



## **A Comparison between Male and Female Students' Language Learning Strategies Preference**

**Muhammad Fauzan Ansyari\*, Hasni Rahmi\*\***

\*English Education Department,  
State Islamic University Sultan Syarif Kasim of Riau,  
[m.f.ansyari@gmail.com](mailto:m.f.ansyari@gmail.com)

\*\*English Education Department,  
State Islamic University Sultan Syarif Kasim of Riau,  
[harahmi@gmail.com](mailto:harahmi@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

*This research focuses on comparing the language learning strategies preference between male and female students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru. The aim of this research is to find out the language learning strategies of male students of the tenth grade at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru, to find out the language learning strategies of female students, and to find out whether there is or no a significant difference on language learning strategies preference between male and female students. A total of 90 male and 90 female students were participated in this research. They were taken from 45% of the total population. By using Simple Random Technique, 9 male and 9 female students were randomly taken from each class. The data were collected by using adapted SILL questionnaire version 7.0 translated to Bahasa Indonesia. By using Independent sample t-test formula on SPSS version 17 the collected data were analyzed. The findings show that both male and female students language learning strategies preference were Metacognitive Strategies, and there is no significant difference on the language learning strategies preference between male and female students in learning English at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru. Based on the data analysis, the researchers concluded that there is no significant difference on the language learning strategies preference between male and female of the tenth grade students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru in learning English.*

*Keywords: Language Learning Strategies, Preference, Gender, Adapted SILL Questionnaire version 7.0, Senior High School.*

## 1. Introduction

Learning English as a foreign language is having some problems and difficulties because the social and situation of where English is used do not support the learners to communicate in English in their daily life situation. While to have successful language learning, learners are demanded to master four language skills namely speaking, writing, reading and listening, and language components such as grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, etc. thus language learners need strategy to help them master the language, and manage their own learning.

Learning strategies are parts of a larger system included in the process of learning and acquisition of a second or a foreign language. Oxford (1990:8) states that, "language learning strategies are specific actions taken by the learners to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferrable to new situations". According to her, the use of these strategies are influenced by a variety of factors such as degree of awareness, stage of learning task requirements, teacher expectations, age, sex, nationality, general learning style, personality traits, motivation level, and purpose for learning the language.

Learners are inevitably variable. They have certain ways in learning and figuring something out. When learning a foreign language, they use a number of different strategies serving as a tool that helps them to independently master it. Many of them may not even be aware of the strategies they are using as it has become a natural and automatic process for them. And the use of these strategies will not be the same among them, because their individual differences such as gender, age, learning style, motivation, previous experience in language learning, and learner's belief.

Therefore, Cohen and Dörnyei (2002 cited in Obzori) said that the most important individual differences among learners relate to their age and gender.

A lot of researches conducted to find out the relationship between language learning strategies and genders. According to Oxford (1990), gender has significant influence on the language learning strategies use, female students use different strategies than male students, and female students use more strategies than male. Recent study by Aslan (2009) found that the most frequent used strategies of female student are Compensation Strategies, and male students are Metacognitive Strategies.

State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru is one of the state senior high schools in Pekanbaru that offers English to students as one of the subjects taught. In the process of teaching and learning English, State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru used Curriculum 2013. Based on Curriculum 2013, learning English is aiming at "developing communicative competence in oral and literal for the level of information" (BSNP 2013:308). Based on the preliminary study of the researchers on 10<sup>th</sup> July 2015 in State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru, especially for the tenth grade students, it is clear that some of the tenth grade students of State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru were encountering the problems and difficulties in learning English, especially in using appropriate language learning strategies.

The problem of the students can be seen in the following phenomena:

1. Some of the female students often used metacognitive strategy in learning English.
2. Some of the male and female students used the same strategy in learning.

3. Some of the male students often used compensation strategy in learning English.
4. Some of the male students were using more strategies in learning.

Based on the phenomena, it is clear that some of male and female students had a lot of problems in using appropriate language learning strategies in learning English. Considering the fact among the findings found by researchers about the preference of using language learning strategies are different among learners related to their gender, thus, the researchers are interested in researching the problems above into a research project to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the language learning strategies of male students of the tenth grade at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru in learning English?
2. What are the language learning strategies of female students?
3. Is there any significant difference on the language learning strategies preference between male and female students?

In respect to the research questions, the hypotheses for this research are formulated as follows:

Ha: There is a significant difference on the language learning strategies preference between male and female of the tenth grade students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru.

Ho: There is no significant difference on the language learning strategies preference between male and female of the tenth grade students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru.

