



INSIGHTS INTO MONOLINGUAL MALAYSIAN AND BILINGUAL INDONESIAN UNDERGRADUATES MAJORING IN ENGLISH



 Mahendran
Maniam¹⁺
 Shanti
Ramaningam²

¹Associate Professor, Sultan Idris Education University, Malaysia.

Email: mahendran@fbk.upsi.edu.my Tel: +60163230467

²Senior English Language Teacher, SJKT West Country Barat, Malaysia.

Email: shanti.usm@gmail.com Tel: +60133531609



(+ Corresponding author)

ABSTRACT

Article History

Received: 23 October 2019

Revised: 28 November 2019

Accepted: 6 January 2020

Published: 21 January 2020

Keywords

Mother tongue
Second language
First language
Monolingual
Bilingual
Language learning strategies.

This research investigated the connection between language learning strategy (LLS) preferences utilized by monolingual Malaysian Malay students and bilingual Indonesian students who are specializing in English language and in the second year of their studies. The study was conducted among 50 Yogyakarta State University (Indonesia) students and 50 University Putra Malaysia (Malaysia) students. Strategy Inventory for Language learning (SILL), Version 7.0(ESL/EFL) by R. Oxford 1989 was utilized to measure the types of learning strategies used by the undergraduates of both the universities. The data was analyzed by using the t-test. The researcher wanted to investigate what language learning strategies do monolingual and bilingual students use and if there were differences in the use of language learning technique between the two set of students. The findings of this study indicated that monolingual and bilingual undergraduates majoring in English employed a wide selection of language learning methodology to learn English. The t-test indicated that there were obvious distinctions between monolingual and bilingual learners. Anyhow the monolinguals in this study were more prone to use cognitive, meta-cognitive and social language learning techniques. This reporting of greater strategies used by monolinguals that was not consistent with past studies, give some reinforce for the new argument that monolinguals demonstrate advanced skills when learning a new language. This is an important insight as it has pedagogical implications in terms of curriculum and assessment design for undergraduate programs related to language learning.

Contribution/ Originality: This study is one of very few studies which have investigated insights into monolingual and bilingual ESL learners from Malaysia and Indonesia. The findings of this study will give new understandings on language learning strategies utilized by monolinguals and bilinguals.

1. INTRODUCTION

For decades, scholars have been trying to identify the variables affecting second language acquisition. The scholars still also interested in knowing the distinctions between successful students and those who are less successful. On the basis of the notion that success is the product of some variables, some researchers (Ellis, 1985; McLaughlin, 1987; Oxford, 1990) have emphasized that the use of learning strategies is one of the major variables that affect language learning. However, research into the relationship between bilingualism and multilingualism and many other factors such as intelligence, cognitive development and learning strategies are also important to be

investigated. developing more language learning experience by learning, studying, and having exposure to more than one language, multilingual or bilinguals may have specific skills, techniques or belief which enables them to tackle the language learning process more effectively than those with expertise in one language only (McLaughlin and Nayak, 1989).

1.1. The Study Aim

In general, research into language learning strategies use have been conducted in a context where English language is the official one. As a result, few studies have been conducted into language learning strategies use in a context where monolingual, bilingual and multilingual are presented. On the basis of above mentioned reason, the current study aims to make a comparative analysis of language learning strategies used by bilingual and monolingual university learners from two neighboring countries who are specializing in English for the reason of becoming English instructors.

