

THROUGH THE LENS OF YOUNG SARAWAKIAN ENGLISH AS SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNERS: IDENTIFYING THEIR LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES

*¹Sarina Sani & ²Hanita Hanim Ismail

¹ Sekolah Kebangsaan Agama Ibnu Khaldun, Jalan Tan Sri Ikhwan Zaini,
94300 Samarahan, Sarawak, Malaysia.

² Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia,
43600 Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia.

*Corresponding author: hanitaismail@ukm.edu.my

Received: 20.02.2022

Accepted: 30.04.2022

ABSTRACT

Background and Purpose: Different language learners have varying capacities to acquire L2, where some learners develop their learning strategies faster than others. Hence, it is critical for instructors to examine the degree of understanding and ability obtained by the learners through the investigation of their language learning strategies particularly on the type of schools the learners attend. This study, therefore, reveals frequently employed learning strategies in ESL classrooms based on the type of school the learners attend, notably the distinction between Cluster School of Excellence (CSE) and non-cluster primary school in Malaysia.

Methodology: This quantitative research gathered information through the administration of a survey questionnaire. In total, 112 young ESL Malaysian learners (CSE:56; Non-CSE:56) aged 11 were chosen through stratified random sampling in Samarahan, Sarawak. The close-ended Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) that consist of 50 questions was used to collect information and SPSS Version 25 was used to interpret an independent t-test to determine the significant in strategies employed by the respondents.

Findings: The data revealed that the most prevalent Language Learning Strategy (LLS) used by young Malaysian ESL learners are metacognitive strategies that allow learners to manage their learning.

Learners in non-CSE school adopt learning strategies more than learners in CSE school and there is no significant difference in the type of learning strategies employed by both learners.

Contributions: School's environment reflects a significant impact on the academic success of students and the result of the investigation helped throughout the educational process to tailor teaching strategies to help learners achieve common educational goals. Teachers from both schools should use this chance to conceive, construct, or assign tasks that will push students to reach their full potential in language learning.

Keywords: Language learning, language learning strategies, type of school, Malaysian young learner.

Cite as: Sani, S., & Ismail, H. (2022). Through the lens of young Sarawakian English as second language learners: Identifying their language learning strategies. *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, 7(2), 399-423. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol7iss2pp399-423>

1.0 INTRODUCTION

English has become extremely important in all contexts, both local and international, and it serves as a lingua franca among nations; thus, language learners are projected to strive in future educational challenges (Zukiflei & Said, 2020), particularly with the existing requirements of 21st-century learning ultimatums. They must be knowledgeable in communication, cooperation, and problem-solving abilities so that when the learners leave school, they are prepared for the workplace and have the requisite competencies and aspirations. Hence, learners are required to be mutually competent in writing competencies and effective communication skills following graduation, as enthused in the new Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025. As a result, Malaysian primary school learners aged 7 to 12 are expected to master English because it is enacted as a second language in the country. However, there are disparities in the ability of various language learners to acquire L2 because some may adapt quicker than others (Hu, 2016). Language learners, particularly in primary schools, are unaware of their language knowledge, and their diverse ability in the classroom makes it difficult for teachers to adapt to individual requirements (Kim, 2020). The mastery of numerous skills is essential for grasping various types of knowledge for future demands (Lee, 2010). As a result, Language Learning Strategies (LLS) is regarded as a supplementary strategy for enhancing language learning (Saad et al., 2016). LLS plays a significant role in promoting autonomy among ESL students. On the other hand, not all teachers are aware of LLS, which limits the generous benefit of LLS (Gani, Fajrina, & Rizaldy, 2015).

Apart from that, the numerous types of national primary schools in Malaysia are believed to be a factor that contributes to the preference of language learning strategies by the learners (Owusu & Cobbold, 2020). Malaysian national primary school consists of National School, Vernacular School, High Performing School, Cluster School of Excellence, Vision School, Premier School, Smart School, and Trust School. The various schools are thought to grasp the system's existing performance, achievements, and beliefs that can best serve each learner. The effort of the Malaysia Ministry of Education (MOE) to recognize excellent schools by awarding the status of Cluster Schools of Excellence (CSE) successfully injected the spirit of its management to improve performance (Ismail & Abdullah, 2012). CSE is a merit system for its educational institutions that aims to improve the quality of schools and to produce great students in Malaysia as well as to reach an internationally acknowledged world-class standard (Ismail & Abdullah, 2011). Their determination is proven, among others, some rural schools have forged collaborations with urban schools to drive academic and co-curricular excellence (Lee & Samuel, 2020). Hence, this study focuses on learners in CSE school and learners in National School that are considered non-CSE learners. The substantial characteristics of CSE schools that consists of proven track record in both academic and co-curricular over three consecutive years, have encouraged the researchers to take CSE students to be part of the research population to identify their learning strategies in language acquisition. In addition, due to these various types of primary schools, this study proposes to evaluate learners' learning strategies to define the efficacy of their language learning and to empower strategies that correspond to their learning preference.

Wong and Nunan (2011) mentioned that there have been various studies on LLS concentrating on language learning such as strategies preferred by secondary schools, college or university learners (Zhou, 2010; Iamudom & Tangkiengsirisin, 2020; Rachmawati, 2013; Giang & Tuan, 2018), strategies employed by young learners (Bayuong, Hashim, & Yunus, 2019; Weng, Yunus, & Embi, 2016; Chilkiewicz, 2015), gender differences in strategies used (Balci & Ügüten, 2018; Ho & Ng, 2016), strategies associated with successful and less successful learners (Nazri, Yunus, & Nazri, 2016; Nasir, Yusuf, & Zulfarlia, 2016), strategies associated with positive emotions (Mohammadipour et al., 2018), motivation (Chang & Liu, 2013), attitudes (Platsidou & Kantaridou, 2014; Habók, & Magyar, 2018:), beliefs (Al-Qahtani 2013), academic achievement (Ofiaz, 2019; Balci & Ügüten, 2018) and age-related learning strategies (Sepasdar & Soori, 2014; Chen, 2014).