## 2. Review of Literature

### a) The Individual Variables In Learning

Individuals are inevitably variable. They have certain learning styles and strategies, include in learning a foreign language. Griffiths (2008:94) believes that many factors construct the outcome of an individual's language learning; there are learner variables (such as aptitude, learning style, motivation, age, beliefs, culture, gender, personality, metacognition, or autonomy) and learning variables (such as vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, function, skills, teaching or learning method, strategy instruction, error correction, or task). All of these variables create unique pattern to each learners.

### b) The Nature of Language Learning Strategies

The language learning strategies are not newly created strategies, but have been used by ancient storytellers thousands of years ago. They used mnemonic tools to help remember the narrative. Nowadays, the language students use these and other strategies to develop communicative competence.

The definitions of the learning strategies have not been uniformly defined. Many experts have defined language learning strategies from different points of view. According to Wenden and Rubin (1987:19), language learning strategies are "any sets of operations, steps, plans, and routines used by learners to facilitate the obtaining storage, retrieval and use of information". While Richards and Platt (1992:209) say that "learning strategies are intentional behavior and thoughts that learners make use of during learning in order to better help them understand, learn, or remember new information".

Rigney (1987:165) states that learning strategies are “operations used by learner to facilitate the acquisition, retention, or retrieval of information”. While O’malley and Chamot (1990:1) defined learning strategies as “the special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information”. Then, Cohen (1990:4) states that “learning strategies are processes which are consciously selected by learners and which may result in actions taken to enhance the learning or use of a second or foreign language through the storage, retention, recall and application of information about that language.”

Moreover, learning strategies are defined by Oxford (1990:8) as “specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferrable to new situations.” These definitions show that the weight in foreign language teaching and learning is changing from teacher centered to learner centered instruction. And this change has brought language

learning strategies to the center of attention for some teachers.

According to Liang (2009:199), he states that:

Although each of these arguments describes learning strategies from a unique perspective, altogether they may have helped us get a general notion of what are learner strategies:

- Learning strategies are either behavioral thus observable, or mental then not observable.
- Learning strategies could be either general approaches or specific actions or techniques adopted to learn a Target Language (TL).
- Learners are generally aware of what approaches or techniques they have used in language learning, despite some subconscious activities under certain circumstances.

### c) The Features of Language Learning Strategies

Oxford lists twelve basic features of learning strategies that the strategies are oriented with the development of communication competence in a foreign language that includes interaction between learners.

*Table 1. The Features of Language Learning Strategies (Oxford, 1990:9)*

<b>Language Learning Strategies:</b>	
1.	Contribute to the main goal, communicative competence.
2.	Allow learners to become more self-directed.
3.	Expand the role of foreign language teachers.
4.	Are problem-oriented.
5.	Are specific actions taken by the learner.
6.	Involve many other aspects of learner, not just the cognitive.
7.	Support learning both directly and indirectly.
8.	Are not always observable.
9.	Are often conscious.
10.	Can be taught.
11.	Are flexible.
12.	Are influenced by a variety of factors.

#### **d) The Classification of Language Learning Strategies**

Oxford (1989) in her Strategies Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) emphasized six categories namely: Memory strategies (e.g., grouping, representing sounds in memory), cognitive Strategies (e.g., repeating, analyzing, getting the idea quickly and taking notes), compensation strategies (e.g., switching to the mother tongue, using other clues), metacognitive strategies (e.g., linking new information with already known one, self-monitoring), affective strategies (lowering anxiety by use of music, encouraging oneself and discussing feelings with others) and social strategies (asking for clarification, cooperating with others and developing cultural understanding).

In this research, the researchers will use Oxford's classifications of language learning strategies. According to Oxford, language learning strategies are divided in to two major classes: direct and indirect. These two classes are subdivided into a total of six groups (memory, cognitive, and compensation under direct class; metacognitive, affective, and social under the indirect class).

#### **e) The Research on Language Learning Strategies**

Research of foreign language learning strategies began in the nineteen seventies (Rubin, 1975; Savignon, 1972; Stern, 1975). During the eighties and the nineties, learning strategies became one of the most intriguing areas of study in foreign language learning (MacIntyre, 1994). The main research issues addressed by the researchers dealing with language learning strategies are related to the role of strategies in language acquisition, to the impact of strategies on language

teaching, and to the correlation and the comparison of strategies to other individual traits of learners, such as learning style, attitude towards learning, motivation, foreign language anxiety and other factors.

#### **f) The Language Learning Strategies Used Between Genders**

Learning strategies have been studied from different perspectives, based on which it was concluded that numerous individual variables affect the selection of learning strategies, such as gender, age, motivation for language learning, cognitive learning style, maturity level, previous experience in language learning, learner's beliefs and other factors. Therefore, Cohen and Dörnyei (2002) believe that the most important individual differences among learners relate to their age and gender. In line with the statements above, Nyikos (2008:78-79) states that the differences in language learning preferences between males and females, in some cases are statically significant.

