
The Correlation between Language Learning Strategies and Speaking Achievement of Junior High School Students

Putri Yurika Sari

Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang

Putriyurikaa37469@gmail.com

Annisa Astrid

Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang

annisastrid_uin@radenfatah.ac.id

Eko Saputra

Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang

ekosaputra_uin@radenfatah.ac.id

Corresponding Email: Putriyurikaa37469@gmail.com

Abstract

The objective of this research was to find out the significant correlation and the influence of their language learning strategies and speaking achievement. This study used quantitative research with a correlation design. The population of this research was 30 students of the eighth grade students of Junior High Schools in Palembang. In this study, the participants were selected using a purposeful random sampling technique. In collecting the data, the researcher used a questionnaire and a speaking test. students' speaking achievement was scored in terms of the six subskills of grammar, vocabulary, fluency, pronunciation, comprehension, and task. Furthermore, Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) questionnaire was used to determine students' language learning strategies. Pearson Product-Moment was used to find out the correlation between variables. The result showed that there was a significant correlation between cognitive and speaking achievement with $r = (.402)$ higher than r -table (.361) and the level of probability (p) significance was (.028) which was lower than 0.05. It means that H_{a2} was accepted and H_{o1} was rejected. In this research, language learning strategies gave a 16,8 % contribution to speaking achievement. While a significant correlation between social-affective and speaking achievement with $r = (.385)$ which was higher than r -table (.361) and level of probability (p) significance was (.036) which was lower than 0.05. Meanwhile, social strategies contribute to speaking achievement in 14,8 %.

Keywords: *Language Learning Strategies, Speaking Achievement*

Introduction

Speaking has an important role not only in daily life, but also in the learning process. It is said that speaking is one of the four fundamental skills in language acquisition that is very important for students to master, along with listening, reading, and writing (Hossain, 2015). Speaking is like a window to the world, because students who are aware of the importance of speaking in the learning process will certainly try to express their desire to speak as a form of adding to their speaking skills more fluently and skillfully compared to students who are reluctant to encourage themselves to have the opportunity to speak.

The success of English language learning is largely determined by the driving factors, as they can influence the learning objectives. Some factors that affect the success of learning include the application of appropriate learning methods, the selection of appropriate teaching materials, and differences in various learner characteristics. First, the application of appropriate learning methods will certainly help improve students' understanding and skills in achieving learning objectives. In other words, if the application of the learning method is not interesting, it can actually make it difficult for students when learning and practicing independently. Second, the selection of teaching materials or materials that are suitable for students in the learning process occupies an important position as a tool to organize an effective teaching and learning process and adjust students so that they can be actively involved in understanding concepts and mastering material, easy to understand, and not feel bored in class.

Meanwhile, there are various differences in the characteristics possessed by students. These characteristics lead to affective domains such as motivation, anxiety, self-efficacy, and learning strategies (Shi, 2017). Every student tends to need a motivational boost during the learning process. Some of them can also experience English language anxiety when they feel they are considered less by others, face the fear of being laughed at, and have limited vocabulary (Rahman, 2017). This is in line with Hanifa (2018) that unfavorable responses from people around can make students anxious and hesitant to speak causing them to be nervous and prefer to be silent. Then, self-efficacy by students also affects self-confidence in the abilities that exist in themselves seen from the process of achieving success in a matter and expectations of results that will lead to the behavior of following the learning process optimally and student perseverance. An individual who has a high level of efficacy will certainly be more devoted to what he does in achieving the expected goals. This is also one of the links with language learning strategies.

Language learning strategies are ways or steps that can be chosen by an educator in delivering subject matter, making it easier for students to understand the learning material and produce the learning objectives achieved. Oxford (2016) stated that language learning strategies are divided into two sub-categories, namely direct strategies and indirect strategies. Direct strategies consisted of memory

strategies, cognitive strategies, and compensation strategies. Meanwhile, indirect strategies consisted of metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies. All of these strategies can be used to determine the most dominant strategy used by each student.