Contrastingly, there have been fewer studies on understanding young learners and the type of schools they attend (Nhem, 2019; Tezcan & Deneme, 2015; Owusu & Cobbold, 2020;

Gavriilidou & Petrogiannis, 2016; Vimalakshan & Aziz, 2021). As a result, the significance of concentrating on young ESL learners and linking the application of learning strategies with the type of school they attend was seen in this study. Investigating LLS adjacent to young learners is important because it could provide insights to a better perception of acquiring language mastery at an early point in the process of language attainment. Wan Mahzan, Alias, and Ismail (2020) further added that not all learning strategies are acceptable or appropriate for adolescent learners. Learners' desire to investigate and select appropriate learning strategies are mechanisms toward enhancing the conception of these LLS, allowing learners to learn effectively alongside boosting the autonomy in language learning (Lee, 2010). This study is an extension of practices to observe the preferences to use LLS among the students particularly by type of school by creating opportunities in classroom activities that fulfill what the students lack as advocated by Iamudom and Tangkiengsirisin (2020). They proposed that carefully planned language learning material designs and tasks based on the students' needs promote the natural enthusiasm of students by acquiring suitable strategies of their own.

Wong and Nunan (2011) discovered a benefit of employing learning strategies and that is a potential to enhance learners to exploit a whole lot of the classroom activities. Thus, it suggests that learners who are aware on learning strategies are strongly driven to become proficient in learning the language. Additionally, it empowers pupils to acquire greater responsibility for learning the language at their speed and perceive it as an opportunity for personal growth (Tahang et al., 2019), as well as to develop successful students (Nazri et al., 2016; Nasir et al., 2016). Expanding awareness among learners on learning strategies allows students to evaluate their methodology and learning effectiveness (Yunus, Sulaiman, & Embi, 2013). Hence, teachers are obligated to consult the young learners and educate them on learning strategies.

As young language learners are projected to participate in future challenges in education, it has been shown that English learners among the Malaysian are not sufficiently competent, showing a lack of mastery of the language (David, Thang, & Azman, 2015). Besides, there is a noticeable increase in the number of jobless graduates due to a lack of English competency and communication skills (Ting et al., 2017; Ab Rahman et al., 2020; Osman & Murdad, 2020). Hence, pioneering young learners to learning strategies gives them mechanism over their learning as they progress toward becoming competent language learners (Tahang et al., 2019). With a plethora of challenges that prevail, serious work must begin, particularly in the education sector, where many advancements are made to generate good language learners, notably in English communication skills. At present, the teaching of

language has gradually shifted from teacher-centered towards student-centered classrooms, pushing L2 learners to develop autonomy in their learning (Zukiflei & Said, 2020). Hence, to assist learners to become more efficient in language acquisition, a teacher must introduce these strategies to the learners in the classroom. Learning strategies, in reality, play an essential capacity in facilitating independence among learners. In that respect, teachers must grasp the substance of the curriculum and the learning strategies that best suit their learners and their relevance to needs and future (Sani & Ismail, 2021). The reason for the learner to identify their learning strategies is to make them learn effectively and in a smart way. Identifying LLS thus scaffolding teachers to help learners acquire the language effectively. Therefore, for the purpose of determining LLS that are most used within young learners at the age of 11 in Cluster School of Excellence and non-CSE schools, this study aims to reach the following research objectives: 1. What are the most used Language Learning Strategies by Year 5 primary school learners?, and 2. What are the most used Language Learning Strategies between Year 5 Cluster School of Excellence (CSE) and non-cluster primary school learners and their significant difference?

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Language Learning Strategies (LLS)

LLS is regarded as a helpful strategy for enhancing language learning (Saad et al., 2016). In teaching, identifying LLS facilitate teacher to increase their awareness to familiarize with the variety of LLS (Fathi-Ashtiani et al., 2007) as well as to decrease the gap between learners (Gerami & Baighlou, 2011; Ang, Embi, & Yunus, 2017) and teachers to train low proficiency learners (Simsek & Balaban, 2010; Nasir et al., 2016). Numerous empirical investigations have aided in the understanding of critical components in LLS in the acquisition of L2 and foreign language (Jalal, 2015; Balci & Ügüten, 2018). This part explains LLS as well as its significance in promoting autonomy in learners' language learning. Lee (2010) highlighted that there are many disparities in the definitions of LLS. Oxford's definition is one of the most often mentioned in the literature (Zare, 2012). Language learners use learning strategies to accelerate the entire development of acquiring, storing, retrieving, or employing linguistic information (Oxford, 1990). As LLS is a reflection of what the learners intend to do and activities carried out in the process of learning, meaning-making is an important part of the language learning procedure. Cohen (1999) stated that allowing students to choose meaning-making can effectuate improvements in the learning of L2 through remembering, reminding, and applying linguistic understanding. Chamot (2004) defined language learning as the deliberate actions of

a learner in language adoption. As a result, LLS is seen as a distinct way to process knowledge that improves comprehension, education, or the preservation of information (Zare, 2012). Based on the above explanations from several experts, the concept of LLS may be described as all the specific mental and physical acts that are selected intentionally and occasionally employed to enhance language learning process.

2.2 Classification of Language Learning Strategies

There are two basics of classification that were established by Oxford (1990) that are used to identify learning strategies. It consists of direct and indirect strategies. Table 1 depicts its classification.

Table 1: Oxford's classification of language learning strategies (1990)

Major Classification of Learning Strategies	Types of Learning Strategies	Forms of Learning Strategies
Direct Strategies	Memory Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creating mental linkages • relating images and sounds to grammar components • reviewing the grammatical items • employing actions
	Cognitive Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • practicing grammar regularly • receiving and sending messages • analysing and reasoning • creating structure for input and output
	Compensation Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • guessing intelligently • problem solving
	Indirect Strategies	Metacognitive Strategies
	Affective Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lowering anxiety • self-encouraging • taking emotional temperature
	Social Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • posing questions • collaborating with others • empathizing with others

Direct strategies refer to strategies that are involved directly in language attainment in tandem with mental processing employment in the target language (Reka Naidu, 2018). It is made up of three parts: memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies. The first subcategory of direct strategies is memory strategies, that related to metacognition, the use of visuals and rhymes, positively embracing knowledge, and engaged behaviours (Oxford, 1990). Memory strategies let learners categorise information as permanent or transitory memory and retrieve it when needed during learning activities by allowing them to collect and retain new knowledge. According to Nemati (2009), learners can obtain stronger memory preservation whenever they can apply appropriate memory methods in language acquisition, for example being taught the usage of strategies or repeating with greater engagement of words. Cognitive strategies are the second group of direct strategies. Students can use cognitive strategies to grasp as well as to develop a new language in a variety of approaches. The final one is compensating strategies, which enable learners to forecast logically in communication while maintaining authentic interactions with others.

