WHAT REALLY INFLUENCES ENGLISH PROFICIENCY OF THE STUDENTS OF ENGLISH DEPARTMENT SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY?

Hariswan Putera Jaya
English Department Sriwijaya University
Email: hariswan_putera_jaya@fkip.unsri.ac.id

Abstract: This study aimed at finding out whether or not (1) the language learning strategies had a significant relationship with language proficiency, (2) there was significant difference in language proficiency among semester, (3) there were relationships between categories of language learning strategies, English and Indonesian-based courses and language proficiency, (4) the language learning strategies and academic achievement gave contributions to the value of language proficiency, and (5) there were significant differences between the students of Regular Program and Extension Program in their language learning strategies, academic achievement, and language proficiency. The statistical analysis show that there were significant relationships among language learning strategy, academic achievement and language proficiency, there were differences in language proficiency between first and third semesters and between fifth and seventh semesters, and there was also significant differences between Regular and Extension Program in Language Proficiency, Academic Achievement, and Language Learning Strategies.

Keywords: Language Learning Strategy, Academic Achievement, Semesters, and Language proficiency

INTRODUCTION

Students whose major is English are exposed to become teachers of English. On the basis of the Decree no 14/2005, teachers are required to have professional competences. There may be many in-service teachers of English who will seemingly be difficult to meet the governments' demands. Dursin (2008:31) gives an illustration:

> A father has this story to tell. Once, his daughter spoke in English and asked him to solve the mathematical equation "two river two is what". Confused the father urged his daughter to translate her question into Bahasa Indonesia. The child said "dua kali dua sama dengan berapa"...This story may sound funny, but this reflects how some students are wrongly taught by teachers still struggling in English. It's a reality that a number of Indonesian teachers make a lot of grammatical mistakes when they use English in teaching their students...How can students learn to use correct English when their teachers don't know how?

It will be difficult for Indonesia in general and South Sumatera in particular, to have students and graduates of schools who can use English fluently and accurately without teachers of English having good proficiency of the language.

There are some reasons why this could happen. Among others is the system of accepting new students. The students who are admitted at the undergraduate programs at all state universities in Indonesia are based only on the University Entrance Examinations, or their academic achievement at high schools (Huminca, 2006). The students are given the same tests nationally and success or failure is determined by either the passing grade system or who can get the most correct answers of all the test items. To illustrate, all the examinees have to find the correct answers of the 100 multiple choice test items consisting of 25 questions respectively for mathematics, Indonesian, and English. The other 75 questions deal with history, geography, economics and integrated social science. So, there are only twenty five items of questions for English which do not have any failing impact if the students cannot answer them but succeed in choosing right answers for the other test items.

ISSN: 2085-4021

There is no any further examinations given to the freshman after succeeding the National State University Entrance Examinations . In other words, many students who go to universities in Indonesia are not given field of study-related tests to discover their academic potentials (Effendi, 2003). Students whose major is English are never assessed whether they are proficient or not in English. They are accepted at the English Department based only on their total scores of the entrance examination, not on their English language proficiency. And so are all students of private universities. However, Volet and Renshaw (1996) as quoted by Brooks and Moya (2007) claim that essentially, learning requires students to negotiate meaning and language skills are fundamental as they are needed for correct interpretation of lectures, texts, and assessment tasks. Similarly, Maleki and Zangani (2007:3) argue that it is the difficulties in grasping fully the contents and concepts of the course given in the target language which seems to be one of the most serious problems that EFL students face in their particular course of study. This might be caused by their weaknesses in English which may bring about bad impact on their learning achievement. In fact, insufficient English proficiency can cause problems in studying even for international students. Reid et.al. (1998) cited in Brooks and Moya (2007) after their research conclude that problems experienced by international students in learning may have more to do with levels of English language proficiency than with styles of teaching and learning. This is because language cuts across all fields of knowledge (Lee, 1983; Maros 2000; Nair-Venugopal, 2001) as quoted by Yamat (2003). To put them in another way, students' academic achievement may be influenced by how much they can understand the books they read, how much they can understand when they listen to recordings, how grammatically accurate and fluent they are in writing and speaking, to name a few.

There are, however, eight semesters that students have at the minimum to complete their study. It is said that language exposures can contribute positively to students learning a language. The length of study combined with the 131 credit hours of English-related courses can possibly help improving the students' language proficiency.