Many researchers have examined the language learning strategies experienced by students in various levels of high school to university level. First, the research by Sukarni (2019) conducted a study to investigate the Language Learning Strategies (LLS) used by high school students and analyze the effect of language learning strategies on their English achievement. Second, research by Novia et al., (2023) conducted a study to examine the relationship between students' speaking proficiency and self-confidence among high school students. Third, research by Wati (2019) conducted a study to investigate the correlation between language learning strategies and English achievement and to find out the dominant strategy among six types of language learning strategies among high school students. Fourth, the research by Purwaningsih (2018) conducted a study to find out the language learning strategies in speaking that are applied, along with the aim of knowing the frequency of use of language learning strategies used by university students. Fifth, the study by Daflizar et al., (2022) conducted a study to explore language learning strategies and autonomy of 76 EFL students at the university level. Sixth, the study by Alhaysony (2017) conducted a study to investigate the relationship between the use of language learning strategies, gender, and duration of learning English among university-level Saudi EFL students.

The research studies previously mentioned focus on the language learning strategies applied by high school and university level students. They concentrated on exploring the frequency of strategy application, the types of language learning strategies, and how students apply their learning strategies. This study centers on advanced level classroom learning strategies to investigate the extent to which strategies are predominantly used by students in the classroom and the underlying factors. Thus, the researchers were interested in conducting research that focused on two research questions: 1) Was there any significant correlation between each aspect of language learning strategies and speaking achievement of the Eighth Grade students at Junior High Schools in Palembang? 2) Did each aspect of language learning strategies significantly influence their speaking achievement of the Eighth Grade Students at Junior High Schools in Palembang?

Research Method

This research used a quantitative with a correlational design which attempted to find the significant correlation and contribution between the variables language learning strategies and speaking achievement of the students. Another nonexperimental form of research is the correlational design in which investigators use correlational statistics to describe and measure the degree or association (or relationship) between two or more variables or sets of scores (Creswell & Guetterman, 2018). Bivariate correlation explores the association between variables, where the term association refers to any relationship (linear and not linear).

The population is the population of each school. This research was conducted in three schools because this research is quantitative, where the results generalize. So it is used by more than one school. If only one school is contextual, the results cannot be generalized. Therefore, several schools were selected with consideration of the accreditation level. To obtain a heterogeneous sample. The population of this research were students from three schools in Palembang with differences in accredited. First, SMPN 27 Palembang, which is accredited A; Second, SMPN 53 Palembang, which is accredited B. Third, MTs Assanadiyah Palembang, which is accredited C. The participants in this research were 30 students. The sampling technique used was a purposeful random sampling technique with criteria. These criteria are based on consideration of the minimum number of correlational research requirements, namely 30 participants. This is supported by the opinion of Creswell (2023), who explains that correlational research that connects related variables requires a minimum of 30 participants.

Table 1. The Sample of the Study

No	Class	Number of Students
1	VIII SMPN 27 Palembang (A)	10 students
2	VIII SMPN 53 Palembang (B)	10 students
3	VIII MTS Assanadiyah (C)	10 students
Total		30 students

The researcher used a questionnaire and speaking test as instruments in this study to collect data on the correlation between learning strategies and speaking achievement of eighth grade students at Junior High Schools in Palembang. The SILL Questionnaire has 50 items. The SILL adopted from Oxford (2016) dengan nilai CFA .99 SILL ready-made from Oxford. In addition, this questionnaire has been try out with a value of $r = 0.361 > 0.70$. The results of the instrument were considered reliable. Frankel et al., (2012) explained the criteria for a research instrument to be reliable by using Cronbach Alpha Formula if the reliability coefficient must be at least 0,70, preferably higher, and many reach a reliability coefficient of 0,90. Similar calculations were performed using the SPSS version 26.

In addition, the researcher also checked for the instruments' validity and reliability. As for the questionnaire, since the researcher used the English version, it needed to be translated. The translation was approved by two validators.

The researcher conducted a speaking test to get the students' speaking achievement. The speaking test was given in the form of booklets. The booklets were split into two categories: a teacher's booklet and a student's booklet. Students were given different topics and were asked to make a conversation based on the illustration in the students' booklet.

The comment of the expert showed that the speaking test with the topics, rubric, content was very appropriate, and time allocation and instructions were appropriate. From the result of validity, the

value obtained $r = 0.649 > 0.92$ is considered reliable.

There are three stages of statistical analysis in the questionnaire and speaking test data. First, analyzing using descriptive statistics. Then, pre-requisite statistical analysis of normality and linearity. After that, correlation statistical analysis of language learning strategy and speaking achievement. Finally, regression statistical analysis to see how much the contribution of language learning strategies and speaking achievement.