According to Reka Naidu (2018), indirect strategies are generally connected to encouraging and managing the learning of the target language with no obvious involvement. It consists of metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. Metacognitive strategies enable learners to govern their intellectual capacities through learning, tracking self-planning, as well as self-assessment (Maqbool, Ismail, & Maqbool, 2020). It is also related to a level of consciousness that learners have, in which they are aware of their learning needs yet feel overwhelmed and unclear about things to do (Anderson, 2002; Ho & Ng, 2016). The second type of indirect strategy is affective strategies. It refers to emotions, mindsets, motivation, opinions, and the development of learners' self-confidence (Oxford, 1990). The third subcategory is social strategies, which improve communication along with raising empathetic consciousness. Learning language requires a large quantity of communication between people to be a competent language user (Iamudom & Tangkiengsirisin, 2020).

Oxford's classification has been praised as the predominant and thorough taxonomy in investigating language learning strategies (Ranjan & Philominraj, 2020). A further analysis mentioned that the classifications provided a specific attribute to the cognizance of each item in the LLS (Sepasdar & Soori, 2014), and such qualities create a strong understanding of each category (Chen, 2014).

2.3 Related Studies on LLS

Numerous researches in the field have proven the success in identifying learners' learning strategies that could help teachers in their pedagogy as well as the learners' language learning process (Jalal, 2015; Mohammadipour et al., 2018; Nasir et al., 2016; Balci & Ügüten, 2018; Oflaz, 2019). Iamudom and Tangkiengsirisin (2020) emphasised the importance of introducing learners to LLS permitting them to choose and experiment with the strategies that are appropriate for them. Identifying LLS among high and low proficiency helps the low proficiency students to evaluate their weaknesses and sharpen their recent learning strategies (Khandari, Setiyadi, & Nurweni, 2015; Nazri et al., 2016). Apart from that, it is found that some strategies such as metacognitive and compensation strategies contribute more to the performance of pupils than other strategies (Sepasdar & Soori, 2014; Chen, 2014; Viriya & Sapsirin, 2014). Enhancing student awareness of the LLS would strengthen their learning process (Tahang et al., 2019; Kaur & Embi, 2011) and LLS is an opportunity to adapt learning the skills among learners (Wong & Nunan, 2011).

In Cambodia, Nhem (2019) investigated learning strategies used by 73 young learners and revealed that most learners employed cognitive and affective strategies the least. Nhem proposed that instructors and school administrators provide training on LLS, which students rarely use in his study, to help strengthen their learning skills. However, Tezcan and Deneme (2015) revealed that learners used metacognitive, social, and affective strategies the most in their study to 111 ESL learners in Turkey. Despite raising awareness among teachers, they advised a properly constructed language learning environment to promote the natural interest of learners in language acquisition.

Research conducted by Sepasdar and Soori (2014) and Chen (2014) on LLS has also demonstrated an exhilarating discovery when the results suggest that the choice of LLS is impacted by age in language attainment. Sepasdar and Soori (2014), identified 4 four distinct ages and their preferred learning strategies among 94 Iranian EFL students. Their study demonstrated that 10 to 12 years old learners employed metacognitive strategies the most while the 13 to 22 years old learners employed compensation strategies the most, Hence, teachers should reflect on the preferences of age groups to employ LLS and modify their teaching to suit the need of students in language acquisition. Chen (2014) who performed a study on 1,023 students in Taiwan, also found similar findings on the influence of age on learners' choice of LLS. The results in Chen (2014) revealed that the increase in age is likely to encourage students to utilize different strategies which shows that teachers must be more sensitive to their student

differences and employ flexibility in diversifying educational activities to match with the latter's developmental requirements.

A growing body of literature has also examined the use of LLS between the types of school (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Owusu & Cobbold, 2020; Ras, Mahdum, & Masyhur, 2014; Gavriilidou & Petrogiannis, 2016; Vimalakshan & Aziz, 2021). The learning environment of schools has an impact on learners' learning as well as language learning (Kamaruddin, 2006). Several schools are greater and more effective than others, and the school that students attend can have a substantial impact on their academic performance. Oxford and Nyikos (1989) discovered a strong relationship between an individual's usage of LLS and institutional environment, which, in this study, is related to the environment concerning the type of school attended by learners. The study argues that pupils' type of school influences their LLS.

Owusu and Cobbold (2020) emphasize that school type is an environmental factor associated with the choice of LLS among learners. In their study of 668 final year economics students from 18 public and six private schools in the Central Region of Ghana, they discovered that the school type explains a considerable portion of the diversity in the learners' LLS. The findings revealed no significant difference, however, learners in public schools reported using more strategies than learners in private schools.

The fact that the type of school is one of the main factors influencing LLS among students was also echoed in a study conducted by Ras et al. (2014). They researched the usage of LLS to 400 high school students in Riau, Indonesia, and discovered that there is no significant difference between 200 students in state school and 200 students in private school. From the data, they concluded that the private learners used more strategies compared to the state learners. They also discovered that private learners use metacognitive strategies the most, while state learners preferred social strategies the most. Hence, they agreed that the type of school is one of the major factors influencing LLS among students.

Gavriilidou and Petrogiannis (2016) identified a substantial difference in LLS between 3348 mainstream school learners and 1584 minority school learners in Greece and demonstrated higher mean scores in all types of LLS. Both learners employ metacognitive the most, however, the minority learners reported using metacognitive strategies at a higher frequency compared to the counterpart. They concluded that the type of school had a significant impact on the learners' reported LLS. They discovered that children in minority schools are bilingual, and in some cases trilingual, and strive to learn their second language for social adjustment reasons, they employ more strategies to assist in finding sources as well as materials to efficiently absorb information, particularly in linguistics.