Additionally, success and failure in language learning may also depend on personal endeavors. They are any set of actions, plans, tactics, thoughts or behaviors that the learners employ to facilitate their comprehension, storage, retrieval, and use of information, which Rubin, (1987), O'Malley and Chamot (1990) called them language learning strategies.

The importance of language learning strategies becomes more evident when Oxford (1990) states that they are specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations. Following the importance of language learning strategies, there have been many studies that involve language learners and they often show that the most successful learners tend to use learning strategies that are suitable to the task, material, self-objective, needs, motivation and stage of learning (Oxford,1990). Good language learners also seem to possess abilities to succeed while others lack those abilities (Rubin & Thompson 1994). Good learners, according to them, can find their own way by taking charge of their learning, organizing their language information and making their own opportunities for practicing using the language.

This study aimed at finding whether or not (1) the language learning strategies had a significant relationship with language proficiency, (2) there was significant difference in language proficiency among semester, (3) there were relationships between categories of language learning strategies, English and Indonesian-based courses and language proficiency, (4) the language learning strategies and academic achievement gave contributions to the value of language proficiency, and (5) there were significant differences between the students of Regular Program and Extension Program in their language learning strategies, academic achievement, and language proficiency.

METHODOLOGY

The subject of this study was all the students of English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University. The students were at the first, third, fifth, and seventh semesters in the academic year of 2007/2008. They consisted of 227 students.

ISSN: 2085-4021

Table 1: Subject of the Study

	SEMESTERS								TOTAL
	1		3		5		7		
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	
	71	7	49	6	68	4	19	3	
Total	78		55		72		22		227

The instrument that will be used for collecting data on strategy use was Oxford's Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) version 7. SILL has been used worldwide for students of second and foreign languages in settings such as university, school and government. The internal consistency reliability of the SILL is .94 based on a 505-person sample (Yang, 1992) and .92 based on a 315-person sample (Watanabe, 1990). Content validity is .99 based on independent raters (Oxford, 1986; Oxford and Burry-Stock, 1995). It consists of 50 items, which Oxford (1995) divided into six categories:

(1) Memory strategy, such as grouping, imagery, rhyming, and structured reviewing (nine items).
(2) Cognitive strategy, such as reasoning, analyzing, summarizing and general practicing (fourteen items).
(3) Compensation strategy (to compensate for limited knowledge), such as guessing meanings for the context in reading and listening and using synonyms and gestures to convey meaning when the precise expression is not known (six items).
(4) Metacognitive strategy, such as paying attention, consciously searching for practice opportunities, planning for language tasks, self-evaluating, and monitoring error (nine items).
(5) Affective strategy, such as anxiety reduction, self encouragement, and self-reward (six items).
(6) Social strategy, such as asking questions, cooperating with native speakers of the language, and becoming culturally aware (six items).Each item in the survey is a statement starting with, I do .. (e.g., I review English lessons often.), and students respond on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (Never or almost never true of me) to 5 (always or almost always true of me).

The SILL appears to be the only language learning strategy instrument that has been checked for reliability and validated in multiple ways (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995) cited in Schamais (2003:2) and it is the most often used strategy scale around the world at this time (Schamais, 2003:2). Similarly, Alptekin (2007: 4-11) states that it has become a suitable instrument to measure the strategy preferences of all language learners, whether the target language is learned as a second or foreign language, or acquired in a naturalistic or instructed context. It is also approved to be as, "the most comprehensive classification of learning strategies to date" In the field of ESL and EFL, a lot of research concerning the use of language-learning strategies has been conducted since Oxford's original Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) was introduced in 1987 (Ellis, 1994). So, there is no need for the writer to re-measure the validity and reliability of the instrument, since it has been used and validated many times.

The data for the Academic Achievement are taken from the students Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA) for the third, fifth, and seventh semester students, and for the first semester students will be taken from their Grade Point Average of first semester only. The writer will get the data from the Faculty's administration office.

In order to obtain the information on the student's language proficiency, the writer invited all the students to take a TOEFL Prediction Test. The test was administered at Sriwijaya University Language Institute (SULI).

The Pearson Product Moment Coefficient Correlation was used to find out the correlations between the independent variables (language learning strategies and academic achievement) and the dependent variable (language proficiency).