1.2. Significance of the Study

The results of the current study will be very helpful for language instructors who are interested to know about how learning strategies can help their learners based on the number of languages known to them. Language instructors can convince demotivated and unsuccessful language learners on why they must use the right strategy/strategies to learn or improve their comprehension/proficiency. Language learners must be mindful of the strategies that led to their success in order to remain successful with learning tasks. Understanding of one's own way of thinking processes is usually referred to meta-cognition. Meta-cognitive awareness is important in language learning. The worth of this kind of self-knowledge is that it promotes reflection, planning of ways to continue with a learning task, observation of performance on regular basis, and self-evaluation upon task achievement. Students with greater meta-cognitive awareness comprehend the similarity between the latest learning task and previous ones, know the technique required for successful learning, and expect success as a outcome of knowing "how to learn" (Paris and Winograd, 1990). The results of this study is expected to measure the level of language learning strategies utilized by monolinguals and bilinguals in Malaysia and Indonesia and use them correctly to improve their language learning.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Previous studies, especially, one of the earliest comparative studies involving 10 multilingual and 10 monolingual participants was conducted by Ramsay (1980) revealed that the set of successful learners are predominated by the multilinguals. Nation and McLaughlin (1986) conducted a comparative study where learners learnt a small scale linguistic system and came to a conclusion that multilinguals used some techniques that can assist them to get resources to process linguistic information better when they were not given clear instructions to learn. Nayak *et al.* (1990) found that multilingual participants who had more opportunity to learn a third language knew better than monolinguals which learning strategies to use in different language learning situations that are best for them and were more flexible in utilizing and trying technique that is appropriate to the task. In more recent studies Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006) compared bilingual Korean-Chinese University learners and monolingual Korean in the strategies they use. The researcher stated that the bilingual Korean-Chinese reported higher use of learning strategies, despite a less English learning experiences and less favorable formal English education environment in the Korean-Chinese society. Tuncer (2009) investigated monolingual and bilingual adult EFL students and found a supportive relationship between bilingualism and the strategies used. The author predict that the bilinguals have more advantages than monolinguals in the language learning process because they are motivated intrinsically and that the factor of this motivation may be the earlier achievement at learning or acquiring other languages. Kostic-Bobanovic and Bobanovic (2011) studied the differentiation between university

students that are bilingual and monolingual in the language learning strategies used. On the other hand, a smaller case study conducted by [Shabani and Najafi \(2009\)](#) concluded that there were no significant differences in the strategy use overall and on individual items between the two set of learners and attributed these findings to factors such as gender and social position of women in Iran. In Greece [Psaltou-Joycey and Kantaridou \(2009\)](#) looked into a potential connection between plurilingualism degrees, usage of strategies and learning styles of university students (L1 Greek speakers with certificates in foreign languages, taught in tertiary education) and reported that bilingual students used less language learning strategies than and trilingual students that more advanced trilinguals made use of strategies more frequently.

[Oxford \(1990\)](#) said that students who can adequately consolidate and deal with language strategies that are distinctive are doing better in learning a second or third language. There are also other research that reported a positive connection between level of proficiency in a foreign language and the recurrence of strategy use ([Wharton, 2000](#); [Bruen, 2001](#); [Gerami and Baighlou, 2011](#)).

[Wharton \(2000\)](#) expressed that the previous success at learning or acquiring other languages have fortified bilinguals' utilization of procedures. There is almost very limited research on this topic despite the fact that there is much episodic proof that individuals who have learned many languages previously are better at language learning than are "linguistically naïve subject" ([Nayak et al., 1990](#)). There are many research that discovered that bilinguals were more adaptable in looking for and using procedures correctly to the task, had more prominent facilities to learn a third language, and knew better than monolinguals which learning approach would best work for them in different language learning situations.

3. METHODOLOGY

The first group of respondents was undergraduate students at the Putra University of Malaysia, studying English as a Second Language. This group comprised of 50 Malay undergraduates. Their mother tongue was the Malay language. There were no participants who were fluent or able to communicate consistently and correctly in any language other than the Malay language. So, they are best defined as monolinguals. The monolingual Malaysian group was not equal in terms of gender with 19 males (24%) and 31 females (76%). English is taught as a second language in Malaysia.

The second group consist of 50 bilingual university students. The bilingual students were 12 males (38%) and 38 females (62%). Members of the bilingual group were learners from Jogjakarta State University with the knowledge of two languages, Bahasa Indonesia and either one of the followings: Buginese, Mandarese, Javanese, Sundanese, and Mandarese as their mother tongue. Bahasa Indonesia is the official language of Indonesia. It has a population of 242 million and they speak 300 different native languages. English language teaching in Indonesia cannot be separated from its linguistic settings. The linguistic settings in Indonesia are quite complex due to the vast cultural diversity. According to [Alwasilah \(2005\)](#) most children in Indonesia are bilingual, they had acquired their first language such as Javanese, Balinese, Sundanese and so on. They learn Bahasa Indonesia (Indonesian language) as the second language in schools. English is taught as a foreign language in Indonesia.

