WORKING AND NON-WORKING STATUS OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS' LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES

Asti Gumartifa[1*], Indawan Syahri[2]

Universitas Muhammadiyah Palembang
[1] asti_gumartifa@um-palembang.ac.id, [2] indawansyahri_ump@yahoo.co.id

Abstract

Study while working has several effects in advanced higher education. Working and studying at the same time in university can be as reward and stressful. Thus, language learning strategies for working students and non-working students play an important role in the effectiveness and efficiency of English language learning. The researchers examined whether or not there is significant differences of English language learning strategies used by working and non-working students. Quantitative descriptive study was used to describe the findings. The result showed that working students applied memory strategies dominantly. The number average mean score of memory strategy was 4.02 in the category of high, where compensation learning strategies was 2.77 that categorized the lowest mean average. Non-working students applied all learning strategies at the medium level category. The highest number of mean average of language learning strategies was cognitive strategies with the average mean was 3.11. Total number mean average of metacognitive and affective strategies was the same 2.79. Compensation, memory, and social strategy were also in the medium category with different total numbers average. The mean average of compensation strategies was 3.01, memory strategy was 2.93, and social strategy was 2.75.

Keywords: English Language, Learning Strategy, Status, Category, Undergraduate

INTRODUCTION

Along with technological developments, humans are also required to be able to develop abilities both in the field of education and work careers. Having side job while studying has an impact on educational studies and college experiences (Faizuddin, Mansir, Purnomo, and Aisyah, 2020). This could causes some difficulties such as time limitations and availability in learning. Working while studying in university give reward and stressful. According to the Stevenson and Harper (2016) stress improved hard struggle because students should manage the target strategies for significant activities as well as learning. Maquiling (2018) said that working students get some problems while studying in university level. Thus, students would be dropped out from university because of various reasons. For instance, students must complete the target of study graduation along 4 years, students find some difficulties to manage the time in completing college assignments and work (Sampelolo and Atmawardoyo, 2016). Working students' negative effects are primarily linked to anxiety, stress, and poor academic achievement. According Curtis and Shany (2002) working while studying has an bad effect on the academic performance because it influences students' mental health. Students may wish to improve good grades and attend classes more frequently, but it is hard to match the job schedule. In contrast, study while working has several good effects in advanced higher education scope. Some students feel enjoy and motivated to study while working. Part-time work can provide both experience and training to the students. Furthermore, students feel proud and build self-motivation in the learning atmosphere. In addition, Faizuddin et al., (2020) expressed that there

were significant impact of students' work experience on their academic studies. Students can be more self-disciplined, decided to commit, and capable to manage the duties between time to work and study.

Over the years, the amount of students who work and study has increased significantly (Bakker and Akkerman, 2011). According to Guile and Griffiths (2001) there is connection between learning while working. Therefore, there is no great strategy for achieving accomplishment in all learning contexts. Students should be taught how to understand and use appropriate strategies to the specific needs. Learning strategies connect to the students' personal traits (Weinstein, 1987)**.** As undergraduate students, working and learning at the same time must implement appropriate language learning strategies. It can be influenced by the learning environment. Biggs (2014) claimed that effective learning environment impact students to pursue deep learning. Language learning strategies for working students and non-working students play an important role in the effectiveness and efficiency of English language learning. Most students of university get the class to study while working. It has various reasons such as; developing interest in the field of job, gaining hands-on experience that relates to the education (Guile and Griffiths, 2001). Thus, most students are used to manage time to study and work at the same time. Education is expected to liberate the perceptions of the students in order to realize the potential practice of achievement to the higher education (Kanlisi, 2016). According to Hartwig and Dunlosky (2011) most European and American can be attributed to empirical teaching and learning strategies used by universities, as well as colleges students. It means teaching and learning strategies not only optimize academic outcome but also provide students with technological and system skills that improve students' mastery and work performance.

