

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter reports the results of comparing the English language learning strategies used by M.5 students with different English achievement at Chulalongkorn University Demonstration Secondary School in Bangkok. The study results with statistical and descriptive forms will be presented as follows:

Part 1: General background information

Part 2: The identification of the use of six English language learning strategies

Part 3: The comparison of English language learning strategies used by M.5 students with different English achievement

Part 4: The relationship between English language learning strategies and students' achievement in studying English

4.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

215 questionnaires were distributed to all M.5 students at Chulalongkorn University Demonstration Secondary School (CUD) and 168 questionnaires were returned. This equals 78.13% of total population.

TABLE 2. Gender

Gender	No. of Students	Percentage (%)
Male	88	52
Female	80	48
Total	168	100

Table 2 shows that 52% of the respondents were male and 48% were female.

TABLE 3. Class

Class	No. of Students returned the questionnaire
M.5/1	38
M.5/2	33
M.5/3	18
M.5/4	29
M.5/5	21
M.5/6	19
M.5/7	10
Total	168

Table 3 shows that 168 respondents were from seven classes of M.5 at CUD.

TABLE 4. Students' Achievement Level

Level of English achievement	No. of students	Percentage (%)
Very high	51	30
High	58	35
Medium	39	23
Low	20	12
Total	168	100

TABLE 4 shows that 51 respondents (30%) were students with very high English achievement, 58 respondents (35%) were students with high English achievement, 39 respondents (23%) were students with medium English achievement and 20 respondents (12%) were students with low English achievement.

4.2 THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE USE OF SIX LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES

4.2.1 The overall use of English language learning strategies of M.5 students at Chulalongkorn University Demonstration Secondary School was the following:

TABLE 5. Descriptive Statistics of English Language Learning Strategies Use in Each Category

English Language Learning Strategies Use in Each Category	Mean \bar{X}	Standard Deviation (S.D.)	Level of Usage	Rank Order of Usage
A. Memory	2.81	.62	Medium	6
B. Cognitive	3.16	.68	Medium	3
C. Compensation	3.27	.58	Medium	2
D. Metacognitive	3.31	.70	Medium	1
E. Affective	2.87	.76	Medium	5
F. Social	3.05	.77	Medium	4
Overall	3.09	.54	Medium	

TABLE 5 indicates that the overall use of English language learning strategies of M.5 students at Chulalongkorn University Demonstration Secondary School was at the medium level (**Mean \bar{X} = 3.09 and S.D.= .54**). None of six English language learning strategies was found being used in the high or low level.

The most frequently use was the Metacognitive strategy category (3.31), followed by Compensation strategy category (3.27), Cognitive strategy category (3.16). The least frequency use was Memory strategy category (2.81), followed by Affective strategy category (2.87).

4.2.2 Regarding individual strategy use, 38 out of 50 strategies were reported average at the medium range and 8 strategies were used at the high level. The strategies which were used at the high level are the following:

TABLE 6. Descriptive Statistics of Individual Strategies Used at the High Level

Item	Individual strategy	Mean (\bar{X})
1.	I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn English.	3.51
15.	I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	3.86
24.	To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	3.85
29.	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	3.75
33.	I try to find out how to be better learner.	3.71
37.	I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	3.53
38.	I think about my progress in learning English.	3.76
45.	If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	3.70

TABLE 6 presents individual strategies which were reported to be used at the high level (>3.5). The most frequent individual strategy used at high level was no. 15 (3.86) which was in the Cognitive strategy category. Three items which were no. 33, no. 37 and no. 38 are in the Metacognitive strategy category. Two items which are item no.24 and no. 29 are in the Compensation strategy category and there was only one item in the Memory (no. 1), the Cognitive (no.15) and the Social strategy category (no.45).

4.2.3 Only 4 out of 50 strategies were reported to be used at the low level. (>2.5)

TABLE 7. Descriptive of Statistics of Individual Strategies Used at Low Level

Item	Individual strategy	Mean (\bar{X})
6.	I use flashcards to remember new English words.	2.19
7.	I physically act out new English words.	2.33
43.	I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.	2.32
47.	I practice English with other students.	2.46

TABLE 7 shows individual strategies which were reported to be used at the low level (>2.5). The lowest frequent individual strategy used (2.19) was no. 6 which was in the Memory strategy category. There were two individual strategies which were no. 6 and no.7 from the Memory strategy category and one item from the Affective (no. 43) and the Social strategy category (no.47).