Regression Analysis was applied to find the contributions of language learning strategies and academic achievement to language proficiency.

To find out the significant differences of language proficiency among the semesters, One Way ANOVA was applied.

FINDINGS

Table 2: Pearson Product moment Correlation among variables measured

No	Independent variables		Dependent variable	Coefficient corr.	Sig.
1	Language Learning Strategies (Global)		Language Proficiency	0.570	<0.0001
2	Language Learning Strategies (Categories)	Memory		0.367	<0.0001
3		Cognitive		0.543	<0.0001
4		Compensation		0.540	<0.0001
5		Metacognitive		0.343	<0.0001
6		Affective		0.273	<0.0001
7		Social		0.363	<0.0001
8	Academic Achievement (Global)			0.641	<0.0001
9	Academic Achievement	Indonesian		0.163	<0.014
10		English		0.696	<0.0001

The statistical results showed that the correlation coefficient between language learning strategies (global) and language proficiency was 0.570 with the probability value less than 0.0001 in which it was lower than the alpha level of 0.05 showing that there is a significant correlation between language learning strategies and language proficiency. Moreover, it was also found that categories of language learning strategies had significant correlation with language proficiency. First, there was a significant correlation between memory and language proficiency with the correlation coefficient 0.367 with the probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than 0.05. Second, there was a significant correlation between cognitive and language proficiency with the correlation coefficient 0.543 with the probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than 0.05 Third,, there was also a significant correlation between compensation and language proficiency with the correlation coefficient 0.540 with the probability value less than 0.000 which was lower than 0.05 Next, there was a significant correlation between metacognitive and language proficiency with the correlation coefficient 0.343 with the probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than .05 Also there was a significant correlation between affective and language proficiency with the correlation coefficient 0.273 with the probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than 0.05 Finally, there was a significant correlation between social and language proficiency with the correlation coefficient 0.363 with the probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than 0.05

The statistical result also showed that academic achievement (global) was significantly correlated with language proficiency with the correlation coefficient 0.641 with the probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than 0.05. When the academic achievement was divided into English-related courses and Indonesian-related courses, the former exceeds the later. The English-related courses correlated very significantly to the language proficiency with correlation coefficient 0.696 with the probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than 0.05. The Indonesian-related courses showed weak correlation with correlation coefficient 0.163 with probability value of .014.(Table 2)

To find whether or not there are differences in language proficiency among semesters, t-test was applied. To do it the writer divided the semester into two groups: first and third semesters, fifth and seventh semesters. First, it was found that there was significant difference between the first and third semester's student in their language proficiency. The result of statistics indicated the F value was 0.039 and probability value less than 0.009 which was lower than 0.01. meaning that there was a difference between the first and the third semester. It showed that the students in the third semester have better language proficiency 442.38 compared to their junior 420.60. Second,

there is significant difference between students in the fifth and seventh semester. The result of the statistics showed that the F value was 8.370 and probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than 0.01, meaning that there was a difference in language proficiency between the fifth and the seventh semesters. It showed that the students in the seventh semester was better, the Mean was 482.18, compared to the fifth semester's students' 433.56 (Table 3)

Table 3: Summary of t test

Variable	Category	Mean	F	df	Sig/ p	Level
Language Proficiency	1st semester	420.6026	0.039	131	<0.009	4
	3rd semester	442.3818				2
	5th semester	433.5694	8.370	92	<0.0001	3
	7th semester	482.1818				1

Although the semester has significant relationships, it was also found that the second semester was better in language proficiency than the sixth semester.

Since the samples involved the students who go to Inderalaya and those who belong to the Extension Program, the writer thought that it was important to talk about the possible differences between them in terms of their frequency in using the six categories of language learning strategies, academic achievement and language proficiency, across semesters.

There are six categories in the questionnaire of language learning strategies which indicate how language learners learn a language. It was found that among the six categories, Metacognitive Strategy was the most preferred strategy with the average value 3.96, followed by Compensation and Social Strategies with the average value 3.56 and 3.34, the fourth and fifth used strategies were Cognitive and Affective with 3.32 and 3.29 on the average, and the least preferred was Memory Strategy. The results also showed that the students usually or sometimes used strategy for learning English.