The research carried out by Zimmerman and Pons (1990, *in* Lee & Oxford, 2008) has found that females use metacognitive strategies as planning and monitoring strategies. As regards gender differences in the use of learning strategies, some studies indicate that the connection between strategy use and gender appears to be blurred (Dadour & Robbins, 1996; Oh, 1996; Park, 1999 *in* Lee & Oxford, 2008).

The term gender is widespread used by people referring to male and female in social. Numerous empirical researches have shown that gender has a significant effect on the extent of strategy use. Females use learning strategies more often than males (Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Green & Oxford, 1995; Lan & Oxford, 2003; Lee & Oh, 2001; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995;

cited in Lee and Oxford, 2008:9). Results of the research carried out by Oxford *et al.* indicate that gender has a significant effect on the frequency of strategy use. The research findings indicate that females more frequently use memory, cognitive and social strategies.

Oxford and Nyikos (1989:291-300) examined the use of learning strategies on a sample of 1200 adult French, Spanish, Italian and German language learners and demonstrated that gender plays a decisive role in the selection of strategies. The research results show that females tend to deploy all types of strategies more frequently, which corresponds to the results of previous researches on the role of gender in foreign language learning. These findings were also replicated in the research conducted by Ehrman and Oxford (1989) on a sample of 78 adult learners, including students and professors at the faculties of philological studies. The languages covered by the research included Indonesian, Turkish, Italian, Hungarian and Arabic.

In accordance with the previous research, gender differences in the use of strategies were revealed. It was shown that female respondents used general learning strategies more often, and authentic strategies, strategies of getting and communicating meaning, as well as self-direction strategies were more frequently deployed by female respondents.

The research carried out by Zimmerman and Pons (1990, in Lee & Oxford, 2008) has found that females use metacognitive strategies as planning and monitoring strategies. As regards gender differences in the use of learning strategies, some studies indicate that the connection between strategy use and gender appears to be blurred (Dadour &

Robbins, 1996; Oh, 1996; Park, 1999 in Lee & Oxford, 2008).

Kaylani (1996:75-88) has found that male students differ from their female counterparts in the extent of strategy use. She has found that female students use memory, cognitive, compensation and affective strategies more frequently than male students and thus the correlation between gender and language proficiency has been established.

Dongyue (2004:5) carried out quite an interesting research on the correlation between language proficiency, gender and strategy use. The research findings indicate that there are statistically significant gender differences in memory, affective and overall strategy used by females. The results indicate that females are better at managing and controlling their emotions than their male counterparts. The author also points out that the difference in the frequency of strategy use between men and women may be affected by other variables such as ethnic background, cultural background and language learning environment.

Aslan (2009) has found a specific result of language learning strategies used between genders. He found that male students differ from female students in the extent of strategy use. He has found that Male prefer to use Metacognitive Strategies while female prefer to use Compensation Strategies. He also found that there is a significant difference between male and female preference in Metacognitive and Social Strategies in learning English.

In conclusion, according to (Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Green & Oxford, 1995; Lan & Oxford, 2003; Lee & Oh, 2001; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995; cited in Lee and Oxford, 2008:9), female students use more strategies than male students. The research findings by

Aslan indicate that males more frequently use Compensation, while males are more frequently use Metacognitive strategy.

#### **g) The Importance of Language Learning Strategies**

Chamot and Kupper (1989:13-24) says that there is a significant correlation between the use of various learning strategies applied by foreign language learners and their learning achievement. Hosenfeld (1977:117-129) also support the statement above, he said that, good language learners use a large number of effective learning strategies, unlike the less successful learners. Good learners are also able to select and combine strategies that are appropriate to the task. While Oxford and Crookall (1989:404-419) believes that successful learners combine certain cognitive strategies (translation, analysis, noting) with specific metacognitive strategies (self-evaluation, planning and organizing)

Nyikos (1987) cited in Gimeno (2002) says that less successful learners use fewer strategies, and their strategies are limited by the type of strategy. Often, less successful learners are not aware of the strategies they use. Then if a less successful learner is aware of his/her use of strategies, he/she can combine them and use them in a successful way. Stern conducted a very interesting study of good foreign language learners and identified learning strategies used by good learners. For good learners, according to Stern (1975), personal learning style, i.e. encouragement of positive learning strategies is of great importance, as well as an active approach to the learning task, a tolerant approach to the target language, and empathy with the speaker. Stern (1975) also mentioned the importance of the technical know-

how of how to tackle a language, the importance of experimentation and planning strategies in an attempt to develop the target language into an ordered system, and the willingness to constantly revise that system

Early studies of learning strategies are associated with the strategies used by good foreign language learners. Good language learners have a wide repertoire of learning strategies and use a series of strategies, rather than a single one, when engaged in a learning task. One fact is obvious – good language learners use a larger number of strategies in the process of foreign language learning, unlike not so successful learners (Rubin, 1975, Bialystok, 1979, *in* Gimeno, 2002; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; McDonough, 1999 and Skehan, 1989 *in* Harris and Grenfell, 2004:116-130).

