

**THE INFLUENCE OF STUDENT'S LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES
USED TOWARDS THEIR ACHIEVEMENT IN STRUCTURE IV**

by

Dwiniasih

English Education Department
Swadaya Gunung Jati University Cirebon
dwini6644@gmail.com

Abstract

This study was aimed to know the influence of student's language learning strategies used towards their achievement in structure IV and the most strategy used. It is done in responding the fact, most of the students do not aware of their learning strategies. It makes them difficult understanding the knowledge transferred. By using descriptive method, this study used document test and SILL questionnaire as the instrument of the data. Meanwhile, in analyzing the data collected, the writer used SPSS simple linear regression (Muijs.200:143). The result of the study showed the influence of L2 student's strategies is significantly weak towards their achievement in structure IV. While the most strategies used was metacognitive strategy. It is because so many factors influence student's achievement, such as student's ability, learning style, and teacher's methodology used. Therefore, it is teacher's task to motivate students aware of learning strategy used, so they could get well understanding.

Keywords: language learning strategies, achievement, Structure IV, Grammar

INTRODUCTION

Language learning success is determined by many factors; involve age, sex, intelligence, motivation, anxiety, action, students' learning style, and language learning strategies. Those factors are related each other. The two of factors mentioned, language learning styles and strategies are among the main factors that help determine how-and how well- our students learn second or foreign language (Celce-Murcia, 2001:359). From that statement, it could be concluded that students could enhance their knowledge if they could recognize their learning style and strategies. In fact, most of them do not

know well themselves. It makes them difficult understanding the knowledge transferred. For example, in one of English faculty of University in Cirebon, most of the students have already learnt English since they were in junior high school, yet, they still find difficulties in understanding the material, especially grammar rules. It means they do not recognize their learning strategies in understanding the subjects learnt. Meanwhile, when the students get the understanding of the subjects learnt, it means their learning strategies fit to his/her task at hand. This assumption in line with Scarcella and Oxford's statement cited in Celcea and Murcia's book (2002, p. 359)

that learning strategies is as “specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques used by students in enhancing their own learning.”

As the teacher, we do realize that grammar is the most difficult subject learnt by the students year by year. It is supported by statement of Dyatmika (2010) that for some students, English is considered as a very difficult subject because they must learn spellings, pronunciation, vocabularies, meaning, and grammar. In addition, Larsen-Freeman cited in Savage (2010) stated that Grammar knowledge is important, but only insofar as it enables students to communicate “accurately, meaningfully, and appropriately”. Therefore, teacher has to know what appropriate technique/method that should be implemented in class; moreover, the students also should recognize their learning style and strategies during learning process.

Referring to those explanations above, the writer is interested to conduct the research that will be aimed to investigate the influence of students’ language learning strategies used towards their achievement in Structure IV and to know what the most student’s language learning strategies used. In details, the research entitled “The influence of students’ language learning strategies towards their achievement of Structure IV”. The achievement here means the students’ achievement in the summative form.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Related to this study, the writer chooses some literatures about previous research that is relevant to this study, which focus on the influence of students’ learning strategies and their achievement of Structure IV. One of the previous studies was designed to investigate the influence of

gender and major on college EFL learning strategy use in Taiwan (Chang, Liu, and Lee: 2007). We know that every student has his/her own ability in learning language. Their ability is commonly influenced by their learning style or strategies. It is in line with Oxford’s statement, which cited in Celce-Murcia (2001) that when learner consciously chooses strategies that is appropriate for him/her learning style and the second language task at hand, these strategies become a useful tool-kit for active, conscious, and purposeful self-regulation of learning. Learning style and learning strategies are related each other. They could work together with or even conflict with the instructional methodology. In addition, Allwright and Little cited in Celce Murcia (2001:362) describe that learning strategies can also enable students to become more independent, autonomous, lifelong learners. Based on those explanations above, the writer can conclude that students could enhance their ability quicker and more effective if they could recognize their learning strategies and implement it during learning process. The main categories of learning strategies have been identified by Oxford (1990). It also have been offered by others (O’Malley and Chamot: 1990) cited in Celce Murcia (2001:363). These categories can be classified into six types: cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, memory-related strategies, compensatory strategies, affective strategies, and social learning strategies.