Simsek and Balaban (2010) stated learning strategies has also long been a popular issue in the educational world. It is commonly recognized that teaching approaches should ascertain and facilitate students to the use of learning strategies. It is true that educators are concerned to the relationships between strategies and various learning results. Individual differences, domain types, instructional approaches, length of time, learning techniques, types of feedback, required level of mastery, methods of measurement, and other instructional variables influence student choice and implementation. Oxford (1990) mentioned learning strategies are specific activities made by students to aid self-learning, making simple, faster, pleasant, self-directed, practical, and more adaptable in learning. Students should be aware to which learning strategies are appropriate for them in terms of learning English language. Cohen (2011) claimed that learning strategies is as active learning that are designed or intended by the learner. Oxford (1990) classified language learning strategies into direct strategies and indirect strategies. Direct strategies require analysis of the target language, where it consists of memory, cognitive, and compensation. Indirect learning strategies in language acquisition is often supported and managed by which do not directly involve the target language. Consists of metacogntive, affective, and social strategies.

Experts have outlined and recommended various language learning strategies. One of the dominant strategies used by the students is memorize learning strategies. According to Ding (2007) that memorized learning strategies is always dominant in academic achievement. Brown, Collins, and Duguid (1989) mentioned that cognitive strategies encourage field learning by allowing students to obtain, progress, and exercise cognitive tools in accurate domain activity. It means, inside and outside of learning classroom through collective social interaction can be as the advanced knowledge achievement. Meanwhile, Vygotsky (1978) argued that situated learning is linked to social development. It declares three major subject matters: the zone of proximal growth, the more knowing about others, and human engagement.

Furthermore, another perception is that students' implementation of specific learning strategies is influenced by systemic factors, students' choices and the needs of an instructor or lecturer (Goodyear and Dudley, 2015). As a result, the goal of this study is to determine students' language learning strategies between working and non-working of undergraduate students. For this research, Oxford's language learning strategies classification was chosen.

METHOD

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education at University of Muhammadiyah Palembang has various statuses of students who study while working or who are just studying. Most students have part time job as a teacher, school administrator, and others. Those second semester students have various levels category of English skill during the learning process. In this study, the author will examine whether or not there is significant differences of English language learning strategies used by working and non-working students. Quantitative descriptive study is used to describe the findings. There were 50 samples of this study including male and female with the status of working and non-working students. The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford (1990) that consists of 50 questionnaires was asked. Each questionnaire includes direct and indirect language learning strategies; cognitive, memory, metacognitive, compensatory, effective, and social strategies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The researchers used Oxford (1990) scoring method for strategy utilization to measure how successful students employ learning strategies. The scale ranges from 1.0 to 2.4, indicating low strategy use, 2.5 to 3.4, moderate strategy use, and 3.5 to 5.0, indicating strong strategy use.

Table 1. Rating Scale for Strategy Implementation

Mean	Category
1.0-2.4	Low
2.5-3.4	Moderate
3.5-5.0	High

The results are grouped into six various types of language learning strategies between working and non-working students. Here is the data obtain from non-working of undergraduate students' learning strategies of Muhammadyah University Palembang.

Table 2. Undergraduate of Non-working Students' Language Learning Strategy

No	The Strategies	Mean Score	Level
1	Compensation Strategies	3.01	Medium
2	Metacognitive Strategies	2.79	Medium
3	Social Strategies	2.75	Medium
4	Cognitive Strategies	3.11	Medium
5	Affective Strategies	2.79	Medium
6	Memory Strategies	2.93	Medium

All of the students were in medium level of language learning strategies. The highest mean average of language learning strategies used was cognitive strategies with the average mean was 3.11. The lowest mean average of language learning strategies used was social strategies was 2.75. Metacognitive and affective strategies which have the same total number of mean 2.79. Compensation and memory strategy were also in the medium category with different total numbers average. The mean average of compensation strategies was 3.01, and memory strategy was 2.93.