It is necessary to emphasize the importance of learning strategy instruction (Oxford and Nyikos, 1989, *in* Gimeno, 2002). The importance of explicit strategy instruction is also highlighted by many researchers. Wenden (1998) believes that strategy training will be much more effective if learners are informed about the value and purpose, and a possible transfer to nonlinguistic tasks. A similar attitude is expressed by Oxford (1990), Cohen (1998), O'Malley and Chamot (1990) who stated that explicit strategy instruction involves the raising of students' awareness of the strategies they use, modeling of strategic thinking, naming of individual strategies, practice and student self-evaluation. The aim of explicit strategy instruction and the development of individualized strategy systems refer to the help provided to learners in raising their awareness of the strategies they already use and to the encouragement to develop a set of new,

adequate and effective strategies within a particular language context.

Another objective of strategy instruction is to encourage learner's autonomy and self direction, to enable learners to choose their own strategies in a spontaneous way, without constant teacher's intervention. Learners should be able to oversee and evaluate the effectiveness of strategy use and to develop problem-solving skills. The teacher can teach strategies and practice them, but each learner is individually responsible for the selection and implementation of an adequate strategy. A learner will select a strategy that suits him/her best and the focus is on how to learn and not what you learn. Oxford (1990) believes that the main purpose of strategic training is to make language learning effective, to foster team spirit among learners and teachers, to learning to learn language and how to practice strategies that raise self confidence.

Given the university settings of the current study, these links are viewed as being of particular relevance. The use of language learning strategies is consistently linked with language proficiency (Green & Oxford, 1995; Wharton, 2000). In general, it is agreed

that using language learning strategies has a positive impact on language proficiency. Apparently, good language learners orchestrate and combine their use of particular types of strategies in effective ways (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990).

## 2. Method

### a) Population and Sample

The population of this research was the tenth grade students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru in 2015/2016 academic year. It consisted of ten classes; with the number of population 394 students (188 male and 206 female students). The sample of this research was 90 male and 90 female students taken from ten classes. (9 male and 9 female students in each class) was taken by using simple random technique. According to Lohr (2009), it is used when every possible subset of *n* units in the population has the same chance of being the sample. Arikunto (2006:134), says that, "if the total population is more than 100, it is better to take 25% or more." In this research, the researcher took 45% from the total population of male and female.

Table 2. Sample of the Research

NO	Class	Population		Number of Population	Sample		Number of Sample (45%)
		Male	Female		Male (45%)	Female (45%)	
1	X MIA 1	18	21	39	9	9	18
2	X MIA 2	17	23	40	9	9	18
3	X MIA 3	17	22	39	9	9	18
4	X MIA 4	9	29	38	9	9	18
5	X MIA 5	23	17	40	9	9	18
6	X IIS 1	20	20	40	9	9	18
7	X IIS 2	20	19	39	9	9	18
8	X IIS 3	22	18	40	9	9	18
9	X IIS 4	26	13	39	9	9	18
10	X IIS 5	16	24	40	9	9	18
Total	10 Classes	188	206	394	90	90	180



**b) Instrumentation**

The adapted SILL questionnaire (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) version 7.0 by Oxford (1989) for ESL/EFL was used as the instrument of this research. It was adapted and translated to Bahasa Indonesia to measure the language learning strategies preference by the tenth grade students of State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru.

This questionnaire consisted of 50 items which are divided into six parts of strategies; Part A (Memory

Strategies), Part B (Cognitive Strategies), Part C (Compensation Strategies), Part D (Metacognitive Strategies), Part E (Affective Strategies), and Part F (Social Strategies). The responses of each item are based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5. (1= “Never or almost never true of me”, 2=“Usually not true of me”, 3= “Somewhat true of me”, 4=“Usually true of me”, 5= “Always or almost always true of me”). This scale is used to interpret the strategies preference level.

