

Language Choice in Learning Strategies on Language Proficiency

Bernadette Ferrer Paladin, Ma. Theresa Liquigan Eustaquio

Isabela State University, Philippines

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8120093>

Received: 27 November 2024; Accepted: 02 December 2024; Published: 03 January 2025

ABSTRACT

This study looked into the significant difference of the respondent's profile to the language learning strategies used of the AB-English student. Using a quantitative data, it endeavors to determine the language learning strategies used of the respondents that will benefits both educators and learners to trail the effective strategies of acquiring a new language. This study was conducted at Isabela State University –Echague main campus, having the size of one hundred fifty-six (156) respondents from 1st year to 4th year AB-English. The instruments used in this study encompassed of six questionnaires such as Memory strategies, Cognitive strategies, Compensation strategies, Meta-cognitive strategies, Affective strategies and Social strategies.

According to the data obtained from the questionnaire, the respondents use all the strategies occasionally in learning a language. The descriptive statistics procedure describes the language learning strategies of the respondents in which all statements appeared to be sometimes using in the scale category and only one appears often under meta-cognitive strategies. This specifies that the language learning strategies plays a vital role in obtaining a new language. In terms of the overall results of the language learning strategies appeared to be significant in some of the items in terms of age, gender, ethnicity and year level of the respondents. This indicates that these strategies are important to consider in the way that will help the student to track the progress of their own in acquiring a new language to achieve proficiency. In addition, in terms of ESL teachers it will help them to search for the best strategies to incorporate with their subject matter that is easier to learn for their student.

INTRODUCTION

In the context of English language, navigating the efficacy and effectiveness of language acquisition in the Philippines is a vast intrigue to a huge number of researcher trying to provide the better strategies that help student to understand more on their nature and having a pattern that they can used in order to easily track the weakness and strength of a certain language.

Having a compromise and rational way of learning is more suitable than those not having their own guide or strategies in learning a language. According to Chamot, (2004) the strategic language learner possess meta-cognitive knowledge about their thinking and learning approaches, a good understanding of what a task requires and the ability to organise the strategies that best meet both the task demands their own strength.

Oxford, R. & Nyikos, M. (1989) state that the use of appropriate learning strategies enables students to take responsibility for their own learning by enhancing learner autonomy, independence and self-direction, because learner need to keep learning even when they are no longer in a formal classroom setting. In addition, learning a language is not only by course requirement but it is also very important in our everyday life in overcoming different situations like survival in a diverse setting or environment. Having knowledgeable learning strategies can help us organise and easy to learn a language even if we are not expose to it at the very first.

For many reasons, language learning strategies in relation to the English language proficiency affect many students in the Philippines, although we have the Filipino and English as an official language, English has a special status; all government publications and correspondence are normally written in both languages. Moreover, English functions as a common language for communication with the large population of expatriates working in the Philippines. More importantly, English is a required subject from the first grade, and it is the

primary medium of instruction in the majority of universities. Despite its essential role, some students due to their limited proficiency in English do not usually perform well in the English prerequisites, which negatively affect their performance in content-based courses. Therefore, this study determine the language learning strategy used and the significant difference in its profile by the AB- English student at the College of Arts and Sciences, Isabela State University. This research administered questionnaire, which was categorised into six different Language learning strategies like Memory, Cognitive, Compensatory, Meta-cognitive, Affective and Social Strategies.

Within the scope of the research, the following question will be answered

Q1. What is the language learning strategy use of the AB-English student in terms of Memory, Cognitive, Compensatory, Meta-cognitive, Affective and Social Strategies?

Q2. What is the significant difference between the respondent's profile and their language learning strategy used in terms of Memory, Cognitive, Compensatory, Meta-cognitive, Affective and Social Strategies?

METHODOLOGY

In this study, the researchers adopted a quantitative research method to determine if there is a significant difference of the respondent's profile and the language learning strategies used. The researcher conducted this study in the college of Arts and Sciences, Isabela State University, Echague Isabela. The respondents of the study were the 1st year to 4th year AB-English students enrolled in the 1st semester. They draw from the list requested by the Office of the Registrar. The sample size was computed using the stratified random sampling with proportional allocation in year level and stratum, after getting the sample size of the respondents, they were proportionately distributed to AB-English students.

