategi pembelajaran ini telah dibincangkan dan implikasi serta cadangan untuk latihan strategi pembelajaran bahasa dan pengajaran Bahasa Inggeris telah dikemukakan seterusnya.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The accomplishment of my study would have not been possible without the kind and greatest support from my supervisor, Dr. Chemaline Usop. I am deeply grateful for his advice and comments in helping me complete this project work. With his constructive remarks and positive critiques, I was able to to make this Master study, a humble contribution to the Open University of Malaysia.

I would also like to thank Mr. Ling Hau Ching from Rajang Teacher's Training Institute for enlightening and coaching me with the statistical readings. There has never been such a patient lecturer who has been able to make a slow learner be happily rewarded with easy understanding and interpretations about logics and numbers.

Sincere thanks and appreciation are extended to Khairul Nazrin bin Mothar and Suzila bin Othman, for helping me with numerous administrative matters especially with the process and procedures in getting this study done.

Besides, I would also like to thank my school principal, Mr. Alexander Joeng Rimok for allowing me to conduct my study with the school children. It was a great privilege to have this study done for the best interest of the students as well as for the language teachers teaching in the suburban schools.

In addition, I would like to extend my grateful thanks to my senior, Truddie ak Nyarie for giving me wonderful, academic notes through emails and undeniable encouragement throughout my entire research study. Thank you for the constant support.

Special thank goes to my family for their unconditional love, confidence and encouragement. Their trust and belief in me to finish this study have never quavered throughout the years. They have been the greatest inspiration and best motivators for me to keep on pushing.

Last but not least, thank God for giving me the opportunity to have my Master's study done with Open University of Malaysia. The five years experience was such a revelation that could only be attained with the will of endurance, patience and persistency. The journey has been long and difficult ... but not anymore.

Catharina Stephen

	Page
<i>Title Page</i>	
<i>Declaration</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>Abstract</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Abstrak</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>Acknowledgement</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>Table of Content</i>	<i>vi</i>
<i>List of Table</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>xi</i>

TABLE OF CONTENT

CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Background of the Study	4
	1.2 Statement of the Problem	7
	1.3 Purpose of the Study	8
	1.4 Research Objectives	9
	1.5 Research Questions	10
	1.6 Significance of the Study	10
	1.7 Definition of Terms	11
	1.7.1 Strategy	11
	1.7.2 Language Learning	11
	1.7.3 Memory Strategy	11
	1.7.4 Cognitive Strategy	11
	1.7.5 Compensation Strategy	11
	1.7.6 Affective Strategy	12
	1.7.7 Social Strategy	12
	1.7.8 School Level	12
	1.7.9 Suburban Secondary School	13
	Summary	13
CHAPTER 2	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	14
	2.1 Introduction	14
	2.2 Related Literature	14
	2.2.1 Language Learning Strategies	14
	2.3 Related Studies	22
	2.3.1 Language Learning Strategy and Proficiency	22
	2.3.2 Language Learning Strategy and Gender	29

	2.3.3	Language Learning Strategy and School Level	35
	2.3.4	Language Learning Strategy and Cultural Background	37
	2.4	Theoretical Review	38
	2.5	Methodological Issues	48
	2.6	Conceptual Framework	50
		Summary	52
CHAPTER 3		METHODOLOGY	55
	3.1	Introduction	55
	3.2	Theoretical Framework	56
	3.3	Research Design	62
	3.4	Research Population and Sampling	64
	3.4.1	Background of Population and Sample	64
	3.4.2	Demographic Profile of Respondents	65
	3.4.3	Sampling	66
	3.5	Instrumentation	68
	3.5.1	Questionnaire – Strategy Inventory Language Learning (SILL)	68
	3.5.2	Reliability and Validity of the SILL Questionnaires	71
	3.5.3	The Translated Version of SILL Inventory	72
	3.5.4	Pilot Testing	72
	3.6	Data Collection Procedures	75
	3.6.1	Pre-data Collection	75
	3.6.2	During Data Collection	75
	3.6.3	Post Data Collection	76
	3.7	Framework for Data Analysis	76
	3.7.1	The Objective	76
	3.7.2	The Question	76
	3.7.3	The Sources of Data	77
	3.7.4	The Types of Data	77
	3.7.5	Technique of Analysis	78
		Summary	83
CHAPTER 4		FINDINGS	84
	4.1	Introduction	84
	4.2	Perceived Language Learning Strategies used by Secondary School Students	85
	4.3	Research Question 1	86
	4.3.1	Normality Test	86
	4.3.2	LLS used among the Upper Secondary Male Students	
	4.3.3	Types of LLS used between Form 4 and Form 5 Male Students	91