The frequency statistics of language learning strategies used of each strategy will be presented in the TABLE 8-13.

TABLE 8. Frequency Statistics of Individual Strategy Use of Memory Strategies

Individual Item of Memory Strategies	Level of Strategy Use					Mean \bar{X}	S.D.	Level
	1	2	3	4	5			
1. I think of relationship between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	1 (0.6)	8 (4.8)	78 (46.4)	67 (39.9)	14 (8.3)	3.51	.74	High
2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.	26 (15.5)	57 (33.9)	56 (33.3)	25 (14.9)	4 (2.4)	2.55	1.0	Medium

(Table continues)

Table 8. (Continued)

Individual Item of Compensation Strategies						Mean \bar{X}	S.D.	Level
	1	2	3	4	5			
3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.	15 (8.9)	51 (30.4)	66 (39.3)	32 (19)	4 (2.4)	2.76	.94	Medium
4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	9 (5.4)	44 (26.2)	54 (32.1)	47 (28)	14 (8.3)	3.08	1.04	Medium
5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.	19 (11.3)	35 (20.8)	56 (33.3)	45 (26.8)	13 (7.7)	2.99	1.12	Medium
6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.	56 (33.3)	56 (33.3)	31 (18.5)	18 (10.7)	7 (4.2)	2.19	1.14	Low
7. I physically act out new English words.	46 (27.4)	48 (28.6)	48 (28.6)	25 (14.9)	1 (0.6)	2.33	1.05	Low
8. I review English lesson often.	23 (13.7)	44 (26.2)	71 (42.3)	18 (10.7)	12 (7.1)	2.71	1.06	Medium
9. I remember new English words by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	9 (5.4)	33 (19.6)	64 (38.1)	46 (27.4)	16 (9.5)	3.16	1.02	Medium

In the Memory strategies, students used item no. 1 “I think of relationship between what I already know and new things I learn in English” most frequently. The mean (3.51) is at the high level. The least frequency used was item no.6 “I use flashcards to remember new English words.” where the mean score was at the low level (2.19).

TABLE 9. Frequency Statistics of Individual Strategy Use of Cognitive Strategies

Individual Item of Cognitive Strategies	Level of Strategy Use					Mean \bar{X}	S.D.	Level
	1	2	3	4	5			
10. I say or write new English words several times.	2 (1.2)	31 (18.5)	64 (38.1)	46 (27)	25 (14.9)	3.36	0.99	Medium
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	11 (6.5)	32 (19)	50 (29.8)	45 (26.8)	30 (17.9)	3.30	1.16	Medium
12. I practice the sounds of English.	11 (6.5)	32 (19)	52 (31)	50 (29.8)	23 (13.7)	3.25	1.11	Medium
13. I use the English words I know different ways.	3 (1.8)	32 (19)	76 (45.2)	37 (22)	20 (11.9)	3.23	0.95	Medium
14. I start conversation in English.	22 (13.1)	56 (33.3)	55 (32.7)	18 (10.7)	17 (10.1)	2.71	1.14	Medium
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go the movies spoken in English.	8 (4.8)	16 (9.5)	32 (19)	48 (28.6)	64 (38.1)	3.86	1.17	High
16. I read for pleasure in English.	17 (10.1)	60 (35.7)	46 (27.4)	28 (16.7)	17 (10.1)	2.81	1.14	Medium
17. I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.	27 (16.1)	41 (24.4)	65 (38.7)	27 (16.1)	8 (4.8)	2.69	1.07	Medium
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	8 (4.8)	38 (22.6)	48 (28.6)	53 (31.5)	21 (12.5)	3.24	1.09	Medium
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	7 (4.2)	30 (17.9)	62 (36.9)	39 (23.2)	30 (17.9)	3.33	1.09	Medium
20. I try to find patterns in English.	7 (4.2)	30 (17.9)	74 (44)	46 (27.4)	11 (6.5)	3.14	0.93	Medium
22. I try not to translate word-for-word.	11 (6.5)	33 (19.6)	53 (31.5)	50 (29.8)	21 (12.5)	3.22	1.10	Medium
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	21 (12.5)	41 (24.4)	63 (37.5)	30 (17.9)	13 (7.7)	2.84	1.10	Medium

In Cognitive strategies, students used item no. 15 “I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go the movies spoken in English.” most frequently at the high level (3.86), while the least used strategy was item no.17 “I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.” which was at the medium level (2.69). There were 13 out of 14 strategies were used at the moderate level.

