Bilingual Education Policy and Indonesian Students' Learning Strategies

by Amirul Mukminin

Submission date: 18-Feb-2019 05:08PM (UTC+0700)
Submission ID: 1079659781
File name: urnitin_17_02_2019_Bilingual_Education_Policy_and_Indonesian.doc (294K)
Word count: 11262
Character count: 60595

Elementary Education Online, 2018; 17(3): pp. 1204-1223
İlköğretim Online, 2018; 17(3): s.1204-1223 . [Online]: http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr
doi

Bilingual Education Policy and Indonesian Students' Learning Strategies

Abstract. The purpose of this study was to examine students' language learning strategies in one private bilingual junior high school in Jambi, Indonesia. Data were collected through SILL questionnaires and face to face interviews. The questionnaires were analyzed statistically while the interviews data were transcribed and analyzed line by line from all participants. The SILL questionnaires and interviews were used to seek the students' types of language learning strategy and the differences of language learning strategies between female and male students. Overall, the findings revealed that participants mostly used memory strategies and there were no significant differences between male and female students in using language learning strategies in learning English. Suggestions and policy implications are also discussed.

Keywords: Bilingual education policy, Indonesian students, Learning strategies

Received: 16.03.2017 Accepted: 13.06.2018 Published: 31.07.2018

INTRODUCTION

Language learning strategy has been investigated by most of the researchers as one of the significant variables affecting language learning and the increasing interest in student-centered learning approaches amongst language teachers has also led to numerous studies to investigate language learning strategies since 1970s. The importance of language learning strategies proposed by Oxford (2003) who indicated that language learning strategies were a specific action taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to a new situation. It is important for language learning since they are tools for active, self-directed involvement making learning strategies a crucial element of the learning process. Meanwhile, Skehan (1989) considered language learning strategies as one of the most important factors accounting for individual differences. Once the strategies of good language learners are identified, they can be made available through teaching to less successful learners to help them to learn second language or foreign language more effectively. Most of the studies conducted on language learning strategies mostly focus on children, adolescents, and adults in monolingual classes where English is taught as a foreign language (Martinez, 1995; Valcarcel *et al.*, 2002; Chamot, 2004; Hong-Nam *et al.*, 2006; Hong-Nam *et al.*,2007; Tuncer, 2009; Ylmaz, 2010; Daneme, 2010; Gerami *et al.*, 2011; Lavasani, 2011; Ghavamnia, 2011; Salahshour, 2012; Sadeghi *et al.*, 2013; Chang *et al.*, 2013; Ruba *et al.*, 2014). Since not all countries are English speaking countries, some countries provide bilingual classes for their citizen including Indonesia. There are certain schools that provide bilingual classes for the students who want to learn English but only limited studies which discuss about language learning strategies in bilingual classes (Fillmore, 1976; Padron *et al.*, 1988 Purdie *et al.*, 1999; Gursoy, 2004).

Although language learning strategies have been the focus of many researchers around the world since 1970s, this issue is still a new research area in Indonesia, especially language learning strategies in bilingual schools because there is still no any research conducted in bilingual school in Indonesia meanwhile there are few studies conducting on language learning strategies in Indonesia (Setiyadi, 1999; Yusuf, 2012) but both studies were conducted for monolingual learners not for bilingual learners and much of the research conducted on language learning strategies from other countries mostly focuses on children, adolescents, and adults in monolingual since we cannot presuppose that students' language learning strategies in monolingual classes are also applicable to bilingual- aged children.

To fill the gap, this study was conducted in one private bilingual school, one of the bilingual schools in Jambi, Indonesia in order to explore the students' language learning strategies in that school, particularly; the types of language learning strategy, the language learning strategies choice, and the differences of language learning strategy used by female and male students in one private bilingual school in Jambi, Indonesia. To achieve the purpose of the study, it endeavored to answer the following research questions: (1) what types of language learning strategies do bilingual school students use? (2) how is the language learning strategy choice of bilingual school students in learning English as a foreign language in their school? and (3) are there any differences between females and males in using language learning strategies in a bilingual school? Additionally, this study examined the following hypothesis: H_0: There is no significant difference between male and female students of bilingual junior high school in using language learning strategies in learning English?

METHOD

Quantitative and qualitative designs were utilized in this study. In the quantitative design, this study utilized the survey approach and in qualitative design, a case study approach was used to explore the students' language learning strategies in one bilingual school in Jambi, particularly; the types of language learning strategy, the language learning strategies choice, and the differences of language learning strategy used by female and male students in one bilingual school in Jambi. Furthermore, this study was along with a qualitative case study to get a deeper

understanding on the language learning strategies used by bilingual school students at one bilingual school in Jambi, particularly, it focused on the types of language learning strategy, the language learning strategies choice, and the differences of language learning strategy used by female and male students in bilingual school.

The site of this study was at one private bilingual junior high school in Jambi municipality, Jambi Province, Indonesia. To get the access in conducting this study, the researcher asked permission from the principal of the school and teachers who were in charge in handling the class that the researcher conducted his study. The researcher also gave invitation letter along with informed consent form to the participants who were willing to be volunteers in this study. In the words of Creswell (2012), population was a group of individuals possessed one characteristic that distinguished them from other groups. The population consisted of people who were selected by the researcher to involve as the participants in this study. The participants of this study were all students at bilingual junior high school students who were the seventh grade. The main reason to select the population was because the school provides bilingual especially *Bahasa* and English, but in teaching and learning process, the teachers and the students speak English even in the classroom and out of the classroom.

From this population, firstly, we utilized *a target population* or *sampling frame*- a list or record of individuals in a population that a researcher can actually obtain (Creswell, 1998, 2007, 2012), but the population of the participants at the Bilingual Junior High School from seventh grade to ninth grade consisted of 37 students. Finally, we decided to utilize *total sampling* or *entire sampling* so all of junior high school students at the research site were selected since it was easy to access the data which assisted us to conduct the study. Creswell (2012) wrote,'... it is possible in survey to study the entire population because it is small (e.g., members of literacy councils in a state) and can be easily identified" (p. 382). We distributed an invitation letter and a demographic questionnaire to all registered students and based on their statement in the returned demographic questionnaire, so we would know whether they were willing or not to take part in the study, then we went on with a consent form and SILL questionnaires to collect the data. The final participants were 37. 8 of them were the 7th grade, 11 of them were from the 8th grade, and 18 of them were from the 9th grade. Among the participants, 22 of them were males and 15 of them were females.

We utilized a questionnaire and face to face interviews to collect the data in this study (Mukminin & McMahon, 2013). The participants or respondents are not required to write their answer, but they just choose one of the options provided (Dornyei, 2008). We utilized *Likertscale* which consisted of a series of statements, all of which were related to a particular target which ranged from *Strongly Agree* (SA), *Agree* (A), *Not Sure* (NS), *Disagree* (D), and *Strongly Disagree* (SD) (Dornyei, 2008). The questionnaires utilized were taken from Oxford's SILL (the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) (Oxford, 1990). We consulted with the two experts who had doctoral degrees in language teaching regarding the questionnaires before we distributed them. The SILL provides 50 items to access the language learning strategies but we only utilized five items in each strategy, it meant only 30 items as a whole part because it might be impossible to take all items since the participants were Junior high school so they were not really interested in filling a long questionnaire, and the last was the limited time that was given to the researcher in order not to bother their routine activity in teaching and learning process in the classroom.