Table 4: Summary of the Mean of Categories in Language Learning Strategies

Language Learning Strategies	Mean	Degree	Rank
Metacognitive	3.96	High (Usually Used)	1
Compensation	3.56	High (Usually Used)	2
Social	3.34	Medium (Sometimes used)	3
Cognitive	3.32	Medium (Sometimes used)	4
Affective	3.29	Medium (Sometimes used)	5
Memory	3.06	Medium (Sometimes used)	6

The students of first, third, fifth and seventh semester use Metacognitive strategy the most for learning English. It ranked the first in the Mean for all the semester level. The second most preferred strategy by all the semester level was Compensation. The least preferred strategy by all semester level was Memory. Other strategies ranked differently across semesters on the average.

Table 5: Summary of the Mean of Language Learning Strategies across Semesters

Language Learning Strategies	Mean							
	Semester and Rank							
	2		4		6		8	
Memory	3.041	6	3.03	6	2.971	6	3.227	6
Cognitive	3.188	4	3.242	4	3.39	5	3.468	3
Compensation	3.373	2	3.561	2	3.412	2	3.905	2
Metacognitive	3.971	1	3.967	1	3.958	1	3.941	1
Affective	3.153	5	3.356	3	3.34	4	3.341	4
Social	3.329	3	3.193	5	3.406	3	3.45	5

The second, fourth, sixth, and eighth semester students of Regular Program used Metacognitive strategy as the most preferred strategy for learning English with the Mean respectively 4.102, 3.968, 4.247, and 3.941. The second most preferred by all semesters was Compensation Strategy. The least preferred strategy was Memory. Others were used differently in frequency.

Table 6: Summary of the Mean of the Categories in Language Learning Strategies of the Students of Regular Program

Language Learning Strategies	Mean Semester and Rank							
	2		4		6		8	
Memory	3.113	6	3.1	6	3.205	6	3.227	6
Cognitive	3.373	5	3.309	4	3.337	5	3.468	3
Compensation	3.716	2	3.673	2	3.795	2	3.905	2
Metacognitive	4.103	1	3.968	1	4.247	1	3.941	1
Affective	3.424	4	3.494	3	3.663	3	3.341	5
Social	3.558	3	3.294	5	3.458	4	3.45	4

The first, third, fifth semester students of Extension Program used Metacognitive strategy as the most preferred strategy for learning English with the Mean respectively 3.845, 3.3.981, and 3.855. Other strategies were used differently in frequency among semesters.

Table 7: Summary of the Mean of the Categories in Language Learning Strategies of the Students of Extension Program

Language Learning Strategies	Mean Semester and Rank					
	2		4		6	
Memory	2.973	5	2.933	6	2.887	6
Cognitive	3.012	4	3.129	4	3.338	3
Compensation	3.048	3	3.39	2	3.275	4
Metacognitive	3.845	1	3.981	1	3.855	1
Affective	2.895	6	3.176	3	3.225	5
Social	3.113	2	3.057	5	3.387	2

In comparison, the students of Regular Program ranked higher than those of Extension Program in the frequency of using strategies in learning English with Mean 3.548, and 3.251 of Extension Program.

DISCUSSIONS

There is a strong evidence that language learning strategies (global) and categories of language learning strategies correlate with language proficiency. It does appears that good language learners use strategies in effective ways in learning language which have brought about better proficiency in the language. Rossi-Lee's (1989) found that more proficient learners employ a variety of strategies in many situations than do less proficient learners and more proficient EFL students used self-management strategies such as, evaluation and formal practice significantly more often than less proficient students.

Categorically, Cognitive and Compensation correlated more strongly than Memory, Metacognitive, Affective and Social. The students of English Education Study Program's language proficiency has relationships with their preferences of learning English in which they usually (1) guess words intelligently by using linguistics clues and others, (2) overcome limitations in speaking and writing, (3) practice the language, (4) receive and send messages, (5) analyze and reason, and

ISSN: 2085-4021

(6) creating structure for input and output. Among Memory, Metacognitive, Affective and Social, Affective has the lower correlation coefficient with language learning strategies. It may happen because the students of English Education Study Program, when studying English, do not usually try lowering their learning anxiety, encouraging themselves, and taking their emotional temperature.