TABLE 10. Frequency Statistics of Individual Strategy Use of Compensation Strategies

Individual Item of Compensation Strategies	Level of Strategy Use					Mean \bar{X}	S.D.	Level
	1	2	3	4	5			
24. To understand unfamiliar words, I make guess.	-	12 (7.1)	44 (26.2)	69 (41.1)	43 (25.6)	3.85	0.89	High
25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	5 (3)	39 (23.2)	60 (35.7)	45 (26.8)	19 (11.3)	3.20	1.01	Medium
26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	19 (11.3)	46 (27.4)	49 (29.2)	44 (26.2)	10 (6.0)	2.88	1.10	Medium
27. I read English without looking up every new word.	15 (8.9)	39 (23.2)	60 (35.7)	34 (20.2)	20 (11.9)	3.03	1.13	Medium
28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	14 (8.3)	46 (27.4)	63 (37.5)	33 (19.6)	12 (7.1)	2.90	1.04	Medium
29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	2 (1.2)	10 (6.0)	59 (35.1)	54 (32.1)	43 (25.6)	3.75	0.95	High

In the Compensation strategies, two strategies were used at the high level. These strategies were item no. 24 “To understand unfamiliar words, I make guess.”

(3.85) and item no. 29 “If I can’t think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.” (3.75) while the least frequently used was item no. 26 “I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.” (2.88).

TABLE 11. Frequency Statistics of Individual Strategy Use of Metacognitive Strategies

Individual Item of Metacognitive Strategies	Level of Strategy Use					Mean \bar{X}	S.D.	Level
	1	2	3	4	5			
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	5 (3.0)	34 (20.2)	64 (38.1)	46 (27.4)	19 (11.3)	3.24	1.0	Medium
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	4 (2.4)	30 (17.9)	64 (38.1)	55 (32.7)	15 (8.9)	3.28	0.94	Medium
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	5 (3.0)	22 (13.1)	55 (32.7)	59 (35.1)	27 (16.1)	3.48	1.00	Medium
33. I try to find out how to be better learner of English.	3 (1.8)	15 (8.9)	53 (31.5)	54 (32.1)	43 (25.6)	3.71	1.00	High
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	14 (8.3)	39 (23.2)	65 (38.7)	35 (20.8)	15 (8.9)	2.99	1.07	Medium
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	15 (8.9)	53 (31.5)	60 (35.7)	28 (16.7)	12 (7.1)	2.82	1.05	Medium
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	12 (7.1)	47 (28.0)	60 (35.7)	32 (19.0)	17 (10.1)	2.97	1.08	Medium
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	4 (2.4)	23 (13.7)	54 (32.1)	54 (32.1)	33 (19.6)	3.53	1.03	High
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	4 (2.4)	15 (8.9)	42 (25.0)	63 (37.5)	44 (26.2)	3.76	1.02	High

In Metacognitive strategies, there were three strategies which students used at the high level; item no. 33 “I try to find out how to be better learner of English.” (3.71), item no. 37 “I have clear goals for improving my English skills.” (3.53) and item no. 38 “I think about my progress in learning English.” (3.76). The most frequently used strategy was item no. 38 “I think about my progress in learning English.” (3.76), the least frequently used strategy was item no. 35 “I look for people I can talk to in English.”(2.82).

TABLE 12. Frequency Statistics of Individual Strategy Use of Affective Strategy

Individual Item of Affective Strategy	Level of Strategy Use					Mean \bar{X}	S.D.	Level
	1	2	3	4	5			
39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	8 (4.8)	25 (14.9)	65 (38.7)	50 (29.8)	20 (11.9)	3.29	1.017	Medium
40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	11 (6.5)	26 (15.5)	54 (32.1)	54 (32.1)	23 (13.7)	3.31	1.094	Medium
41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	27 (16.1)	39 (23.2)	58 (34.5)	27 (16.1)	17 (10.1)	2.81	1.189	Medium
42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	17 (10.1)	41 (24.4)	62 (36.9)	40 (23.8)	8 (4.8)	2.89	1.035	Medium
43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.	52 (31.0)	49 (29.2)	38 (22.6)	19 (11.3)	10 (6.0)	2.32	1.195	Low
44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	32 (19.0)	41 (24.4)	64 (38.1)	21 (12.5)	10 (6.0)	2.62	1.110	Medium

In the Affective strategies, the strategy which students used most frequently was item no. 40 “I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.”; the mean score was at medium level (3.31), while the strategy

which students used least frequently was item no. 43 “I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.” and the mean score was at the low level (2.32).