The participants or respondents gave a symbol or mark (√) on the provided table. In this study, the questionnaires were classified into two categories: 1) demographic background and (2) statements from SILL (The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) adapted from Oxford (1990). To get the interview data, on the demographic background form, it asked the participants to state whether the participants or respondents were willing or not to take part in the interview. Based on either participants' or respondents' statements, we contacted the participants or respondents in agreement to be interviewed. Nevertheless, as the interview data were secondary data, not all participants were interviewed. In the words of Nunan et al. (2009), reliability was generally established through replication. If, in carrying out a study, a researcher collected the data twice (with the same students, who had not learned or forgotten anything in between the two data collection points and got the same results both times, the researcher could

claim that his/ her data were reliable). In this study, before distributing the questionnaire, it was tested first. We conducted a pilot study to check the appropriateness of the instruments of the data collection as proposed by Creswell (2012) who stated," a pilot test of a questionnaire or interview survey is a procedure in which a researcher makes changes in an instrument based on feedback from a small number of individuals who complete and evaluate the instrument in order to help the individuals in the sample being able to complete the survey and they can understand the question" (p.390). Furthermore, to find out the reliability coefficient for the questionnaire, this study utilized the Cronbach's Alpha formula.

For the interview data, to ensure the credibility of the inquiry or the trustworthiness (Abrar et al., 2018; Mukminin, 2012; Mukminin, Ali, & Fadloan, 2015; Mukminin, Kamil, Muazza, & Haryanto, 2017; Mukminin, Rohayati, Putra, Habibi, & Aina, 2017) of the study or to verify the accuracy of data, findings, and interpretations (Azkiyah, & Mukminin, 2017; Creswell, 1998; Hadiyanto et al., 2017; Habibi et al., 2018; Prasojo et al., 2017), the data were shared among us for analysis. In this study, we returned the interview data either in Indonesian or in English to all participants to get their feedback.

We, then, did two pilot studies and the participants were not from the same school. We contacted the other bilingual school whose students had similarities in terms of age and grades. The participants for the pilot studies were 30 students consisting of 17 female and 13 male students. In the first pilot-study, we only utilized 30 statements out of 50 statements from SILL. In the first pilot study, for the memory strategy, we deleted item no. 6 (I use flashcards to remember new English words.), No. 7 (I physically act out new English words.), no. 8 (I review English lessons often.), no. 9 (I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.). For the affective strategy, the item that we omitted was no. 44 (I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.). For the cognitive strategy, we did not included items of no. 15 (I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.), no. 16 (I read for pleasure in English), no. 17 (I write notes, messages, letters or reports, in English.), no. 18 (I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.), no. 19 (I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.), no. 20 (I try to find patterns in English.), no. 21 (I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.), no. 22 (I try not to translate word-for-word.), no. 23I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English. Additionally, for the social strategy, no. 50 (I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.) and for the compensation strategy, no. 29 (If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.) were not included. Finally, five items of metacognitive strategy that were also not included in the first pilot study were no. 35 (I look for people I can talk to in English.), no. 36 (I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.), no. 37 (I have clear goals for improving my English skills.), and no. 38 (I think about my progress in learning English.). The statements were used to collect the data about language learning strategies. The statements were classified into six categories, namely; memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies. Here was the result of reliability of the first pilot-study on questionnaires. We utilized SPSS (version 20) which had Cronbach alpha to calculate the reliability of the questionnaire.

Table 1. *The reliability result on the first pilot-study*

Six strategies	Cronbach Alpha
Memory strategies	.522
Cognitive strategies	.529
Compensation strategies	.358
Metacognitive strategies	.598
Affective strategies	.625
Social strategies	.446
Total overall strategies	.780

Based on the result shown in the Table 2, there were two strategies which were not reliable, namely; compensation strategies and social strategies. The total overall strategies showed that SILL used by the researcher was reliable. In the words of Nunan *et al.* (2009) the reliability for testing the questionnaire must be > .50, so we can use the instrument for conducting the research. In general, it is recommended as .70. But for instrument with fewer items, the coefficient of .50 can be taken as a criterion.

Due to the result of the first pilot-study, there were two strategies showing that they were not reliable and after consulting with the two experts who asked to do the first pilot study, the two experts suggested us to include all items we deleted in the second pilot study. We finally decided to take 50 items in SILL as a second pilot-study on the questionnaire. If it was not reliable anymore, we would try to modify the questionnaires on each strategy. Here was the analysis of the reliability of each strategy.

Table 2. *The reliability result on the second pilot-study*

Six strategies	Cronbach Alpha
Memory strategies (9 items)	.715
Cognitive strategies (14 items)	.728
Compensation strategies (6 items)	.659
Metacognitive strategies (9 items)	.752
Affective strategies (6 items)	.599
Social strategies (6 items)	.686
Total overall strategies (50 items)	.893

Based on the table shown above, it showed that the questionnaires with 50 items (from each strategy were reliable because it showed each strategy>.50 as the minimum coefficient. In this study, the findings were collected and analyzed from the data of SILL questionnaires that were distributed to all students from one private bilingual junior high school. The questionnaires along with demographic questionnaires and face to face interviews were used to support the data of quantitative. The findings would be discussed as below. We explored, and described language learning strategies used by bilingual junior high school students. We grouped the items for each strategy to find out the mean score for each strategy, for instance, to seek for the mean score for memory strategy, we grouped item 1 to 9 by comparing means using SPSS version 20. The remaining strategy went such as the first step. The mean score of the participants' rank of each language learning strategy was computed and this mean score indicated the language learning strategies used by the bilingual junior high school students. In order to interpret the mean score, we utilized the interpretation of mean score which was adopted from the language learning strategies proposed by Oxford (1990). The interpretation of mean score could be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. *Interpretation of mean score*

Mean score	Interpretation
3.5 to 5.0	High
2.5 to 3.4	Medium
1.0 to 2.4	Low

The participants' mean score for each item was classified into 3 groups as seen in Table 3. The mean score within 1.0 to 2.0 was assumed as the low level; the mean score within 2.5 to 3.4 was determined as the medium level and the last was within 3.5 to 5.0 assumed as the high level in language learning strategies.

RESULTS

Research Question 1: What types of Language Learning Strategies Do Bilingual Junior High School Students Employ?

This part showed the language learning strategies used by the students from one private bilingual school. The language learning strategies used were presented based on the rank order of mean score from the six language learning strategies. The detail data can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. *Rank order of six language learning strategies used by bilingual junior high school students*

Strategy Categories	Mean	Std	Rank Order
Memory	2.78	0.55	First
Affective	2.71	0.60	Second
Cognitive	2.59	0.56	Third
Social	2.36	0.72	Fourth
Compensation	2.33	0.73	Fifth
Metacognitive	2.30	0.72	Sixth

Based on the Table 4, the bilingual junior high school students employed the memory strategy as the most in learning language. Then, the second strategy used was the affective along with the cognitive strategy, the social and compensation strategy. Meanwhile, the students seemed to use the metacognitive strategy as the least strategy. The mean score showed that it was the lowest mean score of all. From the interviews of 14 students, one was sick. The participants consisted of 10 male students and 3 female students; it revealed that most students used the memory strategy as the most.

Research Question 2: How is the Language Learning Strategy Choice of Bilingual Junior High School students in Learning English as a Foreign Language in Their School?