The researchers had constructed the conceptual frameworks of the study to show the independent variable including Age, Gender, Year level and the Ethnicity while the dependent variables were Memory, Cognitive, Compensatory, Meta-cognitive, Affective and Social strategies.

The research instruments used was an adopted questionnaire from Dr. Adel Abu Radwan an Applied Linguist from Georgetown University in Washington. The research instruments had fifty (50) items containing the six strategies, which were the Memory, Cognitive, Compensatory, Metacognitive, Affective and Social strategies. The scale and the descriptive rating and the respondents was used as shown below:

Scale	Range	Descriptive Rating
5	4.5-5.0	Always
4	3.5-4.49	Often
3	2.5-3.49	Sometimes
2	1.5-2.49	Seldom
1	1-1.49	Never

The Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher asked permission from the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to administer the questionnaire among the AB-English student of the said College. After that, the researchers request the permission from the teachers of the respondents in their respective classes and the researcher personally distributed and administered the questionnaire to the respondents himself. After the collections of the questionnaires, the data were tabulated, analysed and interpreted.

The Statistical Treatment of Data

The data gathered were computer-processed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Specific statistical treatments were used to describe the following:

1. Weighted mean was utilised to determine the language learning strategies of the respondents.
2. T-test and Analysis of variance were used to analyse the significant difference between the profile of the respondents and their strategy used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents and analyses the data in light of the objectives of the study. This study begins with the language learning strategies used as shown in the tables below:

Table 1a. Mean Computed on the Language Learning Strategy used among the AB-English Students on Memory Strategies

Items	Mean	Descriptive equivalent
I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English	3.16	Sometimes
I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.	3.25	Sometimes
I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.	3.30	Sometimes
I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	3.26	Sometimes
I use rhymes to remember new English words.	3.17	Sometimes
I use flashcards to remember new English words.	2.83	Sometimes
I physically act out new English words.	3.07	Sometimes
I review English lessons often.	3.32	Sometimes
I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	3.27	Sometimes

Table 1a shows the mean computed on the language learning strategy used among the AB-English student on memory strategies. It can be gleaned that the majority of the respondent answered "sometimes" in all statements; this indicate that the use of this strategy are common to all student learning a language.

According to Radwan, (2011), memory strategies can help the learners to remember, store and gain new information that can attain through representing sounds in memory, grouping, using physical responses. Kunasaraphan, (2015) said that the students with higher English proficiency levels used language learning strategies more habitually, suitably and successfully as compare to those with lower English proficiency level.

Table 1b. Mean Computed on the Language Learning Strategy used among the AB-English Students on Cognitive Strategies

Items	Mean	Descriptive equivalent
I say or write new English words several times.	3.11	Sometimes
I try to talk to native English speakers.	2.98	Sometimes

I practice the sounds of English.	3.33	Sometimes
I use the English words I know in different ways.	3.33	Sometimes
I start conversations in English.	3.16	Sometimes
I watch English Language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	3.37	Sometimes
I read for pleasure in English.	3.28	Sometimes
I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English	3.36	Sometimes
I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	3.21	Sometimes
I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	3.15	Sometimes
I try to find patterns in English.	3.15	Sometimes
I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	3.25	Sometimes
I try not to translate word-for-word.	3.16	Sometimes
I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English	3.28	Sometimes

As shown in the table 1b, Cognitive Strategies are again appeared sometimes in all the statements; it means that students occasionally used this method in learning a language. Practicing, summarising, reasoning deductively and analysing the content of every word are one of the best examples of cognitive strategies.

Chand, (2014) it was found that language learning strategies were used at a medium level by most students. The study had found that all strategies have a weak positive relationship with students' academic language it means that the LLS of Fiji students had a tiny effect on their academic language proficiency.

Table 1c. Mean Computed on the Language Learning Strategy used among the AB-English Students on Compensatory Strategies

Items	Mean	Descriptive equivalent
To understand unfamiliar words, I make guesses.	3.16	Sometimes
When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	3.26	Sometimes
I make up new words if I don't know the right ones in English.	3.23	Sometimes
I read English without looking up every new word.	3.09	Sometimes
I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	3.14	Sometimes
If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or a phrase that means the same thing.	3.33	Sometimes

The result of the statement shown in Table 1c under compensation strategies appeared that the majority of the respondent answered "sometimes" in all statements, this indicates that compensation strategies for the respondents were at the medium level. It means that the respondents sometimes overcome their limitations and gaps in their linguistic knowledge, through language switching, making gestures and seeking help (Radwan, 2011).