Interestingly, several studies conducted in Malaysia only examined the frequency of LLS use by learners. Vimalakshan and Aziz (2021) in their study of 60 Form 1 secondary school learners from varied primary schools in Klang district in Selangor where 20 students were from national school, 20 students from Tamil national type school, and another 20 students were from Chinese national type school. The result indicates that the learners from different school-type employ different types of strategies. National primary and Tamil national type school learners preferred metacognitive strategies the most while Chinese national type school SJKC learners employed compensation strategies the most. Hence, they suggested teachers in secondary schools have a suitable criterion in narrating essays to pupils in national-type schools as they are remarkably striving narrative writing or an essay.

There have been very few studies, notably in Malaysia, that focus on LLS usage between schools, particularly those including CSE schools. Hence, this is an opportunity to get more information on LLS use between different types of school students that possibly help learners in their language learning as the input from the recent study is believed benefit several parties, especially teachers and students themselves. Much research has shown the crucial advantages of identifying LLS. Its role is critical in scaffolding teachers' teaching and learning, as well as enabling students to be effective language learners. Undeniably, the significance of applying it in the classroom not only to the students but also to the teachers of L2 worldwide. The characteristic of LSS themselves help improve the learners' communicative competence in a condition that is performed correctly in the classroom. Hence, this research is an epiphany for teachers to introduce LLS to their learners. Teachers are also encouraged to employ it in the classroom to promote effective learners. If teachers can do so, not only will it help in their teaching but also cater to learners' needs in learning the language.

2.4 National Primary School in Malaysia

In Malaysia, there are two main types of national primary schools: national and vernacular primary schools. National primary schools consist of students from a variety of ethnicities, for vernacular schools are Tamil national-type schools, where students are primarily Tamil, and Chinese national-type schools, where students are primarily Chinese. In the subsidy context, national schools are government wholly administered and affiliated, whereas national-type schools are either wholly owned by the government or government-aided. For the government-aided national-type schools, the government is accountable for the school core curriculum, teachers, and operations. Besides, the school premises and properties are owned by the ethnic group in the area and the institutional assets are protected by the nominated executive

committee. The reason behind the different types of national primary schools is to cater to the homogeneity in language and demographic factors (Malaysia Education Plan 2013-2025). National primary schools are basically considered as a multilingual national school system that consists of learners from multiple races as aspired in Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025, that from the interaction of diversity of background, contributes to the student's acceptance and understanding of differences. Hence, the respondents from national primary schools or non-CSE in this study comprised the learners from Malay-medium of instruction schools with a combination of multi-races such as Malay, Iban, China, India, and Bidayuh.

2.5 Cluster School of Excellence (CSE)

In a sixth strategic thrust of the Education Development Master Plan (EDMP) 2006-2010, the Malaysian Ministry of Education launched the Cluster Schools of Excellence (CSE) as a merit system for its educational institutions (Ismail & Abdullah, 2011, 2012). In this thrust, some exceptional schools have been selected and acknowledged for their great accomplishment in specific fields (Ismail & Abdullah, 2011). The initiative aims to improve the quality of schools and to produce great students in Malaysian schools (Malaklunthu & Shamsudin, 2011) as well as to reach internationally acknowledged world-class standards. Despite being accorded with autonomy to lead schools from the sources of manpower to the assets, the cluster schools are not to be recognized as the finest schools in the country but its existence for advancement the quality of education and boosting school performance in national education (Nor, Hamzah, & Razak, 2019). This is an indicator that the cluster school presence within the same or other clusters is a role model of its kind.

In addition, it is envisioned that students in CSE become role models to other students as they are expected to excel in academics as well as co-curricular and become superior personalities in all fields involved. Simultaneously, the success of students in co-curricular performance is often included as one of the aspects that make up the school (Bhattacharyya, 2015). Thus, school administration needs to offer students space and the chance to organize, control, and manage events and activities both at the school level, domestically, and internationally to attain ongoing excellence in co-curricular work (Ismail & Abdullah, 2011). As academic and co-curricular performance need to be excelled and maintained, the students themselves have to design a plan, manage and perform effectively in their fields. Thus, it is no surprise that students in such a competitive environment can perform at the best of their ability in both academic and co-curricular programs. The substantial characteristics of CSE schools'

students encourage the researcher to take CSE students to be part of the research population to identify their learning strategies in language

3.0 RESEARCH DESIGN

This descriptive research employed a survey method to collect data. Since this research intended to examine the use of LLS based on the respondents' type of school, using the survey method is the best method to be used as it could guarantee the accuracy, trustworthy as well as valid data (Neuman, 2014). Fifty items in the questionnaire was distributed primarily to the identified schools via Google form.

3.1 Respondents

The respondents of this study were ESL learners who were selected through stratified random sampling among the Year 5 pupils in the CSE school and non-cluster schools in Samarahan District. Since there are only two CSE schools in the district, both schools are considered as population. Thus, the researchers choose only one non-cluster school representing a similar CSE school population. Table 2 shows the total respondents by their type of school.

Table 2: Number and percentage of respondents by type of school

Type of School	Number of respondents	Percentage
Cluster School of Excellence (CSE)	56	50%
Non-cluster school (Non-CSE)	56	50%
Total	112	100%

3.2 Data Collection Instrument

The primary tool for data collection in this study is a survey by Oxford (1990) called Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), which is widely used to examine LLS used by students (Habók & Magyar, 2018). Apart from that, the alpha coefficients also indicated .94 hence showing a highly reliable inventory, where alpha values that fall on a range between 0.93–0.94 are considered as an excellent instrument (Taber, 2018). Thus, the reliability of an instrument is indicated through its greater volume of validity in its value. Table 3 explains how the questionnaire is separated into six categories.