TABLE 13. Frequency Statistics of Individual Strategy Use of Social Strategies

Individual Item of Metacognitive Strategies	Level of Strategy Use					Mean \bar{X}	S.D.	Level
	1	2	3	4	5			
45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	5 (3.0)	8 (4.8)	55 (32.7)	65 (37.8)	35 (20.8)	3.70	0.95	High
46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	8 (4.8)	24 (14.3)	71 (42.3)	46 (27.4)	19 (11.3)	3.26	1.0	Medium
47. I practice English with other students.	38 (22.6)	55 (32.7)	45 (26.8)	20 (11.9)	10 (6.0)	2.46	1.14	Low
48. I ask for help from English speakers.	18 (10.7)	48 (28.6)	47 (28.0)	34 (20.2)	21 (12.5)	2.95	1.19	Medium
49. I ask questions in English.	20 (11.9)	55 (32.7)	54 (32.1)	27 (16.1)	12 (7.1)	2.74	1.09	Medium
50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	13 (7.7)	34 (20.2)	55 (32.7)	38 (22.6)	28 (16.7)	3.20	1.17	Medium

In the Social strategies, the strategy that students used most frequently was item no.45. “If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.”; the mean score was at high level (3.70), while the strategy which students used least frequently was item no. 47 “I practice English with other students”, the mean score was at the low level (2.46).

4.3 THE COMPARISON OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES USED BY M.5 STUDENTS WITH DIFFERENT ENGLISH ACHIEVEMENT

4.3.1 In order to see whether M.5 students with different English achievement employed English language learning strategies differently, English language learning strategies use by each group of English Achievement was presented as follows:

TABLE 14. Descriptive Statistics for English Language Learning Strategies Use of Each Group of English Achievement.

Level of English Achievement	N	Mean \bar{X}	S.D.	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	Level
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Very High	51	3.15	.50	3.01	3.29	1.86	4.22	Medium
High	58	3.17	.51	3.04	3.31	2.06	4.22	Medium
Medium	39	3.00	.55	2.82	3.18	1.78	4.30	Medium
Low	20	2.84	.63	2.55	3.13	1.74	3.98	Medium
Total	168	3.09	.54	3.00	3.17	1.74	4.30	Medium

TABLE 14 indicates that students with high English achievement used English language learning strategies most frequently ($\bar{X} = 3.17$) with slightly higher frequency than students with very high English achievement ($\bar{X} = 3.15$). However, the mean score of English language learning strategies use of students with high English achievement was only 0.02 higher than the mean score of English language learning strategies use of students with very high English achievement. Therefore, both high and very high English achievement students tended to use English language strategies at the same level. On the other hand, students with low English achievement use English language learning strategies the least frequently ($\bar{X} = 2.84$). And students with medium English

achievement use English language learning strategies slightly more often than students with low English achievement ($\bar{X} = 3.00$).

Based upon the mean differences on SILL average total score of students with different English achievement, the overall mean score of every group of English achievement was at the medium level.

4.3.2 Regarding each language learning strategy category used by each group, there were some differences as follows:

TABLE 15. Descriptive Statistics for Each Language Learning Strategy Used by Each Group of English Achievement.

English Language Learning Strategies	Level of English Achievement	N	Mean \bar{X}	S.D.	Meaning	Level
A. Memory Strategy	very high	51	2.80	.60	Rarely	Medium
	high	58	2.87	.58	Rarely	Medium
	medium	39	2.75	.68	Rarely	Medium
	low	20	2.78	.67	Rarely	Medium
B. Cognitive Strategy	very high	51	3.35	.59	Sometimes	Medium
	high	58	3.25	.61	Sometimes	Medium
	medium	39	2.97	.72	Rarely	Medium
	low	20	2.75	.76	Rarely	Medium
C. Compensation Strategy	very high	51	3.39	.47	Sometimes	Medium
	high	58	3.31	.58	Sometimes	Medium
	medium	39	3.18	.66	Sometimes	Medium
	low	20	3.00	.61	Sometimes	Medium

(Table continues)

TABLE 15. (continued)