Nevertheless, the statistical analysis also showed that the students in all semesters (total), based on Oxford's (1989) Key to Understanding SILL Scores, had medium frequency (sometimes), on the average of 3.4, in using strategies in learning English. But if we look more closely, it was the students of Extension Program which caused the average Medium. All the students of Regular Program in all semesters had higher overall mean in the frequency of using strategies 3.5 (High), compared to Extension Students' 3.2 (Medium). The high use of strategy in learning had made it possible for the students of Regular program to have better proficiency in English. The Mean of language proficiency of Regular Program for each semester was (1^{st}) 445.56, (3^{rd}) 458.74, (5^{th}) 477.32, (7^{th}) 482.18, while Extension Program was (1^{st}) 395.25, (3^{rd}) 415.90, (5^{th}) 417.89. It is pathetic to know that the language proficiency of the fifth semester students of Extension Program was lower than that of the first semester students of Regular Program. These have clarified my assumption that there are really differences between those who study in Inderalaya and those who study in Palembang.

Academic Achievement and language proficiency are also correlated significantly. The higher the students' academic achievement, the better the language proficiency. This could happen because most of the lectures are delivered in English and also most of the books they must read are written in English. It requires the students to understand the books they read, examinations they have, and lectures they attend and listen to in order to get good academic achievement. Without the ability to fully comprehending what they read, listen, write and speak, the students will find problems in their study which will result in their low motivation and disappointing achievement. To illustrate, I have ever overheard students discussing classes they did not want to attend only because they were required to read thick academic books they did not understand and the lecturer who never spoke language other than English. Moreover, the Mean of Academic Achievement of the students of Regular Program was higher than that of Extension Students which have led to significant differences in language proficiency between the two groups of students.

It also clearly appears that length of study influences students' language proficiency. There is an evidence that there is a significant difference between the seventh semester and the first, third, and fifth semester. The Mean of the language proficiency shows that the students in the seventh semester get the highest score compared to the lower semester students. It proves that students in higher semester get better score in language proficiency, indicating that the higher the semester, the more they know and the better their proficiency. It might also have happened because the higher semester students have more learning experiences and longer exposures to English than the lower semester students. Starting at the sixth semester, the students have more non-English skills lectures in English which require them to read a variety of academic books assigned by their lecturers in which they not only have to read but also write and present any given topics. These are maximal exposures to the target language which result in optimal outcomes.

On the basis of Oxford's (1989) Key to Understanding SILL Scores, there are strategies which the students preferred most and least. Among the six categories of language learning strategies, Metacognitive was the most preferred strategy (3.96). Metacognitive strategy involve exercising over one's own language learning through planning, monitoring, and evaluating. It is a technique that is used for organizing, planning, focusing and evaluating one's own learning. In general, this strategy help learners gain control over their emotion and motivation related to language learning through self –monitoring. Metacognitive which was the most preferred by the students was in line with results of other researchers like Ihsan (1997), Zulkifli (2006), Kaylani (1996) and Green and Oxford (1995). There are three strategies which fall to the same ranks in all semesters. They are Metacognitive (1), Compensation (2), and Memory (6). It is clear from the findings of this study that the students made very little use of Memory strategy. Some of the memory strategies mentioned in the questionnaire are: connecting the sounds of new words to an image or picture, making a mental picture of a situation in which a word might be used, using

rhymes, physically acting out a word, and remembering new words or phrases by remembering their location on pages, the board, etc. The writer thinks that the students probably did not know about these techniques.

The language proficiency of the students fell under the medium level of TOEFL Score Implications issued by IIEF. The Mean of 435.96 indicating that the students are only able to talk about the topic that he or she is familiar with, only have limited English capability and competency, and repeat a lot while communicating. These kinds of English capabilities are insufficient to effectively follow lectures in classes and do other academic activities. Therefore, the educational implication of this study relates to the systems of students' admittance at the faculty. There must be a an English proficiency test to discover the students base line English proficiency before they are accepted at the English educational program. Moreover, since it was found that semester had significant relationship with language proficiency, students must be exposed more to the language by giving all the lectures in English. If possible, there must be a little change in the curriculum by eliminating relatively unnecessary subjects like sports, Indonesian, and religious teachings, to name but a few. More English Intensive Courses seem to be a safe substitute.