Table 3: Total items in the questionnaire

	Strategies	Number of items
Part A	Memory Strategies	8 items
Part B	Cognitive Strategies	9 items
Part C	Compensation Strategies	6 items
Part D	Metacognitive Strategies	8 items
Part E	Affective Strategies	6 items
Part F	Social Strategies	6 items
	TOTAL	50 items

The instrument applied a 5-point Likert scale to demonstrate the amount to which respondents support or oppose various assertions depending on their knowledge and understanding of LLS. The description is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Likert-scale description for each language learning strategy statement

Description	Assisting description	Code
Never or almost never true	0-20%	1
Usually not true	21-40%	2
Somewhat true	41-60%	3
Usually true	61-80%	4
Always or almost always true	81-100%	5

In this questionnaire, the researcher supplemented assisting descriptions in percentages to help respondents to differentiate the frequency. This assisted learners to choose their preferences.

3.3 Procedure and Analysis of Data Collection

The 50 items SILL questionnaire was administered through the distribution of e-questionnaires where the respondents needed to fill the questionnaire in the Google Form after permission from school administration, teachers, and parents were granted. Then, a Google Meet session was conducted with the respondents at an agreed particular time after parents' or guardians' consensus is achieved. The session was done to read and explain each item in the questionnaire to the respondents. The estimated time of completing the questionnaire is approximately 20 to 30 minutes. Respondents were told of their involvement, at the same time their privacy and confidentiality in the research were ensured, without any repercussions on their grades. The session was conducted within two consecutive days. SPSS Version 25 descriptive analysis was

used to analyse the data. It encouraged replies for the investigation to recognize the respondents' general use of LLS as well as to find the most commonly employed approach among young CSE and non-CSE learners through the frequency and independent sample t-test. To identify the learning strategies used, the mean score was interpreted.

4.0 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Oxford (1990) suggested a standard criterion to understand the average mean scores to understand the average mean scores. Three frequency criteria were employed to measure the degree to which strategies were used and labelled as frequency and presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Mean scores interpretation for the SILL

Frequency	Use of Strategies	Mean Scores
High (H)	Always or almost always used	4.5 to 5.0
	Usually used	3.5 to 4.4
Medium (M)	Sometimes used	2.5 to 3.4
Low (L)	Generally not used	1.5 to 2.4
	Never or almost never used	1.0 to 1.4

According to Wharton (2000), this standard criterion was regarded as the common statistical analysis of strategy use in the field of LLS research.

4.1 The Overall Language Learning Strategies

The descriptive information of Year 5 learners' using learning the overall SILL is displayed in Table 6. The overall strategy used ($M = 3.06$, $SD = .63$) demonstrated that the respondents utilised the learning strategies at a medium frequency.

Table 6: Overall strategy use of language learning strategies

	N	(M)	Frequency	(SD)
Overall Strategy Use	112	3.06	M	.63

The survey also revealed that non-CSE learners were higher users of LLS compared to CSE learners as shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Overall strategy use between type of school

Type of School	N	(M)	(SD)	Frequency
CSE	56	3.02	.62	M
Non-CSE	56	3.10	.64	M

Table 7 indicates the mean score of LLS by non-CSE learners ($M = 3.10$, $SD = .64$) was higher than mean score by CSE learners ($M = 3.02$, $SD = .62$). Apart from that, both CSE and non-CSE learners were reported as medium users of LLS in their learning of language.

4.2 The Use of Six Categories of LLS

The data for six categories of strategies across the type of school setting is displayed in Table 10. The table shows the mean scores for the strategies and revealed that both CSE and non-CSE learners employed metacognitive strategies the most. However, for the least use strategies, CSE learners employed compensation strategies while non-CSE learners employed affective strategies the least. Table 8 indicates the mean for the six categories of LLS based on the school type.

Table 8: Six categories of strategy used between type of school

Strategy Use	CSE				Non-CSE			
	(M)	(SD)	F	Rank	(M)	(SD)	F	Rank
Memory	3.07	.68	M	4	3.27	.67	M	2
Cognitive	3.12	.72	M	3	3.11	.66	M	4
Compensation	2.68	.72	M	6	2.88	.81	M	5
Metacognitive	3.28	.72	M	1	3.33	.83	M	1
Affective	2.81	.79	M	5	2.79	.82	M	6
Social	3.17	.76	M	2	3.20	.80	M	3

CSE and non-CSE learners reported to use metacognitive strategies the most (CSE; $M = 3.28$, $SD = .72$, non-CSE; $M = 3.33$, $SD = .83$), which made it the most commonly used strategy by both learners. Followed by social strategies ($M = 3.17$, $SD = .76$) by the CSE learners, however, the non-CSE learners preferred memory strategies ($M = 3.25$, $SD = .68$) as their second most widely used strategy. The third most used strategy by CSE learners is cognitive strategies ($M = 3.12$, $SD = .72$), and for non-CSE learners are social strategies ($M = 3.19$, $SD = .80$). For the fourth rank of strategies, CSE learners preferred memory strategies ($M = 3.07$, $SD = .68$) while

for non-CSE learners is cognitive strategies ($M = 3.10$, $SD = .66$). The second infrequently used strategies by CSE learners is affective strategies ($M = 2.81$, $SD = .80$) and for non-CSE learners is compensation strategies ($M = 2.86$, $SD = .82$). The most infrequently utilised category by CSE learners was compensation strategies ($M = 2.68$, $SD = .72$) while the least used strategies by the non-CSE learners is affective strategies ($M = 2.78$, $SD = .81$). The data also revealed that the six categories of the strategies show a medium (M) use of strategies by both CSE and non-CSE learners. In the current study, neither a high nor a low range of strategy use was discovered in any of the six categories of learning strategies. Further analysis showed that metacognitive was the most preferred strategies of the Year 5 primary school learners.

4.3 The Significant Difference in the Use of LLS Between Types of School

An independent sample t-test was used to determine whether the mean differences were significant and displayed in Table 9. The results of statistical test revealed that there was no significant difference in the mean scores for CSE learners ($M = 3.02$, $SD = .62$), and non-CSE learners ($M = 3.10$, $SD = .64$); ($t = -.629$, $p = .531$). The magnitude of the differences in the means was very small (eta squared = 0.003). The mean score of LLS by non-CSE learners ($M = 3.10$, $SD = .62$) was higher than mean score by CSE learners ($M = 3.02$, $SD = .64$). The results also revealed that non-CSE respondents outperformed the CSE respondents on the overall SILL based on the means scores.