English Language Learning Strategies	Level of English Achievement	N	Mean \bar{X}	S.D.	Meaning	Level
D. Metacognitive Strategy	very high	51	3.44	.70	Sometimes	Medium
	high	58	3.44	.63	Sometimes	Medium
	medium	39	3.11	.65	Sometimes	Medium
	low	20	2.97	.83	Rarely	Medium
E. Affective Strategy	very high	51	2.70	.88	Rarely	Medium
	high	58	2.96	.68	Rarely	Medium
	medium	39	3.00	.76	Sometimes	Medium
	low	20	2.82	.60	Rarely	Medium
F. Social Strategy	very high	51	3.03	.83	Sometimes	Medium
	high	58	3.14	.74	Sometimes	Medium
	medium	39	3.08	.61	Sometimes	Medium
	low	20	2.82	.94	Rarely	Medium

As seen in TABLE 15, students with high and very high English achievement tended to use English language learning strategies differently from students with medium and low English achievement. Students with high and very high English achievement used English language learning strategies which were Metacognitive, Compensation, Cognitive and Memory strategies more frequently than students with medium and low English achievement. However, students with high and medium English achievement used Affective and Social strategies more frequently than students with very high and low English achievement.

TABLE 16. F-Test Table. One way ANOVA Results Comparing and Contrasting Each Strategy Category Used Between Groups and Within Groups of English Achievement.

Strategies		Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom (df)	Mean Square	F	Sig.
A. Memory strategies	Between Groups	.406	3	.135	.348	.791
	Within Groups	63.754	164	.389		
	Total	64.160	167			
B. Cognitive strategies	Between Groups	7.188	3	2.396	5.617	.001
	Within Groups	69.957	164	.427		
	Total	77.145	167			
C. Compensation strategies	Between Groups	2.518	3	.839	2.555	.057
	Within Groups	53.867	164	.328		
	Total	56.385	167			
D. Metacognitive strategies	Between Groups	5.709	3	1.903	4.062	.008
	Within Groups	76.827	164	.468		
	Total	82.536	167			
E. Affective strategies	Between Groups	2.581	3	.860	1.499	.217
	Within Groups	94.154	164	.574		
	Total	96.735	167			
F. Social strategies	Between Groups	1.594	3	.531	.900	.442
	Within Groups	96.792	164	.590		
	Total	98.386	167			

H0: There is no difference in English language learning strategies use of M.5 students with different English achievement at the significance level 0.05.

H1: There is some difference in English language learning strategies use of M.5 students with different English achievement at the significance level 0.05.

As seen from TABLE 16, Cognitive and Metacognitive strategies had significance level less than 0.05 (>0.05). This means that H_0 was rejected. Therefore, there is some difference in M.5 students' English language learning strategies use when they have different levels of English achievement. In Cognitive strategies, Sig = .001 and in Metacognitive strategies, Sig = .008 Students with different English achievement used these two strategies differently.

4.3.3 To examine the use of each strategy category by students with different English achievement, each group was compared with other groups. However, only Cognitive and Metacognitive strategies which were found differently used at significant level 0.05 between groups and within groups were studied.

TABLE 17. Multiple Comparisons of English Language Learning Strategies and Each Group of English Achievement

Dependent Variable	(I) GROUP	(J) GROUP	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Cognitive	Low	medium	-.2261	.17963	.210	-.5808	.1286
		High	-.5011(*)	.16936	.004	-.8355	-.1667
		very high	-.6093(*)	.17231	.001	-.9496	-.2691
	medium	Low	.2261	.17963	.210	-.1286	.5808
		High	-.2750(*)	.13525	.044	-.5421	-.0080
		very high	-.3832(*)	.13893	.006	-.6575	-.1089
	High	low	.5011(*)	.16936	.004	.1667	.8355
		medium	.2750(*)	.13525	.044	.0080	.5421
		very high	-.1082	.12537	.389	-.3558	.1394
	very high	Low	.6093(*)	.17231	.001	.2691	.9496
		medium	.3832(*)	.13893	.006	.1089	.6575
		High	.1082	.12537	.389	-.1394	.3558

(* The mean difference was significant at the .05 level.)

(Table continues)

TABLE 17. (continued)

Dependent Variable	(I) GROUP	(J) GROUP	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Metacognitive	Low	medium	-.1473	.18824	.435	-.5190	.2244
		High	-.4759(*)	.17748	.008	-.8263	-.1254
		very high	-.4712(*)	.18058	.010	-.8278	-.1147
	Medium	low	.1473	.18824	.435	-.2244	.5190
		high	-.3286(*)	.14173	.022	-.6084	-.0487
		very high	-.3239(*)	.14559	.027	-.6114	-.0365
	High	low	.4759(*)	.17748	.008	.1254	.8263
		medium	.3286(*)	.14173	.022	.0487	.6084
		very high	.0046	.13139	.972	-.2548	.2640
	very high	low	.4712(*)	.18058	.010	.1147	.8278
		medium	.3239(*)	.14559	.027	.0365	.6114
		high	-.0046	.13139	.972	-.2640	.2548

(* The mean difference was significant at the .05 level.)