Nacera, A. (2010); the use of the compensation strategies by students with lower vocabulary size can clarified by the fact that they had more difficulties because of their limited knowledge of the target language and had to resort to using compensation strategies more frequently to compensate for their limited knowledge.

Table 1d. Mean Computed on the Language Learning Strategy used among the AB-English Students on Metacognitive Strategies

Items	Mean	Descriptive equivalent
I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	3.26	Sometimes
I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	3.47	Sometimes
I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	3.42	Sometimes
I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	3.54	Often
I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	3.16	Sometimes
I look for people I can talk to in English.	3.19	Sometimes
I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	3.20	Sometimes
I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	3.40	Sometimes
I think about my progress in learning English.	3.47	Sometimes

The table 1d shows the mean computed on the language learning strategy used under meta-cognitive strategies appeared to be "sometimes" in all statements with the exception "I try to find out how to be a better learner of English" having a mean of 3.54 and fall into often use. Zafari, (2014) said that the reason for frequently use of meta-cognitive strategies is not having enough exposure to acquire English as the target language So, they are obliged to employ meta-cognitive strategies purposely to donate their learning of foreign language. This study indicates that meta-cognitive strategies for the respondents are at the medium level. It means that the respondents are moderate users of these strategies in learning a language.

Qingquan, et al. (2008) meta-cognitive strategies entails higher proficiency of the target language, most successful students who usually have clearer visions for learning and stronger abilities of self-monitoring, self-management and self-evaluation than unsuccessful students are better able to plan their learning carefully, monitor their learning processes and assesses their accomplishments frequently.

Table 1e. Mean Computed on the Language Learning Strategy used among the AB-English Students on Affective Strategies

Items	Mean	Descriptive equivalent
I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	3.26	Sometimes
I encourage myself to speak in English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	3.48	Sometimes
I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	3.21	Sometimes
I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	3.32	Sometimes
I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.	2.91	Sometimes
I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English	3.16	Sometimes

Table 1e shows the mean computed average under affective strategies. The majority of the respondent answered "sometimes" in all statements; this indicates that affective strategies for the respondents were at the average level. It means that the respondents were quite good in taking control of their emotions in the language learning. Chan, Z. (2014) contradicts in the study of Razak, N. et al. (2012) this study found that all the learning strategies of ESL were being used at high level of mean distribution by the respondents. Likewise, the study revealed that female ESL learners out-performed their male counterparts in strategy use.

Table 1f. Mean computed on the language learning strategy used among the AB-English students on Social strategies.

Items	Mean	Descriptive equivalent
If I don't understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	3.44	Sometimes
I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	3.22	Sometimes
I practice English with other students.	3.35	Sometimes
I ask for help from English speakers.	3.25	Sometimes
I ask questions in English.	3.30	Sometimes
I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	3.16	Sometimes

As the mean computed in Table 1f on the language learning strategy used under Social strategies shows that the majority of the respondent answered "sometimes" in all statements; this indicates that affective strategies were sometimes used. It means that the respondents were quite developing in their cultural understanding, cooperating with others (Radwan, 2015).

Lavasani, M. et al. (2011), learning social strategies can develop cultural understanding and become aware of thoughts and feeling of others eliminating competition can bring spirit to the group, putting oneself in someone else's situation to understand that person's point of view.

Table 2a. The Significant Difference in Language Learning Strategies when they are grouped according to Age

Strategies	F-Value	P-Value	Decision
Memory Strategies			
Q1	0.71ns	0.75	Accept
Q2	0.95ns	0.50	Accept
Q3	1.0 ns	0.38	Accept
Q4	1.21ns	0.27	Accept
Q5	1.55 ns	0.09	Accept
Q6	1.21ns	0.27	Accept
Q7	2.29*	0.00	Reject
Q8	0.89ns	0.56	Accept
Q9	1.08ns	0.37	Accept
Cognitive Strategies			