*Table 3. SILL Profile of Result (Oxford, 1989)*

High	Always or almost always used	4.5 to 5.0
	Usually used	3.5 to 4.4
Medium	Sometimes used	2.5 to 3.4
	Generally not used	1.5 to 2.4
Low	Never or almost never used	1.0 to 1.4

**c) Procedure**

The collected data of the adapted SILL questionnaire were analyzed by using descriptive statistic to show the general use of the students’ language learning strategies. Before analyzing the data, the students’ gender had to be coded into number for the statistical need. In this research the Male students was coded as “1”, while female students was coded as “2”. Then, the data were classified into its gender and group of strategies to find out the students’ strategies preference.

To answer the research question, the collected data were then analyzed in two steps by using independent sample T-Test formula of SPSS version 17.0. Firstly, the data were analyzed descriptively to find out the language learning strategies preference by male and female students in learning English. In this step the researchers used the first output of SPSS. Secondly, the data were analyzed comparatively to find out the significance difference on language learning strategies preference between

male and female students. In this step, the researchers used the second output of the SPSS.

**d) Validity and Reliability**

The SILL questioner has been extensively field-tested with a large number of respondents who are learning foreign languages in various settings for internal consistency, reliability and content validity of the items. The SILL appeared to be the only language learning strategy instrument whose reliability and validity have been extensively checked and results published. It is demonstrated to be highly valid and reliable, and used for both research and classroom practice (Oxford, 1990). Moreover, considering the social and culture situations of the respondents, a tryout is needed to check the reliability of the adapted SILL questionnaire. In line with the statement above, Pariani in Suryanto and Sutinah ed (2007:85) says, “In a social research although the questions on a questionnaire is already been internationally standardized valid and

reliable, the researcher should check its reliability by considering the social and culture situations of the respondents of research.” Thus, on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2016, the researchers administrated the adapted SILL questionnaire on 20 students of the tenth grade students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru. They were consisted of 10 male and 10 female students from the tenth grade natural science 5 (X MIA 5) and will not be taken as samples of the research. From the tryout, the researchers found that the reliability (Cronbach alpha) of the adapted SILL was 0.88 which means that it has a high reliability to be used as the instrument of this research.

### 3. Result

In this research, the researchers conducted three formulations of the research questions. The data were analyzed in two steps by using SPSS version 17.

#### a) Descriptive Analysis of Male and Female Students’ LLS Preference

In this step, the researchers provided the analyses on the language learning strategies preference in learning English between male and female students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru. The Independent sample T-Test formula of SPSS was used to analyze the data and the first output table was used to see the mean of the data.

*Table 4. Descriptive Analysis of Male and Female Students’ LLS Preference*

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
<b>Memory</b>	1	90	2.918	.5229	.0551
	2	90	2.948	.5724	.0603
<b>Cognitive</b>	1	90	3.014	.5381	.0567
	2	90	2.987	.6071	0.064
<b>Compensation</b>	1	90	3.312	.7582	.0799
	2	90	3.350	.7052	.0743
<b>Metacognitive</b>	1	90	3.331	.7145	.0753
	2	90	3.384	.6873	.0724
<b>Affective</b>	1	90	3.056	.5581	.0588
	2	90	3.301	.5644	.0595
<b>Social</b>	1	90	3.258	.6754	.0712
	2	90	3.260	.6925	.0730
<b>Overall</b>	1	90	3.108	.4741	.0500
	2	90	3.160	.5278	.0556

From the table above, the language learning strategies preference by male students were Metacognitive strategies (M=3.331). The next strategies were Compensation strategies (M=3.312), Social strategies (M=3.258), Affective strategies (M=3.056), Cognitive strategies (M= 3.014), and Memory strategies (M=2.918).

Meanwhile, the language learning strategies preference by female students were also Metacognitive strategies (M=3.384). The next strategies were Compensation strategies (M= 3.350), Affective strategies (M=3.301), social strategies (M= 3.260), Cognitive strategies (M= 2.987), and Memory Strategies (M= 2.948).

In overall strategies used, female students (M= 3.160) were using more language learning strategies in their learning English than the male students did (M=3.108). But, both of them were using language learning strategies in the same level of medium.

Furthermore, in order to find out the students' level of frequency of using

language learning strategies, the students' average of using Language learning strategies is then classified into some levels according to Oxford's SILL Profile of Result 1989. The summary of the students' preference levels of Language Learning Strategies are showed in the following table.

**Table 5. Male and Female Students' level of LLS**

Gender	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social	Overall
1	Mean 2.918	3.014	3.312	3.331	3.056	3.258	3.108
	Level Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
2	Mean 2.948	2.987	3.35	3.384	3.301	3.26	3.16
	Level Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium

In overall strategies used, female students (M= 3.160) were using more language learning strategies in their learning English than the male students did (M=3.108). But, both of them are using language learning strategies in the same level of medium.