Referring to the study conducted, the writer limits the student’s achievement by getting their result of summative test. Achievement tests are often summative because they are administered at the end of a unit or term or study. Here, *Student Achievement* is defined as an improvement

in learning that develops both the individual and the individual's ability to contribute to society (Brownlie: 2003). Meanwhile, Brown (2003:47) An achievement test is related directly to classroom lessons, units, or even a total curriculum. Achievement tests are (or should be) limited to particular material addressed in a curriculum within a particular time frame and are offered after a course has focused on the objectives in question. Meanwhile, the lesson subject limited is Structure IV that is one of the subjects contained part of grammar that should be taken by the students in the fourth semester at the University level. In this subject, students are prepared to face TOEFL TEST. They are taught how to answer the test by understanding tips and trick of the material that is Structure and Written Expression. The long history of grammar came at different times of second-language instruction that grammar has been regarded as a set of rules ("third person singular present-tense verbs take an -s for subject-verb agreement"; "adjectives go before nouns") to be memorized by the learners which is taught and tested up to now in the whole world (Savage, 2010).

RESEARCH METHOD

This study constitutes a quantitative research. Since this study focuses on the investigation of the influence of students' learning strategies and their achievement of Structure IV, descriptive is the most appropriate method for this study. Meanwhile, the writer took the students of the second grades in Swadaya Gunung Jati Cirebon in the academic year of 2014/2015 as the subjects of the study, the participant that is as the sample of this research is class I and J, which consists of forty students. Student's document test and questionnaire by Oxford (1990) that is Strategy Inventory

for Language Learning (SILL) used as the instrument of collecting the data, while in analysis the data collected, the writer used SPSS of simple linear regression formula (Muijs. 2004:143).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

a. The Analysis of Student's Language Learning Strategies used towards Their Achievement in Structure IV.

ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	161.054	1	161.054	1.474	.232 ^a
Residual	4151.321	38	109.245		
Total	4312.375	39			

a. Predictors: (Constant), X_strategy

b. Dependent Variable: Y_result

The above *Anova* table showed that *Sig. Value* is 0.232 = 23.2% that is higher than 5%. It could be assumed that H_0 is accepted which means the similarity regression is *not linear*. Therefore, we can conclude that student's language learning strategies does not give any influence towards their achievement in Structure IV. The next step is analyzing the *Coefficient*, which will be carried out into the following table.

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
1 (Constant)	81.786	12.391		6.600	.000
X_strategi	-.143	.117	-.193	-1.214	.232

a. Dependent Variable: Y_result

According to the *Coefficient* table indicated that the similarity regression is $\hat{Y} = 81,786 - 0,143X$, it revealed that for each independent variable increased as one

unit, so, it will decrease the student's achievement (dependent variable) for about 0.143. The last step is finding simple correlation coefficient that is described into below *Summary Model* table.

Summary Model

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.193 ^a	.037	.012	10.452

a. Predictors: (Constant), X_strategy

The strength of the influence of student's language learning strategies towards their achievement could be seen from the R square value showed 0.037. It could be defined that 3.7% student's achievement is influenced by their language learning strategies while 96.3% is influenced by other factors, such as student's learning style, student's ability, and teacher's teaching strategy. Based on *Model Summary* table, the simple correlation coefficient (r) value is 0.193. It means that r value showed the correlation of each variable is interpreted as in *weak level*. It can be concluded the influence of student's language learning strategies used is significantly weak towards their achievement in Structure IV.

Related to the conclusion above that the use of language learning strategies is significantly weak influence student's achievement in structure IV, it does not mean that there is no any influence of language learning strategies used by the students. It would be useful for the students if they are aware and realize of which strategies that is appropriate in learning process. It is in line with Allwright (1990) and Little's statement (1991) cited in Celce-Murcia (2001, p.362) that learning strategies can also enable students to become more independent, autonomous, lifelong learners.

In fact, the students are not aware and mostly they do not realize it that is important for their learning. It is supported by Nyikos and Oxford (1993), clarified that students are not always aware of the power of consciously using L2 learning strategies to make learning quicker and more effective. So many factors, which influence student's learning achievement. It is not only their language learning strategies used but also their learning style and ability, and teacher's teaching strategy/method used. Both of them are related each other. We cannot separate it during teaching learning process because they influence one to other factors. To prove that statement, below are the descriptions of each language learning strategy used by the students which have been ordered based on the most students used their language learning strategies and it is presented from the higher to the lower percentages that involve metacognitive strategies, memory-related strategies, cognitive strategies, affective strategies, social strategies, and compensation strategies.

b. The Influence of *Metacognitive Strategies* used towards student's achievement in Structure IV

The result of the influence of *Metacognitive strategies* used showed by *Anova* table that *Sig. Value* is $0.092 = 9.2\%$, which means higher than 5%.

ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	314.102	1	314.102	2.985	.092 ^a
Residual	3998.273	38	105.218		
Total	4312.375	39			

a. Predictors: (Constant), metacognitive strategies

b. Dependent Variable: Y_result

The following step is examining the *Coefficient*, which will be carried out as below table.

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	78.851	7.119		11.077	.000
metacognitive strategies	-.625	.362	-.270	-1.728	.092

a. Dependent Variable: Y_result

The *Coefficient* table indicated that the similarity regression is $\hat{Y} = 78,851 - 0,625X_4$. It is said that for each independent variable (*metacognitive strategies*) increased as one unit, the student's achievement (dependent variable) decreased for about 0.625. *Summary Model* table is applied to find simple correlation coefficient that is described below.

Summary Model

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.270 ^a	.073	.048	10.258

a. Predictors: (Constant), metacognitive strategies

The result analysis of R square value showed 0.073. It could be defined that 7.3% student's achievement is influenced by their language learning strategies (*metacognitive strategies*) while 92.7% is influenced by other factors. Still from *Summary Model* table, the simple correlation coefficient (*r*) value is 0.270. *r* value showed the correlation of each variable is in *average level*. It could be determined that some of the student's are aware of the learning strategy, metacognitive strategies, which influences their achievement in Structure IV.

c. The Influence of *Memory-related Strategies* used towards student's achievement in Structure IV.

ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	206.711	1	206.711	1.913	.175 ^a
Residual	4105.664	38	108.044		
Total	4312.375	39			

a. Predictors: (Constant), memory strategies

b. Dependent Variable: Y_result

Based on the *Anova* table above, the result showed that *Sig. Value* is 0.175 = 17.5% that is higher than 5%. It is assumed that H_0 is accepted which means the similarity regression is *not linear*. Therefore, it can be concluded that the independent variable, *Memory-related strategies* does not give any influence towards student's achievement in Structure IV.

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	78.121	8.295		9.418	.000
memory strategies	-.724	.524	-.219	-1.383	.175

a. Dependent Variable: Y_result

After calculating the *Sig. Value*, According to the *Coefficient* table indicated that the similarity regression is $\hat{Y} = 78,121 - 0,724X_1$, it revealed that for each independent variable (memory-related strategies) added as one unit, it would decrease the student's achievement (dependent variable) for about 0.724.

Summary Model

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.219 ^a	.048	.023	10.394

a. Predictors: (Constant), memory strategies

How strength the influence of *memory-related strategies* towards student's achievement could be identified by R square value that showed 0.048. It could be defined that 4.8% student's achievement is influenced by their language learning strategies, memory-related. Meanwhile 95.2% is influenced by other factors. Based on *Model Summary* table, the simple correlation coefficient (r) value is 0.219. r value position is between 0.2 – 0.4 which showed the correlation level of each variable is in *average level*. It can be concluded that some of students' used their language learning strategies appropriately which effected their achievement in Structure IV.

d. The Influence of *Cognitive Strategies* used towards student's achievement in Structure IV

ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	164.089	1	164.089	1.503	.228 ^a
Residual	4148.286	38	109.165		
Total	4312.375	39			

a. Predictors: (Constant), cognitive strategies

b. Dependent Variable: Y_result

The result analysis which is showed in the table above proved that the similarity regression is *not linear*, which means H_0 is accepted. It is strengthen by *Sig. Value* is $0.228 = 22.8\%$ that is higher than 5%. Therefore, the writer can conclude that student's language learning strategies, *cognitive strategies* does not give any influence towards student's achievement in Structure IV.

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
1 (Constant)	54.493	10.234		5.325	.000
cognitive strategies	.710	.579	.195	1.226	.228

a. Dependent Variable: Y_result

Related to the *Coefficient* table, the result indicated that the similarity regression is $\hat{Y} = 54,493 + 0,710X_2$, it can be summarized that for each independent variable (*cognitive strategies*) increased as one unit, so, it will increase the student's achievement (dependent variable) for about 0.710.