Q10	0.76ns	0.70	Accept
Q11	1.62ns	0.07	Accept
Q12	1.17ns	0.30	Accept
Q13	0.48ns	0.93	Accept
Q14	0.48 ns	0.93	Accept
Q15	0.77 ns	0.70	Accept
Q16	1.99*	0.02	Reject
Q17	0.99 ns	0.86	Accept
Q18	1.16ns	0.31	Accept
Q19	1.26ns	0.23	Accept
Q20	0.50ns	0.92	Accept
Q21	0.49ns	0.93	Accept
Q22	0.48ns	0.93	Accept
Q23	0.56ns	0.88	Accept
Compensatory Strategies			
Q24	0.51ns	0.61	Accept
Q25	1.12ns	0.34	Accept
Q26	1.17ns	0.29	Accept
Q27	1.46ns	0.13	Accept
Q28	0.79ns	0.67	Accept
Q29	0.67ns	0.79	Accept
Metacognitive Strategies			
Q30	1.34ns	0.19	Accept
Q31	0.66ns	0.90	Accept
Q32	0.86ns	0.59	Accept
Q33	0.79ns	0.67	Accept
Q34	0.76ns	0.70	Accept
Q35	0.82ns	0.63	Accept
Q36	1.07ns	0.38	Accept
Q37	1.45ns	0.13	Accept
Q38	0.95ns	0.50	Accept
Affective Strategies			

Q39	1.46ns	0.13	Accept
Q40	1.09ns	0.35	Accept
Q41	0.91ns	0.54	Accept
Q42	1.66ns	0.07	Accept
Q43	2.27*	0.00	Reject
Q44	1,72ns	0.05	Accept
Social Strategies			
Q45	1.16ns	0.13	Accept
Q46	1.72*	0.05	Reject
Q47	1.48ns	0.12	Accept
Q48	1.27ns	0.23	Accept
Q49	0.92ns	0.53	Accept
Q50	1.74*	0.05	Reject

By analysing the significant difference on the language learning strategies, when they are grouped according to their age, the table revealed that there is a significant difference on the statements, "I physically act out new English words" having f-value of 2.29 or p- value of 0.00, "I start conversations in English" having f-value of 1.99 or p-value of 0.02, "I write down my feelings in a language learning diary" having f-value of 2.27 or p-value of 0.00, "I talk to someone else about how I feel while learning English" having f-value of 1.72 or p-value of 0.05, "I ask English speakers to correct me while talking" having a f-value of 1.72 or p-value of 0.05, and "I try to learn about the culture of English speakers" having f-value of 1.74 or p-value of 0.05, it means that the older adults typically exhibit age-related decline in language production, when compared with younger adults (Zhang, H. et al. 2019). It contradicts in the study of Sadeghi, Attar (2013), it revealed that the younger beginners did not differ significantly from the older beginners in strategy used, in neither strategy grouped. In other words, neither younger nor older beginners used more language learning strategies in any one of the six strategy groups.

Table 2b. The Significant Difference in Language Learning Strategies when they are grouped according to Gender

Strategies	F-Value	P-Value	Decision
Memory Strategies			
Q1	0.54ns	0.46	Accept
Q2	0.08ns	0.76	Accept
Q3	3.71*	0.05	Reject
Q4	0.74ns	0.39	Accept
Q5	1.25ns	0.26	Accept
Q6	0.07ns	0.79	Accept
Q7	1.82ns	0.17	Accept
Q8	3.94*	0.04	Reject

Q9	1.14ns	0.28	Accept
Cognitive Strategies			
Q10	0.76ns	0.18	Accept
Q11	5.75*	0.01	Reject
Q12	0.48ns	0.48	Accept
Q13	0.04ns	0.83	Accept
Q14	0.00ns	0.94	Accept
Q15	0.18 ns	0.67	Accept
Q16	0.00ns	0.92	Accept
Q17	0.25ns	0.61	Accept
Q18	0.06ns	0.80	Accept
Q19	0.01ns	0.90	Accept
Q20	6.74*	0.01	Reject
Q21	0.14ns	0.73	Accept
Q22	1.14ns	0.28	Accept
Q23	0.22ns	0.63	Accept
Compensatory Strategies			
Q24	4.60*	0.03	Reject
Q25	0.27ns	0.60	Accept
Q26	3.77*	0.05	Reject
Q27	3.50ns	0.06	Accept
Q.28	3.53*	0.03	Reject
Q29	7.66*	0.00	Reject
Metacognitive Strategies			
Q30	1.68ns	0.19	Accept
Q31	0.38ns	0.53	Accept
Q32	0.86ns	0.35	Accept
Q33	3.11ns	0.08	Accept
Q34	1.65ns	0.20	Accept
Q35	1.52ns	0.21	Accept
Q36	1.63ns	0.20	Accept
Q37	0.93ns	0.16	Accept
Q38	0.65ns	0.41	Accept