Result and Discussion

Result

The researcher described the result of the research questions in this research. The research question consisted of two questions :

1. Is there any significant correlation between each type of language learning strategies and speaking achievement of the Eighth Grade Students at Junior High Schools in Palembang?
2. Did each type of language learning strategies significantly influence their speaking achievement of the Eighth Grade Students at Junior High Schools in Palembang?

To answer the first question about whether there was a correlation between language learning strategies and speaking achievement. The researcher used the data obtained from respondents to answer the language learning strategies questionnaire and speaking achievement test. It is analyzed with the analysis steps as follows:

a. Descriptive analysis

The descriptive statistical analysis of LLS for the participants was shown below. The maximum score is 4.06, and the lowest score is 2.14. The mean of the language learning strategies scores for the participants is 3.0 and the standard deviation is .42.

Table 1. Descriptive analysis of Language Learning Strategies

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Memory strategies	30	15	39	26.60	5.399
Cognitive strategies	30	28	55	40.77	6.765
Compensation strategies	30	10	24	17.50	3.928
Metacognitive strategies	30	11	41	29.27	7.273
Affective strategies	30	9	27	16.80	4.302
Social strategies	30	12	29	19.40	3.710
Overall categories of language learning	30	107	205	150.33	21.397
Valid N (listwise)	30				

Table 2

The Percentages of the Each Aspect of Language Learning Strategies

Strategy	High		Medium		Low					
	Always		Usually		Sometimes		Generally		Never	
	4.5-5.0	%	3.5-4.4	%	2.5-3.4	%	1.5-2.4	%	1.0-1.4	%
Memory Strategies	-	-	5,00	16,67	21,00	70,00	4,00	13,33	-	-
Cognitive Strategies	-	-	6,00	20,00	22,00	73,33	2,00	6,67	-	-
Compensation Strategies	-	-	10,00	33,33	16,00	53,33	4,00	13,33	-	-
Metacognitive Strategies	5,00	16,67	14,00	46,67	10,00	33,33	1,00	3,33	-	-
Affective Strategies	1,00	3,33	6,00	20,00	18,00	60,00	5,00	16,67	-	-
Social Strategies	4,00	13,33	13,00	43,33	12,00	40,00	1,00	3,33	-	-

b. The result of Speaking Achievement

The result of the speaking achievement of the students revealed that the maximum score 11,5, and the lowest score was 8. The mean of the speaking achievement score for the participants is 44 and the standard deviation is 43. This mean score indicated that the level of speaking achievement of the participants was category poor.

Table 3. Descriptive Analysis of Speaking Achievement

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Speaking Achievement	30	8	115	44.00	43.496
Valid N (listwise)	30				

Table 4. The distributions of Speaking Achievement

Range Score	Category	Number of the Students	Percentages
25-30	Excellent	-	-
19-24	Good	-	-
13-18	Average	22	73,3%
7-12	Poor	8	26,7%
1-6	Very Poor	-	-

From table 4, the speaking achievement was classified into five categories of readers: excellent, good, average, poor, and very poor. To be precise, twenty-two students (73,3%) were categorized as average speaking. and the last eight students (26,7%) were poor in their speaking achievement. Based on the data above, it was found that “Average” was the most frequent level of students’ speaking achievement (73,3%).

2. Inferential Analysis

1. The Correlation between and Speaking Achievement

Based on the Person Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, the results indicated that the pattern of correlation between each type of language learning strategies and speaking achievement was presented below in Table 5

Tabel 5

Results of Hypothesis Testing in Measuring Correlation between Memory and Speaking Achievement

Correlations			
		Memory Strategies	Speaking Achievement
Memory Strategies	Pearson Correlation	1	.061
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.750
	N	30	30

From Table 5, showed correlation coefficient was .061 it means the coefficient correlation at level high. The correlation coefficient or the r-obtained (.061) was lower than r-table (.361). Then the level of probability (p) significance (sig.2-tailed) was .750. It means that p (.750) was higher than 0.05. In other words, memory strategies do not correlate with speaking achievement.