Table 9: Independent sample T-test of the overall use of LLS between type of school

	School	N	(M)	(SD)	t-Value	Sig.
LLS	CSE	56	3.02	.62	-.629	.531
	Non-CSE	56	3.10	.64		

It is possible to conclude that there was no significant difference in the use of LLS between CSE and non-CSE learners and the type of school variable did not affect language learning use in English.

This research first explored the LLS preferences of young ESL learners based on school type. Base on the school type, a frequency analysis was undertaken to identify the most used LSS among young learners. The analysis revealed that both CSE and non-CSE learners employed metacognitive strategies the most. The results in Table 10 substantiate previous findings in the literature as it is consistent with previous results (Tezcan & Deneme, 2015) where the learners used metacognitive and social strategies the most. Further tests carried out

by Sepasdar and Soori (2014) and Chen (2014) concurred with the current findings that agreed on the young learners aged 11 years old employed metacognitive as the most used strategies in learning the language. As reported by Tezcan and Deneme (2015), metacognitive strategies were widely employed by the young ESL learners in Edirne, Turkey which was comparable to the current research. Although these studies were conducted on various levels of learners, such as university learners (Simsek & Balaban, 2010; Nasir et al., 2016), primary or secondary school learners (Sepasdar & Soori, 2014; Chen, 2014), the findings seem to indicate that these students used mostly metacognitive strategies. In other words, despite their educational levels spanning from primary to tertiary, learners have acknowledged the necessity of metacognitive strategies in their language learning processes. This is in good agreement with Ho and Ng (2016), the tendency for the employment of metacognitive strategies may be related to Malaysia's exam-oriented education system. Due to their desire to achieve in tests, learners are implicitly pushed to prepare, manage and observe the process of learning the English language.

There is a strong probability that the findings indicating metacognitive strategy as the most favoured language learning strategies suggested that these young ESL learners were aware of the value of the strategy. It is plausible to assume that the learners were aware of the need to monitor, plan, and manage their learning because these strategies provide the necessary support for them to be more autonomous and effective in the language learning process, especially considering their age. Aside from that, students are more encouraged to monitor and assess their language acquisition to achieve good grades as proposed by Ho and Ng (2016). They proposed that the usage of metacognitive strategies may be related to their motivation to study English to improve their academic performance.

Surprisingly, this current research revealed that the non-CSE used more strategies compared to the CSE students as the CSE learners are exposed to an outstanding environment due to the merit system awarded to the particular school. This finding is supported by Vimalakshan and Aziz (2021), who found that learners in national primary schools employed more learning strategies than those in Chinese and Tamil national-type schools. This demonstrates that the diversity of races among learners in national schools influenced their selections and frequency of use of LLS in their language achievement. Apart from that, as there was very little research done to investigate the use of LLS among the type of school in Malaysia, thus the researchers concluded that the sociocultural environment among non-CSE students led to the higher frequency of the use of LLS in their language learning. It is found that the students in the selected non-CSE schools were composed of a combination of many races such as Malay, Chinese, Iban, Melanau, and other minority races in Sarawak. This caused

the students to employ a higher frequency of LLS in consideration of this racial diversity that leads to communication enforcement as well as language acquisition. Compared to the students in CSE school in this study, the researchers found that there are only two types of races among them such as Malay and Melanau, where Malay is the dominant language. This grounds them to only interact with each other without having to mix with friends from other races where higher social adjustments are needed. This finding is supported in Gavriilidou and Petrogiannis (2016) where minority learners reported using a higher frequency compared to the mainstream learners due to the social adjustments. The fact that the minority is mostly multilingual, hence, they struggle to grasp the second language as to adapt to the social needs. Hence, they employ a greater frequency of strategies to assist in finding sources to absorb linguistic information efficiently.

Although there is very little research done on examining the significant difference in the use of LLS between school types, there is a board of research that indicates there are discrepancies in the frequency of LLS employed by learners according to the school type. The current study revealed that non-CSE learners used strategies more frequently than CSE learners, despite the lack of a statistically significant difference. This is in line with previous research (Gavriilidou & Petrogiannis, 2016; Vimalakshan & Aziz, 2021). Gavriilidou and Petrogiannis (2016) identified a substantial difference in LLS between mainstream school learners and minority school learners in Greece and demonstrated higher mean scores in all types of LLS. Vimalakshan and Aziz (2021) in their study of students to national and vernacular primary schools indicates that the learners from different school-type employ a different type of strategies. Hence, they suggested teachers in secondary schools have a suitable criterion in narrating essays to pupils in national-type schools as they are remarkably striving in the aspect of preparing narrative writing or an essay.

The learning environment of schools has an impact on learners' learning as well as language learning. This is echoed in Kamaruddin (2006) where he stated that some schools are more productive than others and the school that pupils attend has a significant impact on their educational performance. In a correlation study, Oxford and Nyikos (1989) discovered a strong relationship between an individual's usage of LLS and institutional environment, which, in this study, is related to the environment concerning the type of school attended by learners. According to research, the type of school that pupils attend influences their LLS. Owusu and Cobbold (2020) in their study emphasized that school type is an environmental factor associated with the choice of LLS among learners. In their study of economics students from public and private schools in Ghana, they discovered that the school type explains a

considerable portion of the diversity in the learners' LLS. The study sought to ascertain how individual factors (gender and learning preference), enthusiasm, and school factors (teaching technique, school type, and students' status) foresee the employment of a specific LLS to improve the learning of their students. The findings revealed that there is no statistically significant difference, however, learners in public schools reported using more strategies than learners in private schools.

5.0 CONCLUSION

Based on the outcomes of the study, it can be concluded that studies on the LLS applied by learners in different types of school can open up myriad perspectives among educational practitioners and curriculum designers to improve learner's language learning. Besides, this research can lead to other exploration of inclusive pedagogical concerns like Sarawak teachers for Sarawak students, as suggested by culturally responsive pedagogy where learning tends to be more responsive if shared cultural beliefs and understanding are observed. The current study provides insights on ways the Year 5 learners used to learn and practice the language. The study revealed that the vast majority of respondents indicated metacognitive strategies work the best for them in developing their English language proficiency. It can be said that educators need to initiate interactions and interactive language teaching in class to create a more positive and meaningful learning and teaching environment. Therefore, gaining the perspectives from the learners of the present study about their strategies in language learning stimulates educators and researchers to know how they can go about learning and improving the students' proficiency level of English language. These, in turn, will assist other language learners in ways to develop their competency and proficiency level in English language in the most sufficient and efficient ways.