Table 3. Undergraduate of Working Students' Language Learning Strategy

No	The Strategies	Mean Score	Level
1	Compensation Strategies	2.77	Medium
2	Metacognitive Strategies	3.04	Medium
3	Social Strategies	3.37	Medium
4	Cognitive Strategies	3.28	Medium
5	Affective Strategies	3.72	High
6	Memory Strategies	4.02	High

The result obtained from working students' learning strategies was varied. The result of mean average showed that affective and memory language learning strategies were used by working students dominantly or in the category of high. The number average mean score of memory strategy was 4.02, and affective strategy was 3.72. Compensation strategy with the mean score was 2.77, metacognitive strategy was 3.04, social strategy was 3.37, and cognitive strategy was 3.28. Those findings were in the medium level category used by undergraduate of working student.

Discussion
As the result from previous paragraph, undergraduate of working and non-working students used in language learning strategies categorized into memory, cognitive, compensatory, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. However, the results revealed that the implementation of those strategies was not significant difference between working and non-working of undergraduate students. Most students were in the category of medium learning strategies used. In terms of non-working students result, all students were in the category of medium level with various numbers of mean averages. It can be interpreted that non-working students prefer apply all learning strategies which there is no specific dominantly strategies used. Students apply all strategies or none of the strategies that students specifically used. The possibility reason of this finding was the students did not know and even have never been informed the information about appropriate learning strategies used during learning English language. The samples of this measurement were from non- working and non English majoring students of the first semester class. Furthermore, it's better to analyze the sample of students who have previously been socialized about the use of language learning strategies. Good students are students who are aware and can identify learning strategies according to the learning targets. Rubin and Thompson (1982) said effective language learning strategies used are seen to be a good method to introduce learners to the concept of learning. Besides, the researchers interpreted that it is better to use a sample that is from the English education students which has the connection to the purpose of this research in determining students' English language learning strategies. According to Brown (1994) the accuracy of sample selection is

also important. Particular range of sampling error, probability or random sampling offers the most freedom from bias, but it may also be the priciest sample in terms of both time and energy.

Additionally, compensation and cognitive strategies were categorized into direct learning strategies which were also almost in the high category of this finding. According to Oxford, 1990) direct strategy involves the process of mental language acquisition that consists of memory, cognitive, and compensation learning strategy. Cognitive learning strategies implementation were by taking notes, summarizing, and highlighting the language learning target in order to practice and create the output effectively. The compensation language learning strategies implementation was by guessing and overcoming the language learning target. In this sample research, students tend to do writing repetition practice that is accordance to the English writing correspondence classes. Thus, students always do the learning from what have noted and concluded by the teachers. It means students' learning strategies practiced were usually influenced by the teachers' routines of the learning methods. Most students carry out learning through the method that is relate with the tasks or orders given by the teacher in the classroom. Furthermore, teacher must vary the learning methods due to optimize the targets achievement of each class (Munawaroh, 2017).

Good students are the students who are able to analyze what is the most appropriate learning strategies used for them (Wenden, 1991). The sample of working students' data showed that most students also did not really aware to the English language learning strategies implementation during the learning English language. Therefore, students mixed all strategies or none the dominant of language learning strategies applied (Deneme, 2008). The average mean score of compensation learning strategy for working student was in the medium category with the lowest mean average among others. Compensation strategy is a learning strategy that tends to guess the English word meaning. Guessing strategy was rarely applied by working students to remember or increase vocabulary (Mokhtar, 2012). Working students were almost preferred to learn words by finding out the exactly meaning by brainstorming the previous information than guessing that was called memory learning strategies. Therefore, the finding data of working students was in the high level category of memory learning strategies. While, memory strategies can be categorized as the dominant used by working students. It is supported by Ding (2007) that memory learning strategies tend to be dominant in academic achievement.