Tabel 6

Results of Hypothesis Testing in Measuring Correlation between Cognitive and Speaking Achievement

Correlations			
		Cognitive Strategies	Speaking Achievement
Cognitive Strategies	Pearson Correlation	1	.402*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	30	.028
	N		30

From Table 6, showed correlation coefficient was .402 it means the coefficient correlation at level moderate. The result revealed that there was correlation between cognitive and speaking achievement. The correlation coefficient or the r-obtained (.402) was lower than r-table (.361). Then the level of probability (p) significance (sig.2-tailed) was .028. It means that p (.028) was lower than 0.05. In other words, there is a correlation between cognitive strategies and speaking achievement.

Tabel 7

Results of Hypothesis Testing in Measuring Correlation between Compensation and Speaking Achievement

		Correlations	
		Compensation Strategies	Speaking Achievement
Compensation Strategies	Pearson Correlation	1	.199
	Sig. (2-tailed)	30	.292
	N		30

From Table 7, showed correlation coefficient was .199 it means the coefficient correlation at level weak. The correlation coefficient or the r-obtained (.199) was lower than r-table (.361). Then the level of probability (p) significance (sig.2-tailed) was .292. It means that p (.292) was higher than 0.05. In other words, compensation strategies do not correlate with speaking achievement.

Tabel 8

Results of Hypothesis Testing in Measuring Correlation between Metacognitive and Speaking Achievement

		Correlations	
		Metacognitive Strategies	Speaking Achievement
Metacognitive Strategies	Pearson Correlation	1	.101
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.594
	N	30	30

From Table 8, showed correlation coefficient was .101 it means the coefficient correlation at level weak. The correlation coefficient or the r-obtained (.101) was lower than r-table (.361). Then the level of probability (p) significance (sig.2-tailed) was .594. It means that p (.594) was higher than 0.05. In other words, metacognitive do not correlate with speaking achievement.

Tabel 9

Results of Hypothesis Testing in Measuring Correlation between Affective and Speaking Achievement

Correlations			
		Affective Strategies	Speaking Achievement
Affective Strategies	Pearson Correlation	1	.351
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.057
	N	30	30

From Table 9, showed correlation coefficient was .351 it means the coefficient correlation at level low. The correlation coefficient or the r-obtained (.351) was lower than r-table (.361). Then the level of probability (p) significance (sig.2-tailed) was .057. It means that p (.057) was higher than 0.05. In other words, affective strategies do not correlate with speaking achievement.

Tabel 10

Results of Hypothesis Testing in Measuring Correlation between Social and Speaking Achievement

Correlations			
		Social Strategies	Speaking Achievement
Social Strategies	Pearson Correlation	1	.385*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.036
	N	30	30

From Table 10, showed correlations coefficient was .061 it means the coefficient correlation at level low. The correlation coefficient or the r-obtained (.385) was higher than r-table (.361). Then the level of probability (p) significance (sig.2-tailed) was .036. It means that p (.036) was lower than 0.05. the result revealed that there is a correlation between social strategies and speaking achievement.

Table 11. Interpretation of product-moment

Size of r	Interpretation
0.00 - 0.19	Weak Correlation
0.20 - 0.39	Low Correlation
0.40 - 0.59	Moderate Correlation
0.60 - 0.79	High Correlation
0.80 - 1.00	Very High Correlation

2. The regression analysis between Language Learning Strategies and Speaking Achievement

To answer the second research question, did learning strategies significantly influence their speaking achievement of the Eighth Grade Students at Junior high schools in Palembang. To answer that question, the researcher used an inferential test of regression analysis. Regression analysis is used to know if each type of language learning strategies influences their speaking achievement.

The Regression Analysis of Cognitive Strategies and Speaking Achievement

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.402 ^a	.162	.132	1.8299

a. Predictors: (Constant), Cognitive Strategies

Table 12

The Regression Analysis of Cognitive Strategies and Speaking Achievement

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	18.108	1	18.108	5.408	.028 ^b
	Residual	93.759	28	3.349		
	Total	111.867	29			

a. Dependent Variable: Speaking Achievement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Cognitive Strategies

From Table 12, the result showed a p-value of 0.028 for cognitive strategies. It can be concluded that there was a significant influence between cognitive strategies and speaking achievement. The result of the analysis revealed that R-square was 0.162. This means that cognitive strategies contribute about 16,2 % to speaking achievement.