This part explored the descriptive findings of the language learning strategies utilized by the bilingual junior high school students from the seventh grade to the ninth grade. The mean score of each strategy was interpreted based on the interpretation of mean score as shown from table 5 to table 10.

Memory strategy

This part reports the memory strategy used by bilingual junior high school students in learning English. The data were conveyed based on the mean score level, rank order from the highest to the lowest, and interview data. Table 8 displayed the findings in detail.

Table 5. *Mean, standard deviation, and mean score of the memory strategy*

No	Items	Mean	Std.	Level
1.	I think of relationship between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	2.67	1.41	Medium
2.	I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.	2.40	1.40	Low
3.	I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.	3.48	1.23	Medium
4.	I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	2.67	1.27	Medium
5.	I use rhymes to remember new English words.	2.51	1.16	Medium
6.	I use flashcards to remember new English words.	2.56	1.25	Medium
7.	I physically act out new English words.	2.45	1.26	Low
8.	I review English lessons often.	3.40	1.06	Medium
9.	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	2.86	1.10	Medium

The findings of the memory strategy as shown in Table 5 showed that the bilingual junior high school students used memory strategy at medium level (mean of 2.78). In terms of statements of memory strategy, the findings showed that 7 statements out of 9 statements were in the range of the medium mean score; meanwhile 2 statements out of 9 statements were in the range of low mean score. Observing the mean score for every statement showed that the statement no. 3 (mean 3.48) obtained the highest mean, followed by the statement no. 8 (mean of 3.40), no. 9 (mean of 2.86), no. 1 (mean of 2.67), no. 4 (mean of 2.67), no. 6 (mean of 2.56) and no. 5 (mean of 2.51), no. 7 (mean of 2.45), and no. 2 (mean of 2.40) obtained the lowest mean score. In addition, although the memory strategy which was supposed as a preferred strategy by the participants, the findings from the interviews showed that they seemed to use various ways to remember English words. They reflected, for example,

> I remember English words by pronouncing them and looking up in the dictionary, or I visualize the conversation using the words with some other people or just to keep on pronouncing it or just to visualize what I can do with the word and what's the meaning of the word that I can combine it with the sentences that I say. (Student 1)

> I remember English words by repeating them often, and I write them in a vocabulary list or make a list for the words that I don't know so if I forget it I can see it. (Student 2)

> Sometimes I use Google-translate to remember English words and I use English language to remind my schedule. (Student 3)

> I remember English words by trying to imagine what I am talking about or if I don't know the words, I will try to find them in a dictionary and try to read them. (Student 13)

Affective strategy

Table 6 depicts the findings of affective strategy used by bilingual junior high school students. The findings were discussed according to mean score and the strategy statement was ranked from the highest to the lowest, and the interview data were conveyed. The details about affective strategy used by participants could be seen in Table 6.

Table 6. *Mean, standard deviation, and mean score of the affective strategy*

No	Items	Mean	Std.	Level
39.	I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	2.16	1.09	Low
40.	I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	3.24	1.32	Medium
41.	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	2.81	1.15	Medium
42.	I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	3.10	1.30	Medium
43.	I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.	2.97	1.14	Medium
44.	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	2.00	1.17	Low
	Total mean	2.71	.60	Medium

Table 6 shows that participants employed the affective strategy at medium level (2.71). In terms of statements of affective strategy, the table above showed that some statements of the affective strategy were in the range of medium mean score, and the rest statements were in the range of low mean score. When we took a closer look at the mean score for every statement, it showed that the statement no. 40 (mean of 3.24) obtained the highest score, followed by the statement no. 42 (mean of 3.10), no. 43 (mean of 2.90), statement number 41 (mean of 2.81), no. 39 (mean of 2.16), and no. 44 (mean of 2.00) obtained the lowest mean score. In addition,

although the affective strategy was employed by participants as the second preferred strategy, from the interview data, we found that participants seemed to use different ways to release their worriedness in using English. They reported,

> When I feel afraid of using English, I just try to take a deep breath and just think that it doesn't matter if we make mistake, at least I try or I often consult with other people when I feel afraid. (Student 1)

> When I feel afraid of using English I use gesture or body language, or search for someone who can understand so she or he can translate it for me or search for alternative word and try to be relaxed. (Student 2)

> When I feel afraid of using English, I just believe in myself and show my self-confidence, so it's okay if I make a mistake in speaking English, and I just keep on speaking. (Student 3)

Cognitive strategy

Table 7 reports the findings of the cognitive strategy used by participants. The findings were discussed according to the mean score, the strategy statement was ranked from the highest to the lowest, and the interview data were conveyed. The details could be seen in Table 7.

Table 7. *Mean, standard deviation, and mean score of the cognitive strategy*

No	Items	Mean	Std.	Level
10.	I say or write new English words several times.	2.29	1.12	Low
11.	I try to walk like native English speakers.	2.89	1.28	Medium
12.	I practice the sounds of English.	1.67	.94	Low
13.	I use the English words I known in different ways.	2.83	1.34	Medium
14.	I start conversations in English.	2.21	1.15	Low
15.	I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	3.40	1.23	Medium
16.	I read for pleasure in English	2.18	1.15	Low
17.	I write notes, messages, letters or reports, in English.	2.54	1.12	Medium
18.	I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	2.72	1.30	Medium
19.	I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	2.72	1.07	Medium
20.	I try to find patterns in English.	2.62	1.23	Medium
21.	I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	2.78	1.41	Medium
22.	I try not to translate word-for-word.	2.48	1.36	Low
23.	I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	2.97	1.06	Medium
	Total mean	2.59	.56	Medium

Table 7 above shows that the bilingual junior high school students employed the cognitive strategy at medium (mean of 2.59). In terms of cognitive strategy statements, the findings showed that 9 statements of the 14 statements were in the range of medium mean score, and the rest was in the range of low mean score. The data indicated that the statement no. 15 (mean of 3.40) got the highest score, followed by the statement no. 23 (mean of 2.97), no. 11 (mean of 2.89), no. 13 (mean of 2.83), no. 21 (mean of 2.78), no. 19 (mean of 2.72), no. 18 (mean of 2.72), no. 20 (mean of 2.62), no. 17 (mean of 2.52), no. 22 (mean of 2.48), no. 10 (mean of 2.29), no. 14 (mean of 2.21), no. 16 (mean of 2.18), and no. 12 (mean of 1.67) obtained the lowest mean score. In addition, although cognitive strategy was employed by Bilingual Junior High School

students as third preferred strategy, the interview data from the students showed that they had different ways to learn English. The following quotes reflect some of their feelings and thoughts,

> I learn English from my family because my family speaks English so I think I got it from them, and the other ways to learn English are I always watch English movies, listen to English song a lot and I also learn from games, phone f and friends. (Student 1)

> I learn English from school, video game and my sister. At home, I often speak English to my sister and I also watch western movies. (Student 2)

> The ways I learn English are sometimes I listen to Western music, watch English movies and I play English game in my phone. (Student 3)

> The way I learn English is I try to understand the English text that I read so I can understand both the structure and the meaning well. (Student 4)

Social strategy

Table 8 reports the findings of the social strategy employed by the bilingual junior high school students. The findings were discussed based on the mean score, each statement was ranked from the highest to the lowest, and the interview data were conveyed. The details could be seen in the Table 8.