	4.3.4	Direct and Indirect Strategy used among the Form 4 and Form 5 Male Students	93
4.4		Research Question 2	94
	4.4.1	Normality Test	94
	4.4.2	LLS used among the Upper Secondary Female Students	97
	4.4.3	Types of LLS used between Form 4 and Form 5 Female Students	98
	4.4.4	Direct and Indirect Strategy used among the Form 4 and Form 5 Female Students	100
4.5		Research Question 3	101
	4.5.1	Normality Test	102
	4.5.2	LLS used among the Lower Secondary Male Students	106
	4.5.3	Types of LLS used among the Form 1, Form 2 and Form 3 Male Students	107
	4.5.4	Direct and Indirect Strategy used among the Form 1, Form 2 and Form 3 Male Students	110
4.6		Research Question 4	112
	4.6.1	Normality Test	113
	4.6.2	LLS used among the Lower Secondary Female Students	117
	4.6.3	Types of LLS used among the Form 1, Form 2 and Form 3 Female Students	118
	4.6.4	Direct and Indirect Strategy used among the Form 1, Form 2 and Form 3 Female Students	121
		Summary	124
CHAPTER 5		DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	129
	5.1	Introduction	129
	5.2	Discussions	131
		5.2.1 Research Question 1	133
		5.2.2 Research Question 2	134
		5.2.3 Research Question 3	136
		5.2.4 Research Question 4	138
	5.3	Summary	141
		5.3.1 Gender Differences	141
		5.3.2 School Level	142
	5.4	Implications	143
	5.5	Limitations	146
	5.5	Recommendation for Further Research	147
		Conclusion	148

REFERENCES
APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 2.1 : Summary of Investigations Comparing Findings of Relationship between Second Language Proficiency and Strategies Used	30
Table 3.1 : Distribution of the Total Population in School according to Gender and School Level	66
Table 3.2 : Demographic Profile of the Respondents	66
Table 3.3 : Stratified Sampling of Respondents according to Gender and School Level	67
Table 3.4 : Summary of Samples distributed according to Gender and School Level	67
Table 3.5 : SILL Items and Categories	69
Table 3.6 : SILL Range of Frequency	70
Table 3.7 : Reliability of the SILL Questionnaires	74
Table 3.8 : Internal Consistency Reliability of the Translated SILL Questionnaire	74
Table 4.1 : The Average Means of LLS used by the Secondary Students (N= 325)	85
Table 4.2 : The Average Means of Direct and Indirect Strategy used by the Secondary School Students (N=325)	86
Table 4.3 : Normality Test Results among the Upper Secondary Male Students (N=81)	89
Table 4.4 : The Mann-Whitney Test Results on Cognitive and Metacognitive LLS among the Upper Secondary Male Students (N=81)	90
Table 4.5 : The Average Means of LLS used by the Upper Secondary Male Students (N=81)	91
Table 4.6 : The LLS used between the Upper Secondary Male Students (N=81)	93
Table 4.7 : Direct and Indirect Strategy used among the Upper Form Male Students	94
Table 4.8 : Normality Test Results among the Upper Secondary Female Students	96
Table 4.9 : The Average Means of LLS used by the Upper Secondary Female Students (N=82)	98
Table 4.10 : The LLS used between the Upper Secondary Female Students (N=82)	100

Table 4.11	: Direct and Indirect Strategy used among the Upper Form Female Students (N=82)	101
Table 4.12	: Normality Test Results among the Lower Secondary Male Students (N = 76)	104
Table 4.13	: The Kruskal Wallis Test Results on Affective Strategies among the Lower Secondary Male Students (N=76)	105
Table 4.14	: The Average Means of LLS used by the Lower Secondary Male Students (N=76)	106
Table 4.15	: Differences in the LLS used among the Lower Secondary Male Students (N=76)	107
Table 4.16	: Multiple Comparisons between the Male Groups in Lower Secondary School Level	109
Table 4.17	: Differences in the Direct and Indirect Strategies used among the Lower Secondary Male Students (N=76)	111
Table 4.18	: Multiple Comparison between the Direct and Indirect Strategies used among the Lower Secondary Male Students (N=76)	111
Table 4.19	: Normality Test Results among the Lower Secondary Female Students (N = 86)	115
Table 4.20	: The Kruskal Wallis Test Results on Metacognitive Strategies among the Lower Secondary Female Students (N=86)	116
Table 4.21	: The Average Means of LLS used by the Lower Secondary Female Students (N=86)	117
Table 4.22	: Differences in the LLS used among the Lower Secondary Female Students (N=86)	119
Table 4.23	: Multiple Comparisons between the Female Groups in Lower Secondary School Level (N=86)	120
Table 4.24	: Differences in the Direct and Indirect Strategies used among the Lower Secondary Female Students (N=86)	122
Table 4.25	: Multiple Comparison between the Direct and Indirect Strategies used among the Lower Secondary Female Students (N=86)	122
Table 4.26	: Summary Table of LLS Perceived by Secondary School Students	126
Table 4.27	: Summary Table of Direct and Indirect LLS Perceived by Secondary School Students	127
Table 4.28	: Summary Table of Mean Scores of LLS Perceived by Secondary School Students	128

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 2.1 : Conceptual Framework	51
Figure 3.1 : Mindmap of Strategy System	61
Figure 3.2 : Research Design	63
Figure 3.3 : Summary of Analytical Framework	81
Figure 4.1 : Distribution of Scores obtained on LLS for Upper Secondary Male Students (N=81)	87
Figure 4.2 : Distribution of Scores obtained on LLS for Upper Secondary Female Students (N=82)	95
Figure 4.3 : Distribution of Scores obtained on LLS for Lower Secondary Male Students (N=76)	102
Figure 4.4 : Distribution of Scores obtained on LLS for Lower Secondary Female Students (N= 86)	113