Affective Strategies			
Q39	0.85ns	0.35	Accept
Q40	0.03ns	0.84	Accept
Q41	0.55ns	0.45	Accept
Q42	6.27*	0.01	Reject
Q43	2.80ns	0.09	Accept
Q44	0.00ns	0.96	Accept
Social Strategies			
Q45	0.44ns	0.50	Accept
Q46	1.14ns	0.28	Accept
Q47	0.17ns	0.68	Accept
Q48	0.01ns	0.90	Accept
Q49	3.50ns	0.06	Accept
Q50	1.83ns	0.17	Accept

By analysing the significant difference on the language learning strategies, when they are grouped based on their gender, the table revealed that there is a significant difference on the statements, "I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word" having f-value of 3.71 or p-value of 0.05, "I review English lessons often" having f-value of 3.74 or p-value of 0.04, "I try to talk to native English speakers" having f-value of 5.75 or p-value of 0.01, "I try to find patterns in English" having f-value of 6.74 or p-value of 0.01, "To understand unfamiliar words, I make guesses" having f-value of 4.60 or p-value of 0.03, "I make up new words if I don't know the right ones in English" having f-value of 3.77 or p-value of 0.05, "I try to guess what the other person will say next in English" having f-value of 3.53 or p-value of 0.03, "If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or a phrase that means the same thing" having f-value of 7.56 or p-value of 0.00, and "I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English" having a t-value of 6.27 or p-value of 0.01, it means that all the components of language learning strategies were related to each other as a result of the findings obtained from the correlation analysis there have been found significant positive correlations among all the components of language learning strategies on undergraduates' gender Hakan, K. et al. (2015). However, it contradicts with the study of Khatib, (2013) that indicates differences between male and female respondents in language learning strategies used due to the reason that the English language is important to both male and female Emirati EFL learners and that they both consider English language proficiency as an important factor in their life propelling them to use a variety of strategies while learning English.

Table 2b. The Significant Difference in Language Learning Strategies when they are grouped according to Year Level

Strategies	F-Value	P-Value	Decision
Memory Strategies			
Q1	1.34ns	0.26	Accept
Q2	1.93ns	0.12	Accept
Q3	1.74ns	0.16	Accept

Q4	1.24ns	0.29	Accept
Q5	2.06ns	0.10	Accept
Q6	0.23ns	0.86	Accept
Q7	3.36*	0.02	Reject
Q8	3.26*	0.02	Reject
Q9	6.19*	0.00	Reject
Cognitive Strategies			
Q10	2.51ns	0.06	Accept
Q11	2.66*	0.05	Reject
Q12	2.01ns	0.10	Accept
Q13	1.88ns	0.11	Accept
Q14	1.23ns	0.29	Accept
Q15	2.93*	0.03	Reject
Q16	5.50*	0.00	Reject
Q17	6.67*	0.00	Reject
Q18	8.05*	0.00	Reject
Q19	3.84*	0.01	Reject
Q20	3.43*	0.01	Reject
Q21	2.43ns	0.06	Accept
Q22	2.08ns	0.10	Accept
Q23	5.16*	0.00	Reject
Compensatory Strategies			
Q24	2.97*	0.03	Reject
Q25	5.14*	0.00	Reject
Q26	3.62*	0.01	Reject
Q27	0.76ns	0.51	Accept
Q28	2.72*	0.04	Reject
Q29	4.14*	0.00	Reject

Metacognitive Strategies			
Q30	1.82ns	0.14	Accept
Q31	8.00*	0.00	Reject
Q32	1.41ns	0.24	Accept
Q33	3.58*	0.01	Reject
Q34	3.71*	0.01	Reject
Q35	3.00*	0.03	Reject
Q36	2.99*	0.03	Reject
Q37	2.47ns	0.06	Accept
Q38	3.65*	0.01	Reject
Affective Strategies			
Q39	7.80*	0.00	Reject
Q40	3.60*	0.01	Reject
Q41	2.09ns	0.10	Accept
Q42	4.28*	0.00	Reject
Q43	2.33ns	0.80	Accept
Q44	1.40ns	0.24	Accept
Social Strategies			
Q45	2.33ns	0.07	Accept
Q46	0.70ns	0.54	Accept
Q47	3.61*	0.01	Reject
Q48	3.22*	0.02	Reject
Q49	1.42ns	0.23	Accept
Q50	1.78ns	0.15	Accept