**b) Comparative analysis of male and female students' LLS preference**

Comparative analysis was the last step of computation to ascertain the

result findings. It was used to compare the significant difference on Language Learning Strategies preference in learning English between male and female students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru.. The second output of Independent sample T-Test was used to analyze the significant difference of language learning strategies preference by male and female students. The SPSS output can be seen as follows:

**Table 6. Comparative Analysis of Male and Female Students' LLS preference**

		Independent Samples Test									
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper	
Memory	Equal variances assumed	1.632	.203	-.367	178	.714	-.0300	.0817	-.1913	.1313	
	Equal variances not assumed			-.367	176.559	.714	-.0300	.0817	-.1913	.1313	
Cognitive	Equal variances assumed	1.514	.220	.325	178	.746	.0278	.0855	-.1410	.1965	
	Equal			.325	175.4	.746	.0278	.0855	-.1410	.1965	

	variances not assumed				71					
Compensation	Equal variances assumed	.807	.370	-.346	178	.730	-.0378	.1091	-.2532	.1776
	Equal variances not assumed			-.346	177.076	.730	-.0378	.1091	-.2532	.1776
Metacognitive	Equal variances assumed	.528	.469	-.510	178	.610	-.0533	.1045	-.2596	.1529
	Equal variances not assumed			-.510	177.732	.610	-.0533	.1045	-.2596	.1529
Affective	Equal variances assumed	.180	.672	-2.935	178	.004	-.2456	.0837	-.4107	-.0804
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.935	177.978	.004	-.2456	.0837	-.4107	-.0804
Social	Equal variances assumed	.031	.861	-.022	178	.983	-.0022	.1020	-.2034	.1990
	Equal variances not assumed			-.022	177.889	.983	-.0022	.1020	-.2034	.1990
Overall	Equal variances assumed	1.278	.260	-.698	178	.486	-.0522	.0748	-.1998	.0954
	Equal variances not assumed			-.698	175.987	.486	-.0522	.0748	-.1998	.0954

According to *Levene's Test for Equality of Variances*, the Sig. of the overall strategies was 0.260, which is bigger than 0.05. Therefore, it can be assumed that variances were equal. Then, it is possible to test the hypothesis by using *Equal Variances Assumed* row of the t-test in the table 6.

From the table above, it can be seen that Sig. (2-tailed) value of the overall strategies was 0.486 which is bigger than 0.05, meaning that, the probabilities are > 0.05, thus, Ho is accepted, and Ha is rejected. In other word, there is no significant difference on language learning strategies preference between male and female of the tenth grade students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru.

The detail analysis of hypothesis for each strategy is presented as follows:

**a. Memory strategies**

From the table, the value of t for memory strategies is -0.367 with probability 0.714 > 0.05, Ho is accepted. In conclusion, there is no significant difference on Memory Strategies preference in learning English between male and female of the tenth grade students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru.

**b. Cognitive Strategies**

From the table, the value of t for cognitive strategies is 0.325 with probability 0.746 > 0.05, Ho is accepted. In conclusion, there is no significant difference on Cognitive Strategies preference in learning English between male and female of the tenth grade students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru.

**c. Compensation Strategies**

From the table, the value of t for Compensation strategies is -0.4363 with probability 0.730 > 0.05, Ho is

accepted. In conclusion, there is no significant difference on Compensation Strategies preference in learning English between male and female of the tenth grade students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru

#### **d. Metacognitive Strategies**

From the table, the value of  $t$  for Metacognitive strategies is  $-0.510$  with probability  $0.610 > 0.05$ ,  $H_0$  is accepted. In conclusion, there is no significant difference on Metacognitive Strategies preference in learning English between male and female of the tenth grade students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru.

#### **e. Affective Strategies**

From the table, the value of  $t$  for Affective strategies is  $-2.935$  with probability  $0.004 < 0.05$ ,  $H_a$  is accepted. In conclusion, there is a significant difference on Affective Strategies preference in learning English between male and female of the tenth grade students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru.

#### **f. Social Strategies**

From the table, the value of  $t$  for Social strategies is  $-0.022$  with probability  $0.983 > 0.05$ ,  $H_0$  is accepted. In conclusion, there is there is no significant difference on Social Strategies preference in learning English between male and female of the tenth grade students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru.

### **4. Discussion**

The data analysis revealed several findings. First, both male and female students' strategies preferences in learning English were Metacognitive Strategies. This research finding confirmed the previous researches conducted by Khalil (2005), Radwan (2011), and Zeynali (2012), who was also found that the both male and female students' strategies preferences

in learning English were Metacognitive Strategies. According to Oxford (1990), Metacognitive Strategies are actions which provide learners to coordinate their own learning, and to help them arranging and planning their language learning in an efficient and effective way. The preference uses of these strategies by both male and female students indicated that, both of them were more likely to coordinate their own learning, and had responsibility to seek as many practice opportunities as possible, usually outside of the classroom. In line with the statement above, Anderson (2008:99) states that, "Strong metacognitive skills empower language learners: when learners reflect upon their learning, they become better prepared to make conscious decisions about what they can do to improve their learning."