Table 8. *Mean, standard deviation, and mean score of the social strategy*

No	Items	Mean	Std.	Level
45.	If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	1.59	.83	Low
46.	I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	2.54	1.53	Medium
47.	I practice English with other students.	2.27	1.14	Low
48.	I ask for help from English speakers.	2.78	1.37	Medium
49.	I ask questions in English	2.59	1.36	Medium
50.	I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	2.37	1.23	Low
	Total mean	2.36	.72	Low

Table 8 shows that bilingual junior high school students employed the social strategy at low level (2.36). In terms of social strategy statements, it showed that 3 out of 6 statements were in the range of medium mean score, and the rest was in the range of low medium score. In addition, although the social strategy employed by bilingual junior high school students as the fourth preferred strategy, the findings from interview data showed that the students usually utilized various ways when they did not understand something in English. The following quotes show some of their feelings and thoughts,

> When I do not understand something in English, I just try to ask someone or look up in the dictionary because it will help me a lot. (Student 1)

> When I do not understand something in English, I ask my teacher or friends and search in the dictionary. (Student 2)

> When I do not understand something in English, I try to find it in a dictionary and I often use Google-translate if I cannot find it, I will ask my miss or my family. (Student 3)

Compensation strategy

Table 9 reports the findings of compensation strategy employed by the bilingual junior high school students. The findings were discussed based on the mean score level and each statement was ranked from the highest to the lowest. The detail data were displayed below.

Table 9. *Mean, standard deviation, and mean score of the compensation strategy*

No	Items	Mean	Std.	Level
24.	To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	2.43	1.25	Medium
25.	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	2.70	1.33	Medium
26.	I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	2.37	1.27	Low
27.	I read English without looking up every new word.	2.75	1.38	Medium
28.	I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	1.75	1.01	Low
29.	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	2.00	1.10	Low
	Total mean score	2.33	.73	Low

The findings of the compensation strategy displayed in Table 9 shows that bilingual junior high school students employed the compensation strategy at low level (mean 2.33). The findings showed that 3 statements out of 6 statements were in the range of medium level, and the rest numbers were in the range of low level. In addition, although the compensation strategy employed by the bilingual junior high school students as the fifth preferred strategy, the qualitative findings showed that the students had different ways in understanding unfamiliar words in English. For instance,

> To understand unfamiliar words in English, I will put it on a chat in my phone or I will normally check it up or look up in my dictionary or if I do not understand, I will join it in a sentence or try to figure out by myself. (Student 1)

> I will ask or search in a dictionary and maybe I visualize the word. (Student 2)

> I search them in Google-translate or I will ask someone who can speak English well especially my English teacher, my mom. (Student 3)

> I will translate the words that I never hear into *Bahasa* [Indonesia]. (Student 4)

Metacognitive strategy

Table 10 displays the findings of metacognitive strategy employed by the bilingual junior high school students. The findings were discussed based on the mean score level and each strategy statement was ranked from the highest to the lowest mean score. The detail data were displayed in Table 10.

Table 10. *Mean, standard deviation, and mean score of the metacognitive strategy*

No	Items	Mean	Std	Level
30.	I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	2.24	1.25	Low
31.	I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	2.08	1.32	Low
32.	I play attention when someone is speaking English.	1.83	1.04	Low
33.	I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	2.72	1.30	Medium
34.	I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	2.00	1.08	Low

35.	I look for people I can talk to in English.	2.00	.94	Low
36.	I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	3.13	1.15	Medium
37.	I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	2.64	1.54	Medium
38.	I think about my progress in learning English.	2.02	.98	Low
	Total mean score	2.30	.72	Low

The findings of the metacognitive strategy displayed in Table 10 showed that bilingual junior high school students employed metacognitive strategy at low level (mean 2.30). The findings showed that 3 statements out of 9 statements were in the range of the medium mean score, and the rest statements were in the range of low mean score. In addition, although the metacognitive employed by the bilingual junior high school students as the least strategy, the students also had different ways to improve their English as indicated in the following statements,

> I improve my English by watching a lot of movies or speaking to some people who are good at English and listening to a lot of song, or reading literature or just interacting with people who speak English more. (Student 1)

> The way I improve my English is I use it often and I talk to my friends. (Student 2)

Research Question 3: Are There Any Differences between Male and Female Students in Using Language Learning Strategies at Bilingual Junior High School?

Table 11 below reveals the language learning strategies used by the male and female bilingual junior high school students. It shows what the differences between female and male students in using language learning strategies.

Table 11. *Rank order of six language learning strategies used by the bilingual junior high school students based on gender*

Strategy Categories	Gender	Mean	Std
Memory	Male	2.727	.46981
	Female	2.8667	.67612
Affective	Male	2.7045	.61921
	Female	2.7333	.61334
Cognitive	Male	2.5812	.51285
	Female	2.6238	.65547
Social	Male	2.3030	.69320
	Female	2.4444	.77579
Compensation	Male	2.2955	.51285
	Female	2.4000	.79632
Metacognitive	Male	2.2475	.71757
	Female	2.3778	.75570

The table above shows that there is a slight difference between male and female bilingual junior high school students in using language learning strategies. For the memory strategy, the mean score for male students was 2.72 while it was 2.86 for the female students. The second level was the affective strategy. It revealed that the mean score for the male students was 2.70 while for the female students, it was 2.73. The third level was the cognitive strategy. It showed that male students had a mean score of 2.58 while female students had a mean score of 2.62. The fourth level was the social strategy. It showed that male students obtained a mean score of 2.30 and female students got a mean score of 2.44. The fifth level was the compensation strategy. It showed that male students had a mean score of 2.29 and female students had a mean score of 2.40. The last was the metacognitive strategy in which male students had a mean score of 2.24

while female students had a mean score of 2.37. From the table above, it indicated that female bilingual students tended to be a bit more in every strategy but it was only a slight difference. It didn't show a significant difference between female and male students.

H_0: There is no significant difference between male and female students of one Private Bilingual Junior High school in using language learning strategies in learning English?

The result of levene's test showed that the sample among group obtained the homogeneity of variances across the dependent variables. All significant values of independent variable were more than .05. This meant that the assumption to run Anova was obtained. Table 12 shows the result of homogeneity test of covariance matrices.

Table 12 shows the result of One Way Anova between male and female students at bilingual junior high school toward dependent variables: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social. The findings showed that there was no significant difference between male and female students in using memory (*F*=.550, *p*.=.463>.05), cognitive (F=.049, sig.=.826>.05), compensation (F=.178, sig.=.676>.05), metacognitive (F=.282, sig.=.599>.05), affective (F=.019, sig.=.890>.05), and social (F=.337, sig.=.565>.05).