Another educational implication relates to language learning strategy. The overall Mean of the strategies used fell to the medium level (3.4). This means that the students only "sometimes" use strategy in learning. The writer thinks that the students did not know or unfamiliar with some or many of the strategies. The students would, therefore, benefit greatly from training in the use of all learning strategies. Teachers will also need to offer their students a great deal of guidance in order to help them experiment with these new strategies and decide on the types of strategies that suit them.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the descriptions and discussions in the previous chapter, some conclusions are drawn. Firstly, there is significant relationship among language learning strategy (global) and language proficiency. The statistical analysis showed that the correlation coefficient was 0.570 with the probability value less than 0.0001 in which it was lower than the alpha level of 0.05.

Secondly, there is significant relationship between categories of language learning strategies and language proficiency. there was a significant correlation between memory and language proficiency with the correlation coefficient 0.367 with the probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than 0.05. Second, there was a significant correlation between cognitive and language proficiency with the correlation coefficient 0.543 with the probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than 0.05 Third,, there was also a significant correlation between compensation and language proficiency with the correlation coefficient 0.540 with the probability value less than 0.000 which was lower than 0.05 Next, there was a significant correlation between metacognitive and language proficiency with the correlation coefficient 0.343 with the probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than .05 Also there was a significant correlation between affective and language proficiency with the correlation coefficient 0.273 with the probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than 0.05 Finally, there was a significant correlation between social and language proficiency with the correlation coefficient 0.363 with the probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than 0.05.

Thirdly, there was a significant relationship between academic achievement (global) and language proficiency with the correlation coefficient 0.641 with the probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than the alpha level of 0.05

Next, there was a significant relationship between English-related academic achievement and language proficiency with the correlation coefficient 0.696 with the probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than the alpha level of 0.05. The Indonesian-related academic achievement showed weak correlation with correlation coefficient 0.163 with probability value of .014.

Finally, there were differences in language proficiency among semesters. there was significant difference between the first and third semester's student in their language proficiency. The result of statistics indicated the F value was 0.039 and probability value less than 0.009 which

was lower than 0.01. meaning that there was a difference between the first and the third semester. It showed that the students in the third semester had better language proficiency 442.38 compared to their junior 420.60. There was significant difference between students in the fifth and seventh semester. The result of the statistics showed that the F value was 8.370 and probability value less than 0.0001 which was lower than 0.01, meaning that there was a difference in language profiency between the fifth and the seventh semesters.

On the basis of Oxford's (1989) Key to Understanding SILL Scores, the students of English Education Study Program had medium frequency (sometimes), on the average of 3.4, in using strategies in learning English. Due to the fact that language learning strategies is one of the factors that can increase language proficiency, it is reasonable to say that students must be familiarized with all varieties of language learning strategies.

REFERENCES

Alptekin, C. (2007). Foreign language learning strategy choice: Naturalistic versus instructed language acquisition. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 3 (1): 4-11.

Bayliss, D. & Raymond, P.M. (2004). The link between academic success and L2 proficiency in the context of two professional programs. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 6(1),29-51.

Bedel, D. & Oxford, R., (1996). Cross-cultural comparisons of language learning strategies in the People's Republic of China and other countries. *In:* R. Oxford, (ed.) *Language learning strategies around the world: cross cultural perspectives* (pp.35-60) Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai

Bialystok, E. (1981). The Role of Conscious Strategies in Second Language Proficiency. *Modern Language Journal*, 6(2):35-39.

Bremner, S. (1999). Language learning strategies and language proficiency: investigating the relationship in Hong Kong. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 55 (4), UTPJOURNALS (Online), accessed on July 21st, 2003. [www.utpjournal.com.]

Brooks, G. & Moya, A. (2007). *Spoken English proficiency and academic performance: Is there a relationship and if so, how do we teach?* (Online), accessed on October 21st, 2007. [www.uefap.co.uk.]

Chamot, A. U. & Kupper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22: 13-24.

Cohen, A. D. (1987) Studying learner strategies. How we get the information. In A. L. Wenden, & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning* (pp. 31-42). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice- Hall.

Dreyer, C. & Oxford, R., (1996). Learning strategies and other predictors of ESL proficiency among Afrikaans speakers in South Africa. *In:* R. Oxford,(ed.) *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp.61-74). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai.

Dursin, R.L. (2008, January 27). Challenges of becoming a teacher of English. *The Jakarta Post*, pp.31

Effendi, S. (2003, May 5). *Fenomena Imd dan Pendidikan Tinggi* (Online), accessed on November, 02, 2007. [www.kompas.com.]