Summary Model

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.195 ^a	.038	.013	10.448

a. Predictors: (Constant), cognitive strategies

The effect of *cognitive strategies* towards student's achievement could be identified by analyzing the R square value, which showed 0.038. It could be assumed that 3.8% student's achievement is influenced by their language learning strategies, *cognitive strategies* whereas 96.2% is influenced by other factors. *Model Summary* table indicated the simple correlation coefficient (r) value is 0.195. r value showed the correlation of each variable is in *weak level*.

e. The Influence of *Affective Strategies* used towards student's achievement in Structure IV.

ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	159.446	1	159.446	1.459	.235 ^a
Residual	4152.929	38	109.288		
Total	4312.375	39			

a. Predictors: (Constant), affective strategies

b. Dependent Variable: Y_result

The above table assumed that H_0 is accepted which means the similarity regression is *not linear* as counted result showed that *Sig. Value* is 0.235=23.5% that is higher than 5%. Here, we can say that *affective strategy* does not give any influence towards student's achievement in Structure IV

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	77.382	8.854		8.740	.000
affective strategies	-.616	.510	-.192	-1.208	.235

a. Dependent Variable: Y_result

According to the *Coefficient* table above, it is indicated that the similarity regression is $\hat{Y} = 77,382 - 0,616X_5$ which revealed the increasing of each independent variable (*affective strategies*) as one unit, will decrease the student's achievement (dependent variable) for about 0.616.

Summary Model

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.192 ^a	.037	.012	10.454

a. Predictors: (Constant), affective strategies

How well the affective strategies influence student's achievement could be

seen from the R square value that showed 0.037. It could be defined that 3.7% student's achievement is influenced by *affective strategy* while 96.3% is influenced by other factors. In addition, *Model Summary* table pointed the simple correlation coefficient (*r*) value is 0.192. In other words, *r*-value showed the correlation of each variable is in *weak level*.

f. The Influence of *Social Strategies* used towards student's achievement in Structure IV

ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	106.368	1	106.368	.961	.333 ^a
Residual	4206.007	38	110.684		
Total	4312.375	39			

a. Predictors: (Constant), social strategies

b. Dependent Variable: Y_result

Sig. Value, which is showed by the above table, is 0.333 = 33.3% that is higher than 5%. It is assumed that H_0 is accepted which means the similarity regression is *not linear*. In other words, we can conclude that social strategy does not give any influence towards student's achievement in Structure IV.

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	77.943	11.413		6.830	.000
social strategies	-.606	.618	-.157	-.980	.333

a. Dependent Variable: Y_result

The *Coefficient* table indicated that the similarity regression is $\hat{Y} = 77,943 -$

0,606X₆, it revealed that for each independent variable (*social strategies*) increased as one unit, automatically, will decrease the student's achievement (dependent variable) for about 0.606. The *Coefficient* value is gotten. It turns to find simple correlation coefficient that is described into below *Summary Model* table.

Summary Model

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.157 ^a	.025	-.001	10.521

a. Predictors: (Constant), social strategies

The strength of the influence of *social strategies* towards student's achievement could be seen from the R square value showed 0.025. It could be defined that 2.5% student's achievement is influenced by *social strategies* while 97.5% is influenced by other factors. In relation to the *Summary Model* table, the simple correlation coefficient (*r*) value is 0.157 where *r* value showed the correlation of each variable is weak. It means the influence of *social strategies* used is significantly weak towards student's achievement in Structure IV.

g. The Influence of *Compensation Strategies* used towards student's achievement in Structure IV

ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	56.819	1	56.819	.507	.481 ^a
Residual	4255.556	38	111.988		
Total	4312.375	39			

a. Predictors: (Constant), compensation strategies

b. Dependent Variable: Y_result

Referring to the *Anova* table, the writer got *Sig. Value* is 0.481 = 48.1% that is higher than 5%. It is said that *H₀* is accepted which means the similarity regression is *not linear*. Therefore, it can be concluded that *compensation strategy* does not give any influence towards student's achievement in Structure IV.