Table 12. *Levene's test-homogeneity of variances of independent variables across dependent variables*

Variables	Levene's test for equality Variances	Df	p
Memory	1.350	35	.253
Cognitive	.260	35	.613
Compensation	.919	35	.344
Metacognitive	.022	35	.883
Affective	.048	35	.829
Social	.125	35	.726

Significant at < .05

Table 13. *Analysis Anova gender across learning strategies*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Memory	Between Groups	.173	1	.173	.550	.463
	Within Groups	11.035	35	.315		
	Total	11.209	36			
Cognitive	Between Groups	.016	1	.016	.049	.826
	Within Groups	11.538	35	.330		
	Total	11.555	36			
Compensation	Between Groups	.097	1	.097	.178	.676
	Within Groups	19.152	35	.547		
	Total	19.249	36			
Metacognitive	Between Groups	.151	1	.151	.282	.599
	Within Groups	18.808	35	.537		
	Total	18.960	36			
Affective	Between Groups	.007	1	.007	.019	.890
	Within Groups	13.318	35	.381		
	Total	13.326	36			
Social	Between Groups	.178	1	.178	.337	.565
	Within Groups	18.517	35	.529		
	Total	18.695	36			

Furthermore, to make sure that there was no significant difference between male and female students, we asked permission from the principal of bilingual junior high school to obtain

the scores from each class. The scores were analyzed with levene's test and One Way Anova. The preliminary analysis using Levene's test was performed. The test revealed that the assumption of homogeneity of variances of the groups (male and female) was not violated as indicated by F (1,35)=.216,P>.05. Therefore, a One-Way between groups Anova was conducted. The detail could be seen in Table 13.

Table 14. *Levene's test. Homogenity of variances of independent variables across dependent variables based on score*

Variable	Levene's test for equality Variances	Df	Sig
Score	1.586	35	.216

Significant at < .05

The result of one way anova between gender toward dependent variable students' score in Table 15 showed that there was no significant difference between male and female students. It showed students' score (F=.286, sig.=.596>.05)

Table 15. *Analysis anova gender across students' score*

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Score	Between Groups	21.086	1	21.086	.286	.596
	Within Groups	2577.238	35	73.635		
	Total	2598.324	36			

In conclusion, based on the results of gender across the language learning strategies and the results of gender across the scores above, both of them showed that there was no significant difference in language learning strategy, it meant that the hypothesis of there is no significant difference between male and female students of one private junior high school in using language learning strategies in learning English was accepted although the score level of female was in the medium range and the score level of male was in the low range.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to examine students' language learning strategies in one private bilingual junior high school in Jambi, Indonesia. Particularly, the types of language learning strategy the language learning strategies choice, the language learning strategies choice, and the differences of language learning strategy used by female and male students in one bilingual school in Jambi. In the first research question about types of language learning strategies employed by bilingual junior high school students, the findings revealed that bilingual junior high school students employed 3 preferred language learning strategies, namely memory, affective and cognitive and social, compensation, and metacognitive. The results of this study reflected similar results from a study in the reviewed literature (Bobanovic et al., 2011). They revealed that bilingual learners tended to use five categories strategies such as memory, cognitive, metacognitive, affective and social meanwhile compensation strategies were reported the last strategies used by bilingual learners. In this study, there was a slight difference between Bobanovic's et al. (2011) findings, the least preferred strategies by bilingual junior high school students were social, compensation and metacognitive strategies.

On the other hand, some studies on language learning strategies on bilingual learners in the reviewed reflected different results with this study (Purdie et al., 1998; Bialystok, 2001; Hong-Nam et al., 2007; Tuncer, 2009). In their 1998 study, Purdie and Oliver conducted a quantitative study on language learning strategies to examine the language learning strategies employed by 58 bilingual primary school -aged children and revealed that bilinguals used the same strategies for learning their first and second language. Bialystok (2001) conducted a study on language learning strategies and revealed that there were some cognitive processes, namely

attention and inhibition that developed earlier and possible more strongly in bilinguals, contributing to metalinguistic awareness and language learning. Hong-Nam et al., (2007) conducted a quantitative study and revealed that bilinguals implemented metacognitive strategies with the greatest frequency; compensation strategies were the second most used by bilingual student; cognitive strategies ranked as the third; affective strategies ranked as the fourth and the last was social strategies. Tuncer (2009) also conducted a quantitative study on language learning strategies and he revealed that bilingual learners had an advantage such as employing cognitive and metacognitive skills while learning a language.

In addition, in relation to Oxford's (1990) LLS theory, the findings of this study disagreed with some of the concepts expressed by Oxford (1990). Oxford (1990) expressed that cognitive strategies had the tendency of being frequently used by language learners, but in the finding of this study showed that bilingual junior high school students employed memory strategies the most. Oxford also stated that memory and affective strategies had been reported to be less frequently used strategies by language learner, in fact that in this study showed that bilingual junior high school students used memory strategies the first, and followed by affective strategies. Referring to compensation strategies, Oxford (1990) indicated that lower level students would use or employ compensation strategies more frequently due to their greater lack of knowledge, but the findings of this study showed that bilingual junior high school students were from bilinguals, they had studied English since they were at the elementary level and the findings showed that they used compensation strategies as the second last strategies. Meanwhile, Oxford (1990) stated," learners use metacognitive strategies sporadically" (p.138). The findings about metacognitive strategies statements showed that from nine statements made by Oxford (1990), it showed that bilingual junior high school students in this study only employed 3 statements which had a medium level, namely statement number 33, statement number 36, statement number 37 and the rest of the statements were at the low level. It meant that the findings about metacognitives were the same as the statements from Oxford (1990), but it contradicted with the findings from Hong-Nam et al., (2007). They revealed that bilinguals employed metacognitive strategies the most frequently.

Regarding to social strategies, Oxford (1990) explained that the school system might discourage social strategies such as cooperating with others due to competitive activities that encourage individual performance and recognition. The findings of this study showed that social strategies were in the range of low level, however, the interview data showed that when they did not understand something in English, they had various ways to overcome the problems. The second research question about how the language learning strategy choice of bilingual junior high school students in learning English as a foreign language in their school, the findings revealed that bilingual junior high school students employed memory strategy the most in learning language, then the second strategy employed was the affective along with cognitive strategy, meanwhile the least preferred strategies were social, compensation and metacognitive strategies. First, the findings of memory strategy showed that bilingual junior high school students used memory strategy at medium level. Second, the findings of affective strategy showed that bilingual junior high school students employed affective strategy at medium level. Third, the findings of cognitive strategy showed that bilingual junior high school students employed cognitive strategy at the medium level. Fourth, the findings of social strategy showed that bilingual junior high school students employed social strategy at low level. Fifth, the findings of compensation strategy showed that Bilingual Junior High school employed compensation strategy at low level. The last, the findings of metacognitive strategy showed that Bilingual Junior High School students employed metacognitive strategy at low level. In terms of metacognitive statements, the findings showed that 3 statements out of 9 statements are in the range of medium mean score, and the rest statements were in the range of low mean score. However, some previous studies on language learning strategies produced different result as this study (Chang, 2011; Griffiths, 2003; Oxford, 1990). In their studies, they found that memory strategy was found as the least strategy employed by language learners. In addition, some studies found that the context of learning situation could have a strong influence on learners' choice of language learning (Cohen, 1998; Chamot, 2005; Zhang, 2008).