By analysing the significant difference on the language learning strategies when they are grouped based on year level, the table revealed that there is a significant difference on the statements, "I physically act out new English words" having f-value of 3.36 or p-value of 0.02, "I review English lessons often" having f-value of 3.26 or p-value of 0.02, "I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign" having f-value of 6.19 or p-value of 0.00, "I make up new words if I don't know the right ones in English" having f-value of 2.66 or p-value of 0.05, "I read for pleasure in English" having f-value of 5.50 or p-value of 0.00, "I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English" having f-value of 6.67 or p-

value of 0.00, "I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully" having f-value of 8.05 or p-value of 0.00, "I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English" having f-value of 3.84 or p-value of 0.01, "I try to find patterns in English" having f-value of 3.43 or p-value of 0.01, "I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English" having f-value of 5.16 or p-value of 0.00, "To understand unfamiliar words, I make guesses" having f-value of 2.97 or p-value of 0.03, "I make up new words if I don't know the right ones in English" having f-value of 5.14 or p-value of 0.00, "When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures" having f-value of 3.62 or p-value of 0.03, "I make up new words if I don't know the right ones in English" having f-value of 2.72 or p-value of 0.01, "I make up new words if I don't know the right ones in English" having f-value of 3.63 or p-value of 0.01, "I try to guess what the other person will say next in English" having f-value of 2.72 or p-value of 0.04, "If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or a phrase that means the same thing" having f-value of 4.14 or p-value of 0.00, "I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better" having f-value of 8.00 or p-value of 0.00, "I encourage myself to speak in English even when I am afraid of making a mistake" having f-value of 3.58 or p-value of 0.01, "I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English" having f-value of 3.71 or p-value of 0.00, "I encourage myself to speak in English even when I am afraid of making a mistake" having f-value of 7.80 or p-value of 0.00, "I encourage myself to speak in English even when I am afraid of making a mistake" having f-value of 3.60 or p-value of 0.01, "I practice English with other students" having f-value of 4.28 or p-value of 0.01 and "I ask for help from English speakers" having f-value of 3.22 or p-value of 0.02, it means that there is a significant difference on the language learning strategies used by the 1st year, 2nd year, 3rd year and 4th year respondents. It was found that the students with higher English proficiency levels used language learning strategies more frequently, and effectively than those with lower English proficiency level. It was concluded that students with high English proficiency behaved in unique ways while learning a language (Kunasaraphan, 2015). It also revealed in the study of Salahshour, F. et al. (2013) a significant difference in overall strategy used between high and low proficiency. They said that the sort of this research might indicate the need of raising awareness among language learners to its functions and usefulness of such strategies so that they become encouraged to select and use at various stages of learning their second language more appropriate strategies.

Table 2d. The Significant Difference in Language Learning Strategies when they are grouped according to Ethnicity

Strategies	F-Value	P-Value	Decision
Memory Strategies			
Q1	0.98ns	0.46	Accept
Q2	0.38ns	0.95	Accept
Q3	0.62ns	0.79	Accept
Q4	0.64ns	0.77	Accept
Q5	0.88ns	0.54	Accept
Q6	1.37ns	0.19	Accept
Q7	0.22ns	0.99	Accept
Q8	0.26ns	0.98	Accept
Q9	1.55ns	0.85	Accept
Cognitive Strategies			
Q10	1.41ns	0.17	Accept