CONCLUSION

At university level, there were two status of students; working while studying and just as students. Students' difficulties, pride and comfort was always happened to the working and non-working students. Students certainly have interests to learn English language, especially students who have found comfort in practicing appropriate learning strategies. Learning English by implementing language learning strategies is simple and enjoyable during the process of learning. Therefore, the use of language learning strategies is crucial for student, and the introduction or socialization of it is a must for teachers. When teachers and students have applied both, learning targets would be easily to be obtained effectively. Result of this research concluded that working students applied memory strategies in their learning process. Where, non-working students applied all learning strategies at the medium level category. It can be interpreted that non-working students did not really understand and realize to the use of learning strategies. In future research, it is a must to analyze student learning strategies by selecting the research samples who have already understood about the language learning strategies. Working students were almost preferred to learn words by finding out the exactly meaning and

brainstorming the previous information than guessing that was called memory learning strategies. Memory strategies categorized as the dominant used by working students in English language learning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Bakker, A., & Akkerman, S. (2011). Boundary Crossing and Boundary Objects. *Review of Educational Research*, *81*(2), 132–169.

Biggs, J. (2014). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University Assessing for learning quality : II . Practice*.

Brown. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Brown, S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated Cognition and the Culture of Learning. *Institude for Inquiry*, *18*(1), 32–42.

Cohen, J. (2011). Second-language Literacy Instruction: Five Principles for Effective Fluency Development. *The Asian EFL Journal Professional Teaching Articles*, *54*, 59–68.

Curtis, & N, S. (2002). The Effect of Taking Paid Employement During Term-time on Students' Academic Studies. *Journal of Future and Higher Education*, *26*(2), 129–138.

Deneme. (2008). Language Learning Strategies Preferences of Turkish Students. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Students*, *4*(2).

Ding, Y. (2007). Text memorization and imitation: the practices of successful Chinese learners of English, System. *Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, *35*, 271–280.

Faizuddin, A., Mansir, F., Purnomo, H., & Aisyah, N. (2020). Working Students in Higher Education : Challenges and Solutions. *Jurnal of Islamic Education*, *4*(1), 78–89.

Goodyear, V., & Dudley, D. (2015). " I ' m a Facilitator of Learning !" Understanding What Teachers and Students Do Within Student-Centered Physical Education Models. *Quest*, (67), 274–289.

Guile, D., & Griffiths, T. (2001). Learning through work experience. *Journal of Education and Work*, 1–16.

Hartwig, M. K., & Dunlosky, J. (2011). Study strategies of college students : Are self-testing and scheduling related to achievement ? *Psychonomic Society*, pp. 126–134.

Kanlisi, S. (2016). The Effect of Student Learning Strategies on Performance and Carrier The Effect of Student Learning Strategies on Performance and Carrier Development : The Case of University for Development Studies. *Education Journal*, *5*(6), 172–182.

Maquiling, A. (2018). Working Students : Their Benefits , Challenges and Coping Mechanisms. *Social Science and Humanities Journal*, *2*(3), 358–369.

Mokhtar, A. A. (2012). Guessing Word Meaning from Context Has Its Limit : Why ? *International Journal of Linguistic*, *4*(2), 288–305.

Munawaroh. (2017). The Influence of Teaching Methods and Learning Environment to the Student ' s Learning Achievement of Craft and Entrepreneurship Subjects at Vocational High School. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, *12*(4), 665–678.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York:

Newbury House Publishers.

Rubin, J., & Thompson, I. (1982). *How to be a more successful language learner*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Sampelolo, R., & Atmawardoyo, H. (2016). Learning Strategies and Styles of a Part Time Job Student With Good Achievement (A Case Study of a Successful Part Time Job EFL Learner). *ELT Worldwide*, *3*(1), 91–106.

Simsek, A., & Balaban, J. (2010). Learning Strategies of Successful and Unsuccessful University Students. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, *1*(1), 36–45.

Stevenson, A., & Harper, S. (2016). *Workplace stress and the student Workplace stress learning experience*. 167–178.

Vygotsky, S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Weinstein. (1987). Fostering learning autonomy through the use of learning strategies. *Journal of Reading*, *30*(7), 590–595.

Wenden. (1991). Metacognitive strategies in L2 Writing: A Case for Task knowledge. In *Rountable on Language and Linguistics* (pp. 302–321). George University.