The Regression Analysis of Social Strategies and Speaking Achievement

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.385 ^a	.148	.118	1.8450

a. Predictors: (Constant), Social Strategies

Table 14
The Regression Analysis of Social Strategies and Speaking Achievement

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	16.557	1	16.557	4.864	.036 ^b
	Residual	95.309	28	3.404		
	Total	111.867	29			

From Table 14, the result showed a p-value of 0.036 for social strategies. It can be concluded that there was a significant influence between social strategies and speaking achievement. The result of the analysis revealed that R-square was .148. This means that social strategies contribute about 14,8 % to speaking achievement.

3. Interpretations

To strengthen the value of this study, an interpretation is made based on the results of data analysis. Based on the findings, there is a significant relationship between language learning strategies (LLS) and speaking achievement of eighth-grade students of Junior High Schools in Palembang.

The findings of the Pearson product-moment correlation analysis show that there is a positive correlation between language learning strategies (LLS) and speaking achievement. However, the correlation is moderate and low. The positive value indicated that one variable will affect the other variable, if one variable increases, then the other variable will also increase. It can be assumed that the more often language learning strategies are used, the higher the speaking achievement. In addition, the application of language learning strategies is one of the factors that contribute to students' success in second or foreign language acquisition. According to Warni (2016), students' success in learning is largely determined by the learning strategies carried out by the teacher.

Language learning strategies are an integral part of affective factors as one of learner's variation. The use of these strategies has a very significant role for students, especially in the context of speaking. Indeed, learning strategies are very important in English language learning because having the right strategies will help improve the effectiveness of the learning process needed to achieve learning targets (Nguyen & Terry, 2017). In the context of the teaching and learning process, there is always a difference in achievement between successful students and less successful students, which is influenced by various factors, including the learning methods or strategies used. Students who use strategies usually become more efficient and more confident because strategies act as tools to be active and self-directed.

In addition, some students may not recognize and be unable to use learning strategies at all. Meanwhile, some students who recognize language learning strategies often use them ineffectively. In turn, some researchers believe that language learning strategies play little or no role in students' language development (Su, 2018). Therefore, it is important for educators or teachers to promote learning strategies that are interesting and fun, as this is a major task that impacts the learning process.

Meanwhile, the results of this study are in line with several previous studies by Puspita (2019) who found that the implications of this study for English language learning are that teachers should pay attention to students' speaking fluency by practicing speaking more at every opportunity in class and giving various kinds of grammar tests so that students can more easily master it. One of them is a study conducted by Wati (2019) It indicated that the correlation between language learning strategies and English achievement was positively significant and the degree of correlation was in moderate level. A study conducted by Pietrzykowska (2014), she revealed that there is no strong and positive correlation between learners' language learning strategies and their speaking ability. De Silva (2015), research showed that students' awareness of applying strategies leads to a positive positive contribution to their speaking skills. After training students with the strategies, their speaking skills improved significantly. This finding proves that language learning strategies contribute to student achievement.

From the data analysis, the researcher found that cognitive strategies and social strategies influence speaking achievement contributing 16,8 % and 14,8%. According to Qahtani (2013), research found that cognitive strategies are the most frequently used strategies. Those cognitive strategies help students directly during the learning process to receive input and send messages. The findings from this study show that the most dominant strategy is cognitive strategy. Students who use cognitive strategies try to use strategies such as note-taking, summarizing, highlighting parts in their books, etc. Not only that, the research results of Strambi et al. (2016) can also be used as an argument that some cognitive strategies are left out along the path of language learning skill development. Apparently, the results of the current study show that proficient students often apply cognitive strategies, such as reasoning deductively, translating, or taking notes.

The use of socio-affective strategies is necessary for students to interact with others to acquire the target language and understand the meaning of English words. Thus, students will be able to learn through contact and interaction with others and increase their confidence in speaking English during speaking class activities. Ata (2016) concluded that socio-affective strategies give advantages in a teaching learning activity. They stated that socio-affective strategies can help the learners when the teacher can improve the material with humor. The results showed that a socio-affective strategy is an effective strategy for the students. They become more comfortable to learn and have good

communication when they do the task as a group.