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	73.890	9.990		7.397	.000
	compensation strategies	-.410	.576	-.115	-.712	.481

a. Dependent Variable: Y_result

The *Coefficient* table pointed that the similarity regression is $\hat{Y} = 73,890 - 0,410X_3$. It means that for each independent variable (*compensation strategies*) increased as one unit, the student's achievement (dependent variable) decreased for about 0.410.

Summary Model

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.115 ^a	.013	-.013	10.582

a. Predictors: (Constant), compensation strategies

The R square value showed 0.013. It could be defined that 1.3% student's achievement is influenced by *compensation strategies* used whereas 98.7% is influenced by other factors.

Meanwhile *Summary Model* table showed the simple correlation coefficient (*r*) value is 0.115. In other words, *r* value is assumed the correlation of each variable is in *weak level*. It means the influence of *compensation strategies* used is significantly weak towards student's achievement in Structure IV.

DISCUSSION

After analyzing the data of each strategy used by the students, it continues to discuss the result that has been examined. As the aims of this study is to know how strength the student's language learning strategies used influence their achievement in Structure IV, and the most strategies used, the writer tries to interpret the data by representing the data examined as below:

- a. 7.3% student's achievement is influenced by metacognitive strategies. Here, the student who has been identified used metacognitive strategies, they tend to manage the learning process overall, e.g. preparing and studying material by discussing with his/her friends or by him/herself before discussing in the class. It was also as the teacher's instruction during teaching learning process, so they could understand the material overall. By those activities, he/she could identify how understand they learn the material given. It could be also identified by their score achievement that tends to vary with the scale of 56-79.
- b. 4.8% student's achievement is influenced by memory-related strategies. The student's score achievement is about 51. Actually, Memory-related strategies could help students learn the material by their memorizing, but it helps them a little bit of it because they could not understand the material overall. They need to extra work hard to get the understanding of the material, especially grammar lesson.
- c. 3.8% student's achievement is influenced by cognitive strategies with the score achievement is about 69-72. The students who love practicing the exercises usually use this strategy. They

analyze of the questions by him/her self or discuss with his/her friends to get reason of it. In addition, they tend to be active students to ask many things to her/his teacher, so they are satisfied of the appropriate answer.

- d. 3.7% student's achievement is influenced by affective strategies with the range score achievement is about 50-87, such as identifying one's mood and anxiety level, talking about feelings, rewarding oneself for good performance, and using deep breathing of positive self-talk, such as: Lowering your anxiety, Encouraging yourself, Taking your emotional temperature.
- e. 2.5% student's achievement is influenced by social strategies. Its score achievement is also vary, 63-89. This strategy helps the students learn the material effectively since they could ask and answer to their partner in group. It could decrease student's anxiety or shyness during learning process. They actively work together in class as the goal of teaching learning process planned by the teacher.
- f. 1.3% student's achievement is influenced by compensatory strategies. Their score achievement is between 60 up to 71. This strategy helps students in practice activity, such as guessing the idea by expression. It is commonly used for speaking or writing instead of getting deep understanding of grammar.

Based on that percentage, it means that metacognitive strategy is the most strategies used by the students. Even though only 23.4% student's achievement is influenced by their language learning strategies, while 76.6% is influenced by other factors such as student's ability, student's learning style and teacher's teaching strategy/method used. It is in line

with the Celce-Murcia's statement (2001, p.359) that individual student's learning styles and strategies can work together with-or conflict with-a given instructional methodology. If there is a harmony between (a) the student (in terms of style and strategy preferences) and (b) the instructional methodology and materials, then the student is likely perform well, feel confident, and experience low anxiety. If clashes occur between (a) and (b), the student often performs poorly, lack confidence, and experiences significant anxiety. Therefore, it is the teacher's task to make the student could reach the goal of learning by supporting them realizing their appropriate learning strategies used and knowing well their learning style before the lesson is conducted. In addition, it would be easy for the teacher to apply the appropriate methodology used in the class. So, both teacher and student could achieve the goal of teaching learning process. It is supported by the PISA's (2004) study result conducted that although the results show that the relationship between performance and instrumental motivation is much weaker than with intrinsic motivation (i.e., Interest in and enjoyment of mathematics), instrumental or extrinsic motivation, it has been found that it is an important predictor for course selection, career choice and performance (Eccles, 1994). They added that the finding has a number of implications for educational policy and practice. The weak correlations at the student level suggest that teachers and guidance counsellors are likely to encounter students who have a very low sense of belonging at school but whose performance in academic subjects is average or above average.