Q11	0.62ns	0.79	Accept
Q12	1.06ns	0.39	Accept
Q13	0.70ns	0.71	Accept
Q14	0.18ns	0.99	Accept
Q15	0.29ns	0.98	Accept
Q16	0.42ns	0.93	Accept
Q17	1.16ns	0.32	Accept
Q18	0.77ns	0.65	Accept
Q19	0.73ns	0.69	Accept
Q20	0.76ns	0.66	Accept
Q21	0.82ns	0.60	Accept
Q22	0.52ns	0.87	Accept
Q23	1.47ns	0.15	Accept
Compensatory Strategies			
Q24	0.66ns	0.75	Accept
Q25	0.69ns	0.72	Accept
Q26	0.59ns	0.81	Accept
Q27	0.76ns	0.66	Accept
Q28	0.90ns	0.52	Accept
Q29	1.94*	0.04	Reject
Metacognitive Strategies			
Q30	0.66ns	0.75	Accept
Q31	0.58ns	0.82	Accept
Q32	1.26ns	0.24	Accept
Q33	1.21ns	0.28	Accept
Q34	1.10ns	0.36	Accept
Q35	0.73ns	0.68	Accept
Q36	1.34ns	0.38	Accept
Q37	1.58ns	0.11	Accept
Q38	0.82ns	0.60	Accept

Affective Strategies			
Q39	0.92ns	0.51	Accept
Q40	0.79ns	0.63	Accept
Q41	0.39ns	0.94	Accept
Q42	1.29ns	0.23	Accept
Q43	0.77ns	0.65	Accept
Q44	0.67ns	0.74	Accept
Social Strategies			
Q45	1.08ns	0.38	Accept
Q46	0.77ns	0.65	Accept
Q47	0.78ns	0.63	Accept
Q48	0.34ns	0.96	Accept
Q49	0.78ns	0.64	Accept
Q50	1.07ns	0.38	Accept

By analysing the significant difference on the language learning strategies, when they are grouped based on ethnicity, the table revealed that there is a significant difference on the statements, "If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or a phrase that means the same thing" having f-value of 1.94 or p-value of 0.04, it means that there is a significant difference only in that statement due to their different language used Yang, M. (2007) said that if the strategies employed by students with different ethnic backgrounds could be identified, more insights will be gained into the learning process of individual learners and the characteristics of learners with different ethnic backgrounds, as regarded ethnicity as one of the salient variables that result in differences in strategy used. Chostelidou, D. et al. (2015) said that multilingualism challenges the hegemony of English and is inextricably related to the notion of language and its importance for communication, cultural understanding, development and mobility. The other statements don't show any differences in strategies used.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the study revealed that the respondents used all the statement of the language learning strategies except the statement "I try to find out how to be a better learner of English" which often used statement under meta-cognitive strategies. The overall results of these studies are at the average level, or it can be concluded that the use of learning strategies is common to all AB-English student.

There is a significant difference in the language learning strategies used according to Age in items 7, 14, 43, 44 and 46, so, the older adults typically exhibit age-related decline in language production when compared to younger adults, while the other statements don't show any differences because sometimes age is not the barriers in acquiring the language. While in terms of Gender, nine (9) statements appeared to be significant due to the components of language learning strategies are related to each other while the other statement doesn't show any differences, because the language learning strategies are both significant to male and female respondents. On the other hand, the significant difference on the language learning strategies used according to year level revealed twenty-seven (27) items, having these numbers shows a big difference in terms of the year level of the respondents. It means that due to their exposure to language, the higher level is more knowledgeable in using these strategies in acquiring a language. Another study finds, when they are grouped based on ethnicity shows

only one item to be significant. Therefore, it was concluded that the respondent's ethnicity has nothing to do with the language learning strategies of the respondents since they were exposed to the English language in pre-school.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the result given, the researcher strongly recommends the following:

1. To upsurge the competence of these strategies it is highly recommended to the future researcher to use different way of chasing the language learning strategies of students.
2. It is also recommended to use both qualitative and quantitative research to compare the difference of these strategies and give more accurate data that will benefit both educators and learners.
3. These study also accepts recommendations in dissimilar field to explore more about the use of different strategies that will develop a more advance and more useful strategies.