There are implications towards various stakeholders such as curriculum planners, teachers as well as educators. This research has proven that learners favour metacognitive, social and memory strategies. This implies that the English curriculum should be metacognitive, social, and memory-based. Besides, the findings allow teachers, educators, and curriculum planners to understand which overall strategies are used by young learners hence reflecting upon their current teaching approach. Also, teachers can design, develop or assign a task that could drive the learners to their optimum ability in learning language and implement suitable learning strategies that cater to the needs of every student as regards to the type of school the learners attend. Finally, the teacher's role is to introduce and explain the benefit of

LLS in language acquisition. LLS knowledge can make a major difference to the teacher in their teaching and the learners in their learning.

Because of the multiple benefits to language learners, there are some recommendations as to uplift the use of LLS. Promoting awareness among learners about the importance of LLS is critical to the success of learning acquisition. Raising student understanding of the various learning strategies and their benefits assists learners in becoming extra optimistic about language attainment and effective learners. This is due to the fact that a larger collection of LLS and their regular use leads to more efficient learning. As a result, even if the pupils are young, teachers should broaden their repertoire of LLS, use it and merit from current strategies. Consequently, they must create a prosperous environment in which learning strategies are vigorously applied inside or outside the classroom. It encourages dynamic participation in the teaching and learning process by using a range of learning strategies.

As the study is limited in sample size and the participants' homogeneity, potential research encompassing a broader range of diverse national primary school types should be carried out to expand the validation of LLS identified in the current research. Forthcoming LLS research possibly will investigate the fresh viewpoint in teaching technique, the existence of distinct variables, and by what means these variables may improve or aid strategies, potentially leading to new insights. Once these strategies have been proven, additional successful programme strategies for ESL learners in Malaysia can be developed.

REFERENCES

- Ab Rahman, F., Mohamed, A. H., Nasir, N. S. A., & Saidin, K. (2020). Exploring perceptions of employers on communication skills among fresh graduates. *Practitioner Research*, 1(1), 69-85.
- Al-Qahtani, M. F. (2013). Relationship between English language, learning strategies, attitudes, motivation, and students' academic achievement. *Education in Medicine Journal*, 5(3), 19-29.
- Anderson, N. J. (2002). *The role of metacognition in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 4646). ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.
- Ang, S., Embi, M. A., & Yunus, M. M. (2017). Strategies of successful English language learners among private school students. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 5(2), 47-57.
- Balci, Ö., & Ügüten, S. D. (2018). The relationship between EFL learners' language learning strategy use and achievement. *International Education Studies*, 11(2), 1-12.

- Bayuon, P. D., Hashim, H., & Yunus, M. M. (2019). Identifying language learning strategies used by ESL learners in a rural primary school. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 8(3), 151-165.
- Bhattacharyya, E. (2015). Voice of cluster school students' on educational excellence: Programs, practices, challenges and the way forward for the 21st century. *The Social Sciences*, 10(6), 1503-1509.
- Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues 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.
- Chen, M. L. (2014). Age differences in the use of language learning strategies. *English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 144-151.
- Chilkiewicz, K. (2015). Direct language learning strategies in the theory by Rebecca Oxford in English vocabulary acquisition at the age group of 11-12 year olds. *World Scientific News*, 1(1), 179-206.
- Cohen, A. D. (1999). Strategies in learning and using a second language. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 3(4), 269-298.
- David, A. R., Thang, S. M., & Azman, H. (2015). Accommodation low proficiency ESL students' language learning needs through an online writing support system. *e-Bangi, Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 12(1), 118-127.
- Fathi-Ashtiani, A., Hasani, M., Nabipoor-Ashrafi, S. M., Ejei, J., & Azadfallah, P. (2007). Comparison of learning strategies in successful and unsuccessful students. *Archives of Medical Science* 3(2), 164-169.
- Gani, S. A., Fajrina, D., & Rizaldy, H. (2015). Students' learning strategies for developing speaking ability. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 2(1), 17-29.
- Gavriilidou, Z., & Petrogiannis, K. (2016). Language learning strategy use of English FL learners in Greek schools: The role of school type and educational level. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 5(4), 67-81.
- Gerami, M. H., & Baighlou, S. M. G. (2011). Language learning strategies used by successful and unsuccessful Iranian EFL students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29(1), 1567-1576.
- Giang, B. T. K., & Tuan, V. V. (2018). Language learning strategies of Vietnamese EFL freshmen. *Arab World English Journal*, 9(3), 61-83.

- Habók, A., & Magyar, A. (2018). The effect of language learning strategies on proficiency, attitudes and school achievement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(2358), 1-8.
- Ho, A. P., & Ng, L. L. (2016). Gender-based differences in language learning strategies among undergraduates in a Malaysian public university. *Issues in Language Studies*, 5(2), 1-17.
- Hu, R. (2016). The age factor in second language learning. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(11), 2164-2168.
- Iamudom, T., & Tangkiengsirisin, S. (2020). A comparison study of learner autonomy and language learning strategies among Thai EFL learners. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(2), 199-212.
- Ismail, A., & Abdullah, A. G. (2011). Cluster schools for diverse students' needs in Malaysia: A system view. *International Journal of Education*, 3(2), 1-13.
- Ismail, A., & Abdullah, A. G. (2012). A journey to excellence: A case of Ulu Lubai national primary school in Limbang Sarawak, Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 69(1), 1309-1313.
- Jalal, K. (2015). *Comparison of language learning strategies of Iranian college level students in EFL and ESL settings*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Malaya.
- Kamaruddin, K. (2006). Management of effective schools in Malaysia: Issues and challenges. *Journal Of Global Bussiness Management*, 1(1), 1-9.
- Kaur, M., & Embi, M. A. (2011). The relationship between language learning strategies and gender among primary school students. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 1(10), 1432-1436.
- Khandari, A., Setiyadi, A. B., & Nurweni, A. (2015). Identifying learning strategies between successful and unsuccessful learners in reading comprehension. *UNILA Journal of English Teaching*, 4(6), 1-11.
- Kim, D. (2020). Learning language, learning culture: Teaching language to the whole student. *ECNU Review of Education*, 3(3), 519-541.
- Lee, C. K. (2010). An overview of language learning strategies. *Annual Review of Education, Communication & Language Sciences*, 7(1), 132-152.
- Lee, H. Y., & Samuel, M. (2020). Decentralised centralism: Insights from a Malaysian cluster school of excellence. *Journal of International and Comparative Education*, 9(1), 29-43.
- Malaklolunthu, S., & Shamsudin, F. (2011). Challenges in school-based management: Case of a 'cluster school' in Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15(1), 1488-1492.