The third research question about the differences between males and females in using language learning strategies, the findings showed that both male and female employed six strategies such as memory strategy (F=.550, sig.=.463>.05), cognitive strategy (F=.049,sig=.826>.05), compensation strategy (F=.178, sig.=676>.05), metacognitive (F=.282, sig=.599>.05), affective (F=.019, sig.=.890>.05), and social strategy (F=.337, sig=.565>.05). The sig for each strategy showed that it was more than .05, it meant that there was no significant difference between male and female students in using language learning strategies, it should be less than .05. So, it would be significant differences between male and female students. From the findings, it showed that there was no significant difference between male and female students. However, to make sure that there was no significant difference between male and female students, I asked permission with the principal of bilingual junior high school to obtain the score from each class. The findings also showed that the students' score (F=.286, sig.=.596>.05). This study reflected a similar result from a study in the reviewed literature (Kaylani, 1999; Griffiths, 2003; Psaltou-Joyce, 2008; Tuncer, 2009). Kaylani (1999) conducted a study on language learning strategies in Jordan. In her findings, she confirmed the existence of significant sex differences. Female students used significantly more memory, cognitive, compensation, and affective strategies than male students. At the same time, however, the differences in strategy use resulting from the influence of gender were not as great as differences resulting from proficiency. Successful female students' language learning strategy profiles resembled those of successful males more than they did those of unsuccessful females. Meanwhile, Tuncer (2009) conducted a quantitative study on language learning strategies. His findings showed that males were found to make use of some more specific learning strategies than females. He also stated that although some facts about the gender-related use of strategies were found in his study, the result failed to state the expected more frequent use of learning strategies by females.

On the other hand, previous studies produced differing results as this study (Green & Oxford, 1995; Lee, 2003; Hong-Nam *et al.*, 2006, Zare, 2010; Doro *et al.,* 2013) had shown significant gender differences between males and female language learners in which females had demonstrated to use more and wider range of strategies than males. In relation to oxford's (1990) LLS theory, the findings did not agree with the concept expressed by Oxford. Oxford stated that gender often influenced strategy use, with females typically reporting more strategy use than males in many different cultures. However, the findings of this study showed that there were no significant differences between male and female students at Bilingual Junior High School in learning English. Each sig for every strategy showed that it was more than .05. In addition, why Oxford (1990) could state that females were better than males was a big question. Perhaps the participants of the research conducted by Oxford came from English speaking countries. In Indonesia, especially, the concept of Oxford (1990) could not be accepted because the findings showed there were no significant differences between male and female in learning English.

In addition, the interviews were employed to get in-depth understandings on the language learning strategies used by bilingual junior high school students. The findings showed that bilingual junior high school students employed various strategies. The findings showed that it produced different statements in each strategy which Oxford (1990) recommended. Bilingual junior high school students tended to use their own ways in language learning. The findings of this study reflected a similar finding with Sadeghi et al. (2012). They conducted a qualitative study on language learning strategies in Iran. The findings indicated that structured interviews would be a more reliable and useful tool than SILL since it could reveal more detail regarding the use of LLS by students who began learning English at different ages rather than like what SILL actually did to hide the qualities of them. In addition, Sadeghi et al. (2013) also found that the qualitative data based on the participants' responses to interviews indicated a lot of differences in the frequency of use of LLS by students. In relations to the Oxford's (1990) statements in each strategy, the findings of the interview data showed that bilingual junior high school students did not use the statements provided by Oxford (1990), they seemed to use the new statements concerning with memory strategy, cognitive strategy, compensation strategy, metacognitive strategy, affective strategy and social strategy.

CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to document undocumented students' language learning strategies in one private bilingual junior high school in Jambi, Indonesia, particularly; types of language learning strategies, language learning strategies choice, and differences of language learning strategies used by male and female students. There were some findings about language learning strategies employed by bilingual junior high school students.

First, in terms of type of language learning strategies, bilingual junior high school students employed memory strategies the most frequently, the second strategy was affective strategies, the third strategy was cognitive strategy and the least frequently strategies were social strategy, compensation strategy and metacognitive strategy. On the other hand, in relation to Oxford's (1990) LLS theory, the findings of this study disagreed with some of the concepts expressed by Oxford (1990). Oxford (1990) expressed that cognitive strategy had the tendency of being frequently used by language learners, but the findings of this study showed that bilingual junior high school students employed memory strategies the most. Oxford (1990) also stated that memory and affective strategies had been reported to be less frequently used strategies by language learners, in fact that in this study showed that bilingual junior high school students used memory strategies the first, and followed by affective strategies. Referring to compensation strategies, Oxford (1990) indicated that lower level students would use or employ compensation strategies more frequently due to their greater lack of knowledge, but the findings of this study showed that bilingual junior high school students were from bilinguals, they had studied English since they were at the elementary level and the findings showed that they used compensation strategies as the second last strategies. Meanwhile, Oxford (1990) stated," learners use metacognitive strategies sporadically" (p.138).

The findings about metacognitive strategies statements showed that from nine statements made by Oxford (1990), it showed that bilingual junior high school students only employed 3 statements which had medium level namely; statement number 33 (mean 2.72), statement number 36 (mean 3.13), statement number 37 (mean 2.64) and the rest statements were in the low level. It meant that the findings about metacognitive were the same as the statements from Oxford (1990), but it contradicted with the findings from Hong-Nam *et al.*(2007). They revealed that bilingual employed metacognitive strategies the most frequently.

Regarding to social strategies, Oxford (1990) explained that the school system might discourage social strategies such as cooperating with others due to competitive activities that encouraged individual performance and recognition. The findings of this study showed that social strategies were in the range of low level, however, the interview data showed that when they did not understand something in English, they had various ways to overcome it.

Second, the choice of language learning strategies employed by bilingual junior high school students, bilingual junior high school students employed memory strategy the most frequently, the second was affective, and the third was cognitive strategy, and the less frequently strategies were social and compensation meanwhile the least employed strategies was metacognitive. Most of the previous studies on language strategies only discussed about each strategy but not every statement in each strategy. In this study, we discussed about every statement in each strategy employed by bilingual junior high school students. Some previous studies did not go in line with this study (Chang, 2011; Griffiths, 2003; Oxford, 1990). In their findings showed the least strategy employed by language learners was memory strategy while in our study, the least employed strategies was metacognitive

Third, in terms of differences between male and females in learning strategies, the findings of this study found that there was no significant difference between male and female students. Some previous studies went in line with this study (Kaylani, 1999; Griffiths, 2003; Psaltou-Joyce, 2008; Tuncer, 2009). On the other hand, some previous studies which contradicted with this study found that there were significant differences between male and female students in learning language strategies (Green & Oxford, 1995; Lee, 2003; Hong-Nam *et al.*, 2006, Zare, 2010; Doro *et al.,* 2013). In relation to the concepts of Oxford's (1990) LLS in which Oxford

(1990) stated that there were significant differences between male and females, the findings of this study did not agree with the statement expressed by Oxford.

In addition, the interview data obtained from bilingual junior high school students, the findings showed that bilingual junior high school students produced or created different statements concerning with the statements in each strategy such as memory strategy, affective strategy, cognitive strategy, social strategy, compensation strategy and metacognitive strategy. The findings went in line with the previous study Sadeghi *et al.* (2012). They conducted a qualitative study on language learning strategy in Iran. The findings in interview data stated that structured interview would be a more reliable and useful tool than SILL since it could reveal more detail regarding the use of LLS by students who began learning English at different ages rather than like what SILL actually did to hide the qualities of them. In addition, Sadeghi *et al.* (2013) also found that the qualitative data based on the participants' responses to interviews indicated a lot of differences in the frequency of use of LLS by students.