CONCLUSION

Finishing analysis the data and interpret it into sub sections, it is time for the writer comes to conclude the result of the study. Based on the data description, it could be concluded that the language learning strategies used by the students is not significantly influence their achievement in structure IV. It is supported by the Sig. Value is $0.232 = 23.2\%$ that is higher than 5% assumed that the similarity regression is not linear. While the Coefficient table indicated that the similarity regression is $\hat{Y} = 81,786 - 0,143X$, it revealed that for each independent variable increased as one unit, so, it will decrease the student's achievement (dependent variable) for about 0.143 . Besides that the data gotten from R value which stated that the strength of the influence of student's language learning strategies towards their achievement showed 0.037 . In other words, it could be defined that 3.7% student's achievement is influenced by their language learning strategies while 96.3% is influenced by other factors, such as student's learning style, student's ability, and teacher's teaching strategy. The last is based on Model Summary table, showed the simple correlation coefficient (r) value is 0.193 which means that r value showed the correlation of each variable is interpreted as in *weak level*. Those data was supported the conclusion that the influence of student's language learning strategies used is significantly weak towards their achievement in Structure IV. It is because so many factors that influence their achievement, such their ability, their learning style and teacher's methodology and it would be useful for the students if they are aware and realize of which strategies that is appropriate in learning process.

SUGGESTION

After describing the result study, henceforth, the writer tries to give some suggestions for teacher, students, and further researchers. Firstly, it would be better for the teacher to help their students acknowledging their language learning strategy before teaching learning process, which aim to help them getting the goal of learning process, getting the deep understanding of the material and they could apply it. Secondly, never give up motivating the students, the writer keeps reminding you to learn and learn more, so you could achieve of your goal. Make "reading" as your habit! Without reading, you could not get the understanding well, especially learning grammar. The last, keep practicing. It would be your best experience to know how well you understand the material. Need further research to analyze language-learning strategies used in different topics for improving students' understanding in grammar, especially and other skills in general.

REFERENCES

- Azar, Betty Schramper. (1999). *Understanding and using English Grammar. Third Edition*. NY: Pearson Education.
- Barbour, R, S., & Kitzinger, J. (1999). *Developing Focus Group Research: Politics, Theory and Practice*. London: Sage Publications.
- Barkley, Elisabeth F., Cross, K. Patricia, and Major, Claire Howell. (2005). *Collaborative Learning Techniques*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brownlie, Faye, et all. (2003). *Enhancing Learning: Report of the Student Achievement Task Force*. British Columbia.
- Brown, H. Douglas. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Longman.
- Celce, Marianne-Murcia. (2001). *Teaching English as a Second or a Foreign Language*. Los Angeles. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Thomson Learning, Inc.
- Christensen, Larry B. (2001). *Experimental Methodology*. Boston: Allyn-Bacon.
- Cohen, Louis and Manion, Lawrence. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Creswell, John W. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dyatmika, Gede Eka Puja 2010. *The Contribution of Cognitive styles, Linguistic Intelligence, and Learning Motivation Towards The 10 Eight Grade Students' English Achievement Of SMP 2 Kubutambahan*. Unpublished Thesis. Undiksha Singaraja.
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Jurhill, Dennis A.(2011). *Propelling Students into Active Grammar Participation*. Retrieved from: <http://eric.ed.gov/?ft=on&q=questionnaire+jigsaw&id=ED521059>. Accessed on March 5 2015.
- Muijs, Daniel. (2004). *Doing Quantitative Research in Education with SPSS*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

PISA. (2004). www.pisa.oecd.org.

Philips, Deborah. (2001). *Longman complete course for the TOEFL test: Preparation for the computer and paper tests*. NY: Pearson Education.

Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Savage, K. Lynn, Gretchen Bitterlin and Donna Price. (2010). *Grammar Matters Teaching Grammar in Adult ESL Programs*. USA: Cambridge University Press.

Schumacher and McMillan. (2001). *Research in Education*. London: Longman.

Sharp, Alastair. (2004). *Language learning and awareness of personality type in Chinese settings*. vol. 6 (1) issue 2 Asian EFL journal <http://asian-efl-journal.com> june 04 as.html - Article 1 June as 2004