Ehrman, M. & Oxford, R. (1989). Adults' language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *The Modern Language Journal*, 74, 311-326.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Finnochiaro, M & Christopher, B. (1983). *The functional-notional approach: From theory to practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garcia V.E., Vasquez L.A., Lopez, I.C., & Ward W. (1997). Language proficiency and academic success: Relationships between proficiency in two languages and achievement among Mexican American students. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 21(4): 334-347. Online, accessed on January 05, 2008. [www.ejournal.com.]

Green, J.M. (1992). *Additional analyses of Puerto Rican strategy data*. (Online), accessed on November 1, 2007. [www.unpuertorico.com.]

Green, J. & Oxford, R. (1993). A closer look at learning strategies: L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 2(1): 261-297.

Holton, E.H., & Burnett, M.B. (1997). Qualitative research methods. In R.A. Swanson & E.F. Holton (Eds.), *Human Resources Development Research Handbook: Linking Research and Practice*. San Fransisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Huminca. June 19th 2006. *Masih efektifkah pelaksanaan SPMB?* (Online), accessed on November 05, 2007. [www.pikiranrakyat.com.]

Ihsan, D. & Diem, C.D. (1997). The learning styles and language learning strategies of EFL students at tertiary level. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 4 (special edition): 319-332

Kaylani, C. (1996). The influence of gender and motivation on EFL learning strategy use in Jordan. *In*: R. Oxford,(ed.) *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp.75-88) Honolulu: University of Hawai'i: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Liu, D. (2004). EFL Proficiency, gender and language learning strategy use among a group of Chinese technological institute English majors. *ARECLS-journal* (1)A5:3

Maleki, A & Zangani,E. (2007). A survey on the relationship between English language proficiency and the academic achievement of Iranian EFL students. *Asian EFL Journal*,9(1): 86-96. (Online), accessed on November 01, 2007. [www.asianefljournal.com.]

McKeuon, D.W. (2005). *TOEFL scores interpretation.* Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Tech Graduate School. (Online), accessed on October 18,2007. [www.vtech.com]

Nibset, J., & Shucksmith, J. (1986). *Learning strategies*. Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

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

Oxford, R. L. 1990. *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Oxford, R. L. (1993). Instructional implications of gender differences in language learning styles and strategies. *Applied Language Learning*, 4 (2): 65-94.

Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). *Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL).*Tuscaloosa: AL, University of Alabama.

Oxford, R., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73: 291-300.

Rigney, J.W. (1978). Learning strategies: A theoretical perspective. In H.F. O'Neil, Jr. (Ed.), *Learning strategies* (pp.165-205). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Rubin, J. & Thompsons, I. (1994). *How to be a more successful language learner* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Shmais, W. A. (2003). Language learning strategies use in Palestine. *TESL-EJ* 7(2) :2. (Online), accessed on October,12, 2007. [www.tesl-ej.com.]

Stevens, R. A., Butler, F. A., & Castellon-W. M. (2000). Academic language and content assessment: Measuring the progress of English language learners. *National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.* Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Ulibarri, D., Maria, M., Spencer, L., & Rivas, G. A. (1981). Language proficiency and academic achievement: A study of language proficiency tests and their relationships to school rating as predictors of academic achievement. *NABE Journal,:* 47-80. (Online), accessed on December 19, 2007. [www.nabejournal.com.]

Yamat, H. (2003). *Globalization and diversity: The need for English language.* (Online), accessed on October 26, 2007. [www.atea.edu.au.]

Yang, N. (1999). *The relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategy use.* Department of foreign languages and literature, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan, ROC. (online) (www.ntutaipei.com) (accessed on October 23, 2007)

Yu, L. (2003). Learning strategies and their relationship to listening comprehension: A report on non-English majors in a medical university in China. *Teaching English in China,* 26 (4), 3-11.

Wharton, G. (1997). *Language learning strategy use in a multiple setting: a study of university students of Japanese and French in Singapore.* Ph.D. thesis, University of Texas. (online), accessed on December 15th, 2007. [www.freearticles.com.]

Zulkifli. (2007). *The relationship between language learning strategies and language proficiency of engineering students in State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya.* Unpublished Thesis, Graduate School, Sriwijaya University, Palembang.

ISSN: 2085-4021