Based on the findings of this study, we have some recommendations as follows; first, as EFL teachers, we cannot presuppose that students' language learning strategies in monolingual class are also applicable to bilingual-aged children. There must be a need to develop strategy taxonomy for bilingual-aged students. Second, EFL teachers must have knowledge about academic methods of language learning, psychology of language learning, language learning strategies, and acceptable training. Third, EFL teachers cannot teach students by using memorization so it tends the students to use memory strategy, the EFL teachers must be able to use interactive teaching method so the students will be able to switch to another strategy such as metacognitive which Oxford (1990) recommended as a good strategy which is obliged to be adopted by language learners. Fourth, Gender cannot be assumed as a crucial part for EFL teachers since they are able to understand what strategy employed by the students. They will be able to teach and guide the students to be successful students. The last, for the next researchers, this study is limited only in one school. It makes the result of this study cannot be generalized. So, for the next researchers, it is highly recommended to conduct the research with a large numbers of participants in order to check whether gender, age, and culture affect the students' language learning strategies.

REFERENCES

Abrar, M., Mukminin, A., Habibi, A., Asyrafi, F, Makmur, & Marzulina, L. (2018). "If our English isn't a language, what is it?" Indonesian EFL student teachers' challenges speaking English. *The Qualitative Report, 23*(1), 129-145.

Azkiyah, S.N., & Mukminin, A. (2017). In search of teaching quality of student teachers: The case of one teacher education program in Indonesia. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal, 7*(4), 105-124.

Bobanovic, K. M., Pula, M. M., & Bobanovic, M. (2011). A comparative study of language learning strategies used by monolingual and bilingual EFL learners. *Metodicki Obzori, 6* (3), 41- 53.

Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Creswell. J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

Creswell. J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

Creswell. J.W. (2012). *Educational research : Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson : Pearson Education Incorporate.

Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issue in language learning strategy research and teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *1*(1), 14-26.

Chang, C.-H., & Liu, H.-J.(2013). Language learning strategy use and language learning motivation of Taiwanese EFL university Students. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *10*(2), 196-209.

Cook, V. (2008). *Second language learning and language teaching*. Hodder education : Hachette UK Company.

Crabtree, M., & Powers, J. (1991). *Language files : Material for an introduction to language and linguistics*. Ohio : Ohio State University Press.

Cohen, A. (1990). *Language learning : Insight for learners, teachers, and researchers*. New York : Newbury House.

Deneme, S. (2010). Cross -cultural differences in language learning strategy. Preferences : A comparative study. *Journal of Language and Society*, 81-89.

Dornyei, Z. (2008). *The psychology of the language learner : Individual differences in second language acquisition.*

Doro, K., & Habok, A. (2013). Language learning strategies in elementary school : The effect of age and gender in an EFL context. *Journal of Linguistic and Language Teaching*, *4* (2), 24-37.

Fillmore, W. L. (1976). *The second time around: cognitive and social strategies in second language acquisition*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Standford University.

Ghavamnia, M., Kassaian, Z., & Dabaghi, A. (2011). The relationship between language learning strategies, language learning beliefs, motivation, and proficiency: A study of EFL learners in Iran. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *2*(5), 1156-1161.

Gursoy, E. (2004). *A study in identifying children's language learning strategies and developing children's inventory for language learning strategies (CHILLS).* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Eskisehir Anadolu University the Institute of Educational Sciences, Turkey.

Gerami, M. H., & Baighlou, S. M. G. (2011). Language learning strategies used by successful and unsuccessful Iranian EFL students. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, *29*, 1567-1576.

Habibi, A., Mukminin, A., Riyanto, Y., Prasojo, L. D., Sulistiyo, A., Sofwan, M., & Saudagar, F. (2018). Building an Online Community: Student Teachers' Perceptions on the Advantages of Using Social Networking Services in a Teacher Education Program. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 19*(1), 46-61.

Hadiyanto, Mukminin, A., Arif, N., Fajaryani, N., Failasofah, & Habibi, A. (2017). In search of quality student teachers in a digital era: Reframing the practices of soft skills in teacher education. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 16*(3), 71-78.

Hajhashemi, K., Shakarami, A., Anderson, A,. Amirkhiz, Y. S,. & Zou, Y. (2013). Relation between language learning strategies, language proficiency and multiple intelligences. *Journal of Academic Research, 4*(06), 418-429.

Hong-Nam, K., & Leavell, G. A. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System*, *34*, 399-415.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research : Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Sage: Sage Publications, Inc.

Leavell, G. A., & Hong-Nam, K. (2007). A comparative study of language learning strategy use in an EFL context : Monolingual Korean and bilingual Korean-chinese university students. *Asian Pacific Education Review, 8*(1), 71-88.

Lavasani, G. M., & Faryadres. (2011). Language learning strategies and suggested model in adults processes of learning second language. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *15*, 191-197.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, G.B. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Li, A. (2005). A look at Chinese ESL students' use of learning strategies in relation to their English language proficiency, gender and perceived language difficulties : A quantitative study. *The Proceedings of the Independent Learning Association Conference Inaugural* (pp.234-265). Auckland : Manukau Institute of Technology.

Martinez, I. M. P. (1995). A study of the learning strategies used by secondary school and university students of English in Spain. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses, 8,* 177-193.

Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study application in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mukminin, A. (2012). Acculturative experiences among Indonesian graduate students in US higher education: Academic shock, adjustment, crisis, and resolution. *Excellence in Higher Education Journal*, *3*(1), 14-36.

Mukminin, A. (2012). *From east to west: A phenomenological study of Indonesian graduate students' experiences on the acculturation process at an American public research university* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida.

Mukminin, A., Kamil, D., Muazza, M., & Haryanto, E. (2017). Why teacher education? Documenting undocumented female student teachers' motives in Indonesia: A case study. *The Qualitative Report, 22*(1), 309-326.

Mukminin, A., Ali, Rd. M., & Fadloan, M.J. (2015). Voices from within: student teachers' experiences in English academic writing socialization at one indonesian teacher training program. *The Qualitative Report, 20* (9), 1394-1407.

Mukminin, A., Rohayati, T., Putra, H. A., Habibi, A., & Aina, M. (2017). The Long Walk to Quality Teacher Education in Indonesia: Student Teachers' Motives to become a Teacher and Policy Implications. *Elementary Education Online,16*(1), 35-59.

Mukminin, A., & McMahon, B.J. (2013). International graduate students' cross-cultural academic engagement: Stories of Indonesian doctoral students on American campus. *The Qualitative Report, 18 (69),* 1-19.

Nunan, D.,& Bailey, M.C. (2009). *Exploring second language classroom research: A comprehensive guide.* Philippine : Cengage Learning Asia Pte Ltd.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Prasojo, L. D., Habibi, A., Mukminin, A., Muhaimin, Ikhsan, & Saudagar, F. (2017). Managing Digital Learning Environments: Student Teachers' Perception on the Social Networking Services Use in Writing Courses in Teacher Education. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 16*(4), 42-55.

Purdie, N., & Oliver, R. (1998). Language learning strategies used by bilingual school-aged children. *System*, *27*, 375-388.

Padron, N. Y. & Waxman, H. C. (1988). The effects of ESL students' perceptions of their cognitive strategies on reading achievement. *TESOL Quarterly*, *22*, 146-150.

O'Malley, J . M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. UK : Cambridge University Press.

Oxford , R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know?* USA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Oxford, R. L. (1996). *Language learning strategies around the world : Cross-cultural perpectives*. Honolulu : University of Hawaii Press.

Oxford, R. L. (2003). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know?* USA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Ruba, H., Habiba, U., Amir, A., Aslam, A., & Kiran, S. (2014). Strategy inventory for language learning. *Journal of Academic Research and Reflection*, 2, 15-32 Ruba, H., Habiba, U., Amir, A., Aslam, A., & Kiran, S. (2014). Strategy inventory for language learning. *Journal of Academic Research and Reflection*, *2*, 15-32.