CONCLUSIONS

Some conclusions are drawn based on the description and discussion in the previous chapter. With the assumption that the more often the strategy is used, the higher the speaking achievement. And if the less often the strategy is used, the lower the speaking achievement. It is proven that language learning strategies and speaking achievement are quite positively correlated. The result showed that there was a significant correlation between cognitive and speaking achievement with $r = (.402)$ higher than r -table (.361) and the level of probability (p) significance was (.028) which was lower than 0.05. It means that cognitive strategies gave a 16,2 % contribution to speaking achievement. While a significant correlation between social-affective and speaking achievement with $r = (.385)$ which higher than r -table (.361) and level of probability (p) significance was (.036) which was lower than 0.05 and it means that social strategies gave a 14,8% contribution to speaking achievement.

REFERENCES

- 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.
<http://doi.org/10.5959/eimj.v5i3.124>
- Alhaysony, M. (2017). Language learning strategies used by Saudi EFL students: the effect of duration of English language study and gender. *Theory & practice in language studies*, 7(1) 18-28
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n13p115>
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: principle and classroom practices*. Pearson education.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research method in education* (6th ed.). Madison Avenue.
- Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. (2018). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE.
- Daflizar, Sulistiyo, U., & Kamil, D. (2022). Language learning strategies and learner autonomy: The case of Indonesian tertiary EFL Students. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 15(1), 257-281.
<https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/index>
- De Silva, R. (2015). Writing strategy instruction: Its impact on writing in a second language for academic purposes. *Language teaching research*, 19(3), 301-323.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814541738>

- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N.E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). How to design and evaluate research in education (8th ed.). McGraw Hill.
- Hanifa, R. (2018). Factors generating anxiety when learning EFL speaking skills. *Studies in English language and education*, 5(2), 230-239. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/index>
- Hossain, M. I. (2015). Teaching productive skills to the students: A secondary level scenario. BRAC University. <http://hdl.handle.net/10361/7671>
- Novia, F., & Ramayanti, R. (2023). The correlation between students' self-confidence and speaking achievement. *DIDASCEIN: Journal of English education*, 4(1), 35-43. <https://doi.org/10.52333/djoe.v4i1.62>
- Nguyen, H., & Terry, D. R. (2017). English learning strategies among EFL learners: A narrative approach. *IAFOR journal of language learning*, 3(1),4-16. <https://doi.org/10.22492/ijll.3.1.01>
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know. University of Alabama. Heinle & Heinle Publications.
- Oxford, R. L. (2016). Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self regulation in context. Taylor & Francis. <http://doi.org/10.4324/9781315719146>
- Purwaningsih, D. I. (2018). Language learning strategies in learning speaking. *Journal at-turats*. 12(1), 3-14. <https://doi.org/10.24260/at-turats.v12i1.968>
- Pietrzykowska, A. (2014). The relationship between learning strategies and speaking performance. *In classroom-oriented research*, 5(1), 55-68. Springer, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-00188-3_4
- Rachmawati, D. L. (2017). The correlation between language learning strategies with students' proficiency. *Jurnal ilmiah Bahasa dan Sastra*. 4(1), 114-121. <https://doi.org/10.21067/jibs.v4i1.1944>
- Rahman, A. W. (2017). How good EFL learners decrease their foreign language anxiety: A solution for the EFL students with high anxiousness. *Ethical lingua Journal of language teaching and literature*, 4(2), 127 –138. <https://doi.org/10.30605/ethicallingua.v4i2.625>
- Sugiyono. (2015). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D. Alfabeta
- Sukarni, S. (2019). Language learning strategy used by senior high school students and its influence on their achievement. *CLLIENT (Culture, Literature, Linguistics, and English Teaching)*, 1(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.32699/clients.v1i01.633>
- Su, Y. (2018). A review of language learning strategy research. *Theory and practice in language studies*, 8 (5), 522-527. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0805.10>
- Strambi, A., Kennedy, C., & Dekker, W. (2016). "I'm just gonna put 'la' in there, everywhere":

researching cognitive and metacognitive strategy use in tasks focusing on Italian object pronouns. 93(1), 121-47. University of Illinois Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/i40160220>

Warni. T. S., & Intan. A. R. (2016). *Strategi pembelajaran dalam implementasi kurikulum berbasis softskill.* (1st ed.). Deepublish. 260 - 265
<https://www.ejournal.stkipbudidaya.ac.id/index.php/jc/article/view/517/34>