In contrast, the findings of other researchers found that, male and female students' strategies preferences in learning English were different. From the descriptive data analysis by Aslan (2009), he found that the strategies preference by male students were Metacognitive Strategies, while female students were Compensation Strategies. On the other way, Permata (2013) found that the strategies of male students were Metacognitive, and female students were Compensation. Furthermore, Kayaoğlu (2012) found that the strategies of male students were Social Strategies, while female students were Affective Strategies.

Second, this research found that there is no significant difference on the language learning strategies preference in learning English between male and female students for the overall strategies used. Unlike many previous studies, Aslan (2009) and Zare (2010), found that there is a significant difference of the overall use of strategies between

male and female students. However, this study reveals a significant difference between male and female students' language learning strategies preference use of Affective strategies. In the same way, Zeynali (2012) also found that there is a significant difference between male and female students' Affective Strategies preference.

In consistence with Oxford (1993 cited in Zeynali 2010), female learners tend to pay more attention to their feelings. Another explanation for this finding is relate to the theories of psychology which mention that sensitivity, empathy, nurturance and emotion are strong female traits, whereas aggression, dominance, assertiveness and emotional in expressiveness are male traits (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974 cited in Zeynali 2012).

Finally, although this finding does not show a significant difference in the preference of strategies subgroups across gender, along with the findings of previous studies, a careful examination of the individual items showed that male students used less Affective Strategies than female students. This indicates their reluctance in sharing feelings.

## 5. Conclusion

based on the data analysis, finally, the research about a comparison between male and female students' language learning strategies preference in learning English at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru comes to the conclusion as follows:

1. The male students' language learning strategies in learning English at Sate Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru are Metacognitive Strategies with mean 3.331, in the level of medium.

2. The female students' language learning strategies are Metacognitive strategies with mean 3.384 in the level of medium.
3. There is no significant difference on language learning strategies preference in learning English between male and female students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru.

Considering the results, it can be concluded that Ho is accepted and Ha is rejected for overall strategies. Thus, there is no significant difference preference on language learning strategies in learning English between male and female of the tenth grade students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru.

Furthermore, Ho is accepted and Ha is rejected for the detail group of strategies such as Memory Strategies, Cognitive Strategies, Compensation Strategies, Metacognitive Strategies, and Social Strategies. Thus, there is no significant difference on Memory Strategies, Cognitive Strategies, Compensation Strategies, Metacognitive Strategies, and Social Strategies preference in learning English between male and female of the tenth grade students at State Senior High School Pekanbaru. Meanwhile, Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted for Affective Strategies. Thus, there is a significant difference on Affective Strategies preference in learning English between male and female of the tenth grade students at State Senior High School 12 Pekanbaru.

## REFERENCES

- Aslan, Oktay. (2009). *The Role of Gender and Language Learning Strategies in Learning English*. (Unpublished dissertation).

- Anderson, Neil J. (2008). *Metacognition and Good Language Learners*. In Griffiths, Carol (Ed), *Lessons from Good Language Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta. Bungin, Burhan. *Metodologi Penelitian Sosial dan Ekonomi*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Chamot, A. U. & Kupper, L. (1989). *Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Instruction*. *Foreign Language Annual*, 22. 13-24.
- Cohen, A. (1990). *Language Learning: Insights for Learners, Teachers and Researchers*. New York: Newbury House.
- Cohen, Andrew D. & Zoltan Dornyei (2002). *Focus on the Language Learner: Motivation, Styles and Strategies*. In Schmitt, Norbert (ed.), 170-190.
- Depdiknas. (2013). *Kurikulum 2013 (KURTILAS) Sekolah Menengah Atas*. Jakarta: Depdiknas. 308.
- Dongyue, L. (2004), *EFL Proficiency, Gender and Language Learning Strategy Use among a Group of Chinese Technological Institute English Majors*. *Arecls E-Journal*, 1 (A5).
- Dreyer, C., & Oxford, R. (1996). *Learning Strategies and Other Predictors of ESL Proficiency among Afrikans Speakers in South Africa*. In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-Cultural Perspectives* (pp. 231-522), Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- Gay, L.R., and Peter Airasian. (2000). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application*. 6<sup>th</sup> edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gimeno, V. V. (2002), *Grammar Learning through Strategy Training: A Classroom Study on Learning Conditionals through Metacognitive and Cognitive Strategy Training*, doctoral dissertation, <https://proxy.knjiznice.ffzg.hr-> Accessed June, 2015.
- Griffiths, Carol. (2008). *Strategies and Good Language Learner*. In Griffiths, Carol (Ed), *Lessons from Good Language Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, V. and Grenfell, M. (2004), *Language Learning Strategies: A Case for Crosscurricular Collaboration*. *Language Awareness*, 13 (2), 116-130.
- Hosenfeld, C. (1976). *Learning About Learning: Discovering Our Students' Strategies*. *Foreign Language Annuals*, 9. 117-129.
- Kaylani, C. (1996). *The Influence of Gender and Motivation on EFL Learning Strategy Use in Jordan*. In Oxford, R.L. (Ed.). *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. (Technical Report #13). (pp. 75-88), Honolulu: Univeristy of Hawai'i Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.
- Khalil, Aziz. 2005. *Assesment of Language Learning Strategies Used by Palestinian EFL Learners*. Bethehem University: SPRING 2005.
- Lavine, R.E. and Oxford, R.L. (1990), *Dealing With Affective Issues in the Foreign or Second-Language Classroom*. *Modern Language Association Annual Meeting*, Chicago.