Rubin, J., & Wenden, A. (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ : Prentice Hall.

Richards, J.C., & Platt, H. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Essex: Longman.

Sadeghi, K., & Attar, T. M. (2013). The relationship between learning strategy use and starting age of learning EFL. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, *70*, 387-396.

Salahshour, F., Sharifi, M., & Salahshour, N. (2012). The relationship between language learning use, language proficiency level and learner gender. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, *70*, 634-643.

Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second language learning.* London : Edward Arnold.

Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issue and option in language teaching*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Setiyadi, B., Holliday, L,. & Lewis, R. (1999). A survey of language learning strategies in a tertiary EFL in Indonesia. *The Proceedings of the AARE Annual Conference* (pp.35-41). Melbourne: Australia.

Tuncer, U. (2009). How do monolingual and bilingual language learners differ in use of learning strategies while learning a foreign language? Evidences from Mersin University. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, *1*, 852-856.

Valcarcel, M., & Coyle, Y. (2002). Children's learning strategies in the primary Fl classroom. *Centro Virtual Cervantes*, 423-458.

Ylmaz, C. (2010) . The relationship between language learning strategies gender, proficiency and self-efficacy belief : A study of EFL : A study of ELT learner in turkey. *Procedia Social and Behaviour*, *2*, 682-687.

Yusuf, S. (2012). Language learning strategies of two Indonesian young learners in the USA. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *2* (4), 65-72.

Zare, P. (2010). An investigation into language learning strategy use and gender among Iranian undergraduate language learners. *World Applied Sciences Journal.*

Bilingual Education Policy and Indonesian Students' Learning Strategies

ORIGINALITY REPORT

14%	12%	7%	0%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	eulatranslations.spaces.live.com Internet Source	1%
2	Maryam Farzam. "The Effect of Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategy Training on Intermediate Iranian EFL learners' Willingness to Communicate", International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 2017 Publication	1%
3	www2.ipcku.kansai-u.ac.jp Internet Source	<1%
4	www.cambridgemichigan.org Internet Source	<1%
5	Oxford, R.L.. "Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)", System, 199502 Publication	<1%
	www.tandfonline.com	

6	Internet Source	<1%
7	www.sciedu.ca Internet Source	<1%
8	nsse.indiana.edu Internet Source	<1%
9	Language Learning Strategy use by P Alfian, Mirella Wyra, Marietta Rossetto. "Chapter 10 Language Learning Strategy use by Prospective English Language Teachers in Indonesia", Springer Nature, 2016 Publication	<1%
10	Monika L. Appel, Lars G. Dahlgren. "Swedish Doctoral Students' Experiences on their Journey towards a PhD: Obstacles and opportunities inside and outside the academic building", Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 2003 Publication	<1%
11	jurnal.radenfatah.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
12	www.tojqi.net Internet Source	<1%
13	dspace.nwu.ac.za Internet Source	<1%

14	HARYANTO, Eddy, MUKMİNİN, Amirul, MURBOYONO, Rahmat, MUAZZA, Muazza and EKATİNA, Meitia. "Teacher Certification Policy: Evidence from Students' Perception on Certified English Teachers at One Public High School in Jambi Indonesia and Policy Implications", Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, 2016. Publication	<1%
15	www.educ.utas.edu.au Internet Source	<1%
16	www.dfps.state.tx.us Internet Source	<1%
17	oaji.net Internet Source	<1%
18	journal.uad.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
19	www.dliflc.edu Internet Source	<1%
20	tabaran.ac.ir Internet Source	<1%
21	www.tdx.cat Internet Source	<1%
22	insciencepress.org Internet Source	<1%

23	www.iseeadyar.org Internet Source	<1%
24	Saeb, Fateme, and Elham Zamani. "Language Learning Strategies and Beliefs about Language Learning in High-School Students and Students Attending English Institutes: Are They Different?", English Language Teaching, 2013. Publication	<1%
25	ecommons.usask.ca Internet Source	<1%
26	media.neliti.com Internet Source	<1%
27	www.icgl.gr Internet Source	<1%
28	idus.us.es Internet Source	<1%
29	www.alaskaice.org Internet Source	<1%
30	www.indjst.org Internet Source	<1%
31	cgel.tni.ac.th Internet Source	<1%
32	Gursoy, Esim. "Investigating Language	<1%

	Learning Strategies of EFL Children for the Development of a Taxonomy", English Language Teaching, 2010. Publication	
33	wallaby.vu.edu.au Internet Source	<1%
34	ojs.cepsj.si Internet Source	<1%
35	184.168.176.242 Internet Source	<1%
36	www.mizumot.com Internet Source	<1%
37	www.mitosweb.com Internet Source	<1%
38	www.scribd.com Internet Source	<1%
39	www.lw23.com Internet Source	<1%
40	www.cdc.gov Internet Source	<1%
41	www.awej.org Internet Source	<1%
42	bas.ictu.edu.vn Internet Source	<1%

43	researchdirect.uws.edu.au Internet Source	<1%
44	www.citeulike.org Internet Source	<1%
45	psikobuana.com Internet Source	<1%
46	www.jourlib.org Internet Source	<1%
47	"Distribution and Comparison of Language Learning Strategies Used by Language Learners and Their Status as Repeating and Non-repeating at Language Levels", Journal of Language and Literature Education, 2015 Publication	<1%
48	www.ipedr.net Internet Source	<1%
49	Lenny Marzulina, Akhmad Habibi, Amirul Mukminin, Deta Desvitasari, Mohd Faiz Mohd Yaakob, Doni Ropawandi. "The Integration of Social Networking Services in Higher Education", International Journal of Virtual and Personal Learning Environments, 2018 Publication	<1%
50	ir.lib.ncu.edu.tw:88 Internet Source	<1%

51	issuu.com Internet Source	<1%
52	www.abqar.com Internet Source	<1%
53	dr.library.brocku.ca Internet Source	<1%
54	www.docstoc.com Internet Source	<1%
55	blogspot.com.es Internet Source	<1%
56	eltsjournal.org Internet Source	<1%
57	www.i-scholar.in Internet Source	<1%
58	relp.khuisf.ac.ir Internet Source	<1%
59	meritresearchjournals.org Internet Source	<1%
60	journals.aiac.org.au Internet Source	<1%
61	etds.ntut.edu.tw Internet Source	<1%
62	laslab.org Internet Source	

		<1%
63	www.mcser.org Internet Source	<1%
64	onlinelibrary.wiley.com Internet Source	<1%
65	coarts.ncue.edu.tw Internet Source	<1%
66	Mirza, Hanadi S.. "ESL and EFL Learners Improve Differently in Pronunciation: The Case of Lebanon", Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2015. Publication	<1%
67	www.thetefluniversity.com Internet Source	<1%
68	www.portal.state.pa.us Internet Source	<1%
69	www.ipbl.edu.my Internet Source	<1%
70	"Language learning", Language Teaching, 04/2000 Publication	<1%

Exclude quotes	On	Exclude matches	Off
Exclude bibliography	On		

Bilingual Education Policy and Indonesian Students' Learning Strategies

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

/100

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8

PAGE 9

PAGE 10

PAGE 11

PAGE 12

PAGE 13

PAGE 14

PAGE 15

PAGE 16

PAGE 17

PAGE 18

PAGE 19