- Maqbool, S., Ismail, S. A. M. M., & Maqbool, S. (2020). Language learning strategies for Gen Z ESL learners as digital natives. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(8), 3439-3448.
- Mohammadipour, M., Rashid, S. M., Rafik-Galea, S., & Thai, Y. N. (2018). The relationships between language learning strategies and positive emotions among Malaysian ESL. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 6(1), 86-96.
- Nasir, C., Yusuf, Y. Q., & Zulfarlia, R. (2016). Language learning strategies employed by successful and less successful learners. *Proceedings of AICS-Social Sciences*, 6(1), 323-327.
- Nazri, N. M., Yunus, M. M., & Nazri, N. D. M. (2016). Through the lens of good language learners: What are their strategies? *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(1), 195-202.
- Nemati, A. (2009). Memory vocabulary learning strategies and long-term retention. *International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education*, 1(2), 014-024.
- Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Nhem, D. (2019). Language learning strategies: A comparative study of young and adolescent Cambodian learners. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 1(2), 34-45.
- Nor, M. S. M., Hamzah, M. I., & Razak, K. A. (2019). Cluster schools of excellence: Concept and implementation. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 8(3), 118-125.
- Oflaz, A. (2019). The effects of anxiety, shyness and language learning strategies on speaking skills and academic achievement. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 8(4), 999-1011.
- Osman, W. H., & Murdad, R. (2020). Graduate employability in Sabah's agriculture sector perception and expectation of employers and graduates. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(6), 10747-10767.
- Owusu A. A., & Cobbold, C. (2020). Factors that influence learning strategy use among senior high school economics students in Ghana: A quantitative approach. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 19(5), 167-185.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

- Oxford, R., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(3), 291-300.
- Platsidou, M., & Kantaridou, Z. (2014). The role of attitudes and learning strategy use in predicting perceived competence in school-aged foreign language learners. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 5(3), 253-260.
- Rachmawati, Y. (2013). Language learning strategies used by learners in learning speaking. *Journal of English and Education*, 1(2), 124-131.
- Ranjan, R., & Philominraj, A. (2020). Language learning strategies, motivation and gender in foreign language context. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(2), 591–604.
- Ras, F., Mahdum, M., & Masyhur, M. (2014). Language learning strategies used by successful students of senior high schools in Dumai, Bengkalis, and Selat Panjang Riau province. *Proceedings of ISELT FBS Universitas Negeri Padang*, 2(1), 137-146.
- Reka Naidu, C. K. (2018). *Gender differences in the use of language learning strategies among ESL students*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Malaya.
- Saad, N. S. M., Sidek, H. H. M., Baharun, H., Idrus, M. M., & Yunus, M. M. (2016). A conceptual framework to explore the English language learning experiences of international students in Malaysia. *International E-Journal of Advances in Education*, 2(6), 453-464.
- Sani, S., & Ismail, H. H. (2021). Assessing the use of learning strategies among young Malaysian English as second language learners. *Creative Education*, 12(1), 2124-2145.
- Sepasdar, M., & Soori, A. (2014). The impact of age on using language learning strategies. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 2(3), 26-31.
- Simsek, A., & Balaban, J. (2010). Learning strategies of successful and unsuccessful university students. *Contemporary Education Technology*, 1(1), 36-45.
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's Alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in Science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(1), 1273–1296.
- Tahang, H., Sarmin, S., Yuliana, Y., & Taslim, T. (2019). Language learning strategies employed by successful students in developing English-speaking performance. *Qalam: Jurnal Ilmu Kependidikan*, 7(1), 56-65.
- Tezcan, S., & Deneme, S. (2015). A study on language learning strategy use of young Turkish learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(1), 42-48.
- Ting, S. H., Marzuki, E., Chuah, K. M., Misieng, J., & Jerome, C. (2017). Employers' view on the importance of English proficiency and communication skills for employability in Malaysia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 215-327.

- Vimalakshan, S., & Aziz, A. A. (2021). Investigating language learning strategies used by ESL lower secondary learners from national and vernacular school background. *International Journal of New Technology and Research*, 7(1), 41-47.
- Viriya, C., & Sapsirin, S. (2014). Gender differences in language learning style and language learning strategies. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 77-88.
- Wan Mahzan, M. S., Alias, N. A., & Ismail, I. S. (2020). Investigating the needs of developing a digital vocabulary learning material for Malaysian indigenous learners in ESL classroom. *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, 5(2), 282-302.
- Weng, P. L. P., Yunus, M. M., & Embi, M. A. B. (2016). Successful language learning strategies used by successful year 5 English as a second language (ESL) learners. *Proceedings of the ICECRS*, 1(1), 539-538.
- Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning*, 50(1), 203-243.
- Wong, L. L., & Nunan, D. (2011). The learning styles and strategies of effective language learners. *System*, 39(2), 144-163.
- Yunus, M. M., Sulaiman, N. A., & Embi, M. A. (2013). Malaysian gifted students' use of English language learning strategies. *English Language Teaching*, 6(4), 97-109.
- Zare, P. (2012). Language learning strategies among EFL/ESL learners: A review of literature. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(5), 162-169.
- Zhou, Y. (2010). English language learning strategy use by Chinese senior high school students. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 152-158.
- Zukiflei, K., & Said, N. E. M. (2020). Language attitude among Malaysian secondary school. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 10(6), 841-855.