As seen from TABLE 17, students with low and medium English achievement used English language learning strategies, both Cognitive and Metacognitive strategies, differently from high and very high English achievers at significant level 0.05.

According to TABLE 15, TABLE 16 and TABLE 17, students with very high and high English achievement used language learning strategies differently from students with medium and low English achievement, and students with very high and high English achievement used language learning strategies more frequently than students with medium and low English achievement.

4.4 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES USE AND STUDENTS' ENGLISH ACHIEVEMENT

In order to find the relationship between English language learning strategies use and students' English achievement (correlation coefficient), the researcher examined two variables, which were strategies used and students' English achievement (average grades).

H0: There is no relationship between English language learning strategies use of M.5 students and their achievement in studying English.

H1: There is a relationship between English language learning strategies use of M.5 students and their achievement in studying English.

TABLE 18. The Correlations Between Memory Strategies Used and Students' English Achievement

		GROUP	Memory Strategies
GROUP	Pearson Correlation	1	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.797
	N	168	168
Memory strategies	Pearson Correlation	.020	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.797	.
	N	168	168

As seen from TABLE 18, Sig. = 0.797. It can be concluded that there was no significant relationship between Memory strategies and students' English achievement.

TABLE 19. The Correlations Between Cognitive Strategies Used and Students' English Achievement

		GROUP	Cognitive strategies
GROUP	Pearson Correlation	1	.299(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	168	168
Cognitive strategies	Pearson Correlation	.299(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	168	168

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

As seen from TABLE 18, Sig =.000 and Pearson Correlation = 0.299. It can be concluded that there was some relationship between Cognitive strategies and students'

English achievement. Pearson Correlation indicated that Cognitive strategies had positive correlation with students' English achievement.

TABLE 20. The Correlations Between Compensation Strategies Used and Students' English Achievement

		GROUP	Compensation strategies
GROUP	Pearson Correlation	1	.207(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.007
	N	168	168
Compensation strategies	Pearson Correlation	.207(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.007	.
	N	168	168

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As seen from TABLE 20, Sig =.007 and Pearson Correlation = 0.207, it can be concluded that there was some relationship between Compensation strategies and students' English achievement. Pearson Correlation indicated that Cognitive strategies had a positive correlation with students' English achievement.

TABLE 21. The Correlations Between Metacognitive Strategies Used and Students' English Achievement

		GROUP	Metacognitive strategies
GROUP	Pearson Correlation	1	.238(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.002
	N	168	168
Metacognitive strategies	Pearson Correlation	.238(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.
	N	168	168

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Looking at TABLE 21, Sig = .002 and Pearson Correlation = 0.238, it can be concluded that there was some relationship between Metacognitive strategies and students' English achievement. Pearson Correlation indicated that Metacognitive strategies had a positive correlation with students' English achievement.

TABLE 22. The Correlation Between Affective Strategies Used and Students' English Achievement

		GROUP	Affective strategies
GROUP	Pearson Correlation	1	-.090
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.246
	N	168	168
Affective strategies	Pearson Correlation	-.090	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.246	.
	N	168	168

As seen from TABLE 21, Sig. = 0.246, it can be concluded that there was no significant relationship between Affective strategies and students' English achievement.

TABLE 23. The Correlations Between Social Strategies Used and Students' English Achievement

		GROUP	Social Strategies
GROUP	Pearson Correlation	1	.056
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.473
	N	168	168
Social strategies	Pearson Correlation	.056	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.473	.
	N	168	168

From an examination of TABLE 22, Sig. = 0.473, it can be concluded that there was no significant relationship between Social strategies and students' English achievement.

According to TABLE 19, 20 and 21, H₀ was rejected. H₁ was accepted. Therefore, there is a relationship between student's language learning strategies and their achievement in studying English.

Regarding the correlations between English language learning strategies use and students' English achievement, there were only three out of six English language learning strategies which had positive correlations (Cognitive, Compensation and Metacognitive strategies). This indicated that the more frequently students used English language learning strategies, the higher grades they might gain. The strongest correlation (.299) was between the use of Cognitive strategies and their English achievement, and the weakest correlation (.207) was between the use of Compensation strategies and their English achievement. However, the level of correlations was relatively low.