REFERENCES

1. Alias, A.A., Manan, N.A., Yusof, J. & Pandian, A. (2012). The Use of Facebook as Language Learning Strategy (LLS) Training Tool on College Students' LLS Use and Academic Writing Performance, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 67 (10), 36-48, DOI:[10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.305](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.305).
2. Chand, Z. (2014). Language learning strategy use and its impact on proficiency in academic writing of tertiary students, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 118 (19), 511-521, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.070>
3. Chostelidou, D. & Griva, E. (2015). Language Learners' Skills and Strategies: Assessing Academic Needs in a Multilingual Context, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 191 (2), 1472-1478, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.442>.
4. Djigunovic, J. (2000). Language learning strategies and affect. *CLS Occasional Papers, Asian EFL Journal*, 13 (1) 1-28.
5. Djigunovic, J. (2000). Language learning strategies and affect. *CLS Occasional Papers*, 59 (Autumn), 1-28.
6. Gu, Y. P., (2003). Vocabulary in learning a second language: person, task, context, and strategies. *TESL-EJ*, 7 (2), 1-25, <https://tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume7/ej26/ej26a4/>.
7. Hakan, K., Aydin, B. & Bulent, A. (2015) An Investigation of Undergraduates' Language Learning Strategies, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197 (25), 1348-1354, DOI:[10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.388](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.388)
8. Harris, V. (2003). Adapting classroom-based strategy instruction to a distance learning context. *TESL-EJ*, 7(2), <https://www.tesl-ej.org/ej26/a1.html>.
9. Khatib, A. (2013). Language Learning Strategies of EFL Students in the University General Requirements Unit in the United Arab Emirates University, *Scholarworks@uaeu*, https://scholarworks.uaeu.ac.ae/all_theses/652/.
10. Kunasaraphan, K. (2015). English Learning Strategy and Proficiency Level of the First Year Students Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197 (25), 1853-1858, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.246>
11. Lan, R. & Oxford, R. (2003). Language learning strategy profiles of elementary school students in Taiwan. *IRAL*, 41, 339-379, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285833233>.
12. Lavasani, M. G., & Faryadres, F. (2011). Language learning strategies and suggested model in adults processes of learning second language, *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 15, 191-197, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.072>
13. Nacera, A. (2010). Languages learning strategies and the vocabulary size, *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2 (2) 4021-4025, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.634>.
14. Nisbet, D.L., Tindall, E. & Arroyo, A. (2005). Language learning strategies and English proficiency of Chinese university students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38 (1), 100, x107, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2005.tb02457>.

15. Qasimnejad, A., Hemmati, F. (2014). Investigating the Language Learning Strategies used by Iranian Monolingual (Persian) and Bilingual (Persian Turkish) Speakers as EFL learners, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136 (9) 26-30, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.281>.
16. Quingquam, N. Chatupote, M. and Toe, A, (2008). A Deep Look into Learning Strategy Use by Successful and Unsuccessful Students in the Chinese EFL Learning Context. In *Regional Language Center Journal*, 39 (3), 338-358, <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ814839>.
17. Radwan, A. A. (2011) "Effects of L2 proficiency and gender on choice of language learning strategies by university students majoring in English" *Asian EFL Journal*. 13 (1)114-157. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/288740309>.
18. Razak, N.Z.A., Ismail, F., Aziz, A.A. & Babikkoi, M.A. (2012). Assessing the Use of English Language Learning Strategies among Secondary School Students in Malaysia, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 66, (7) 240-246, <https://www.scribd.com/document/480201327/Assessment>.
19. Oxford, R. & Nyikos, M. (1989) Variables Affecting Choice of Language Learning Strategies by University Students. *The Modern Language Journal*. pp. 291-300 (10 pages). <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1989.tb06367.x>
20. Sadeghi, K. & Attar, M.T. (2013). The relationship between learning strategy use and starting age of learning EFL, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70 (25) 387-396, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042813000773/pdf?md5=5902f1be19747bc329ae3198cd762c7a&pid=1-s2.0-S1877042813000773-main.pdf>.
21. Salahshour, F., Sharifi, M. & Salahshour, N. (2013). The relationship between language learning strategy use, language proficiency level and learner gender, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70 (25) 634-643, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.103>.
22. Sen, H. & Sen, M. (2012). A comparison of EFL teachers' perception of language learning strategies (LLSS) and learners' reported used of LLSS in their English language class, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 1846-1854, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.390>.
23. Yang, M. (2007). Language Learning Strategies for Junior College Students in Taiwan: Investigating Ethnicity and Proficiency, *The Asian EFL Journal*, 9, Number 2, <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com>
24. Zafari, M. & Biria, R. (2014). The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Language Learning Strategy Use, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, (6) 1966-1974, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269808670>
25. Zhang, H., Diaz, M. & Eppes, A. (2018) Task difficulty modulates age-related differences in the behavioral and neural bases of language production, *Researchgate Journal, Neuropsychologia-0028-3932*,124 DOI:[10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.11.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.11.017)