- Lee, K. R., & Oxford, R. (2008). Understanding EFL learners' strategy use and strategy awareness. *Asian EFL Journal*, 10(1), 7.
- Liang, Ting. (2009). *Language Learning Strategies – The theoretical Framework and Some Suggestions for Learner Training Practice*. CCSE English Language Teaching. Shaanxi. 2(4). 199
- Lodico, Marguerite G., Dean T. Spaulding., Katherine H. Voegtle. (2010). *Method in Educational Research: from Theory to Practice*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- MacIntyre, P.D and R.C Gardner. (1994). *The Effects of Induced Anxiety on Cognitive Processing in Second Language Acquisition*, 17. 1-17.
- McMillan, James H., and Sally Schumacher. (2006). *Research in Education: Evidence-Based Inquiry*. 6<sup>th</sup> edition, Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Nyikos, Martha. 2008. *Gender and Good Language Learners*. In Griffiths, Carol (Ed), *Lessons from Good Language Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Obzori, Metodicki. *Gender Differences in the Use of Learning Strategies in Adult Foreign Language Learners*. In Original Scientific Article. 2011. Dubrovnic University: vol 6. P.11.
- O'Malley, J. M., and Chamot, A.O. (1990). *Learning strategies in second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- O'Malley, J. M et al. (1985). *Learning Strategies used by Beginning and Intermediate ESL Students*. *Language Learning*, 35, 21-46.
- Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher should Know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Oxford, R.L. and 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) System*, 23(1), 1-23.
- Oxford, R.L and Crookall, D. (1989). *Research on Language Learning Strategies: Methods, Findings, and Instructional Issues*. *Modern Language Journal*, 73(4). 404-419.
- Oxford, R.L and M. Nyikos. (1989). *Variables Affecting Choice of Language Learning Strategies by University Students*. *The Modern Language Journal*. 73. 291-300.
- Pariani, Siti. (2007). *Pengamatan dan Pengukuran*. In Suryanto, Bagong and Sutinah. (Ed), *Metode Penelitian Sosial*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Permata, Kartika Indah. (2013). *A Comparative Study of Gender on Language Learning Strategies Preference*. 2013. Salatiga: Unpublished thesis.
- Radwan, Adel Abu. *Effect of L2 Proficiency and Gender on Choice of Language Learning Strategies by University Students Majoring in English*. In *Asian EFL Journal*. 2011. p.115-163.
- Richards, J.C. and H. Platt. (1992). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistic*. Essex: Longman.



- Rigney, J. (1978). *Learning strategies: A theoretical perspective*. In O'Neil, H. F. Jr.(Ed.), *Learning Strategies*. New York: Academic Press.
- Vidal, R.J. (2002). *Is There a Correlation between Reported Language Learning Strategy Use, Actual Strategy Use and Achievement?.* *Linuagem and Ensino*, 5(1), 43-73.
- Wharton, G. *Language Learning Strategy Use of Bilingual Foreign Language Learners in Singapore*. *Language Learning*, 2000. 50 (2), 203–243.
- Wenden, A. & Rubin, J. (eds). (1987). *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International.
- Zare, Pezhman. *An Investigation into Language Learning Strategy Use and Gender among Iranian Undergraduate Language Learners*. In *World Applied Sciences Journal*. 2010. Marvdast: IDOSI Publications: 11 (10), p.1238-1247.
- Zeinali, Simin. *Exploring the Gender Effect on EFL Learners' Learning Strategies*. In *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 2012. Finland: ACADEMY PUBLISHER.2.pp.1614-1620.