3.1. Instrument

To measure language learning strategies (LLS), Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) is an internationally recognized instrument. The SILL Version 7.0 was used to evaluate learning strategy preferences (please refer to [Appendix 1](#)) for this study. The SILL is a 50 item self –report, survey designed to assess frequency and style of learning strategies use by [Oxford \(1990\)](#). The strategies are divided into indirect and direct strategies which are divided into six categories. Indirect strategies are classified as meta-cognitive, social and affective strategies. Direct strategies are also defined as memory-related strategies, compensation and cognitive strategies. Memory strategy helps students enter information in long-term memory and recall it when they need to

communicate (e.g., using sounds or imagery, or both to recall new words). Nine items are used to evaluate these. Cognitive strategy involves revision and formation of internal mental models (e.g., analyzing, reasoning, and summarizing). These are evaluated by fourteen items. On the other hand, compensation strategy is used to assist learners to solve problems in language learning (e.g., guessing, using clues, getting help, and using gesture and synonyms, using circumlocution). These are evaluated by six items. Meta-cognitive strategy is related to domains like organizing, centering and directing learning such as self-monitoring and evaluating, planning schedule, and setting goals to help learners to manage their learning. These are evaluated by nine items. Affective strategy allows learners to control attitudes and emotions connected to language learning (for example discussing one's feelings with others and reducing anxiety). These are evaluated by six items. Meanwhile, the social strategy involves cooperating with others and communication in language learning, such as asking for correction and asking questions. These are evaluated by six items also. The respondents were asked to respond in a multiple-choice fashion for the items been investigated in the questionnaire; ranking from 'almost always' to 'almost never' on a five-point Likert scale. The items were used to investigate the frequency of use of a given strategy. However, the internal reliability of the questionnaire was tested using Cronbach's alpha; the value was 0.64.

This study was designed to answer the following research questions:

1. What language learning strategies do monolingual and bilingual learners who are majoring in English language use?
2. Is there a significant difference in the use of language learning strategies between the groups?

3.2. Data Analysis

The results from the questionnaire were mainly analyzed using SPSS, version 13.0. Demographic information as well as strategies used by participants were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Mean scores for each strategy were calculated and used to determine the use of LLS. All the items used in this study were leveled from one to five. A comparison was made between strategies used by monolinguals and those used by bilinguals using t-test.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Language Learning Strategies

In this study, six types of English language learning strategies were assessed among the monolingual and bilingual participants; namely memory, cognitive, compensation, meta-cognitive, affective and social strategies. As revealed in the following tables, in three parts of the questionnaire, i.e. Cognitive, Meta-cognitive, and Social strategies, the obtained value for p is at 0.001 and therefore it can be concluded that the level of significance is meaningful. Among the three categories of the SILL used by monolinguals and bilinguals, there is a significant and meaningful difference. Based on this study findings, the first research question was labeled with positive answer, since a wide variety of strategies have employed by the students from all the parts of the questionnaire. Meanwhile the second research question was labeled with partially positive answer, since only 29 items out of the 50 in the questionnaire indicated a significant difference and 21 indicated that there is no significant difference between the two groups.

4.1.1. Memory Strategies

Table 1 shows the outcome for memory strategies usage among the respondents. The overall average score showed the usage of memory strategies to be similar between the monolingual and bilingual users ($p=0.139$). However, for individual strategies, monolinguals often think of the relationships between what already known and new things compared to their bilingual counterpart (mean \pm SD = 3.94 ± 0.77 versus 3.58 ± 0.95 ; $t(98) = 2.086$, $p=0.040$). The monolingual group also frequently remember new English words by making mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used (mean \pm SD = 4.04 ± 0.92 versus 3.52 ± 1.05 ; $t(98) = 2.621$, $p=0.010$).

Meanwhile, the bilinguals were not in favour of this strategy as they prefer to associate the new word learned with other languages known to them.

Table-1. Score of memory strategies usage among the monolingual and bilingual respondents, compared using independent sample t-test.

	Mean±SD		Statistic	
	Monolingual (n=50)	Bilingual (n=50)	t	p-value
Overall average score	3.29±0.51	3.13±0.54	1.492	0.139
Strategies				
I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	3.94±0.77	3.58±0.95	2.086	0.040*
I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.	3.48±0.91	3.72±1.03	-1.235	0.220
I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help remember the word.	3.66±1.06	3.48±1.13	0.821	0.414
I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	4.04±0.92	3.52±1.05	2.621	0.010*
I use rhymes to remember new English words	2.88±1.24	2.54±1.15	1.424	0.158
I use flashcards to remember new English words.	2.16±1.11	2.26±1.10	-0.451	0.653
I physically act out new English words.	2.60±1.20	2.96±0.99	-1.641	0.104
I review English lessons often.	3.34±1.02	2.98±0.87	1.897	0.061
I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	3.48±1.15	3.12±1.29	1.476	0.143

Note: * Significant p-value at 0.05.

4.1.2. Cognitive Strategies

Table 2 shows the outcome for cognitive strategies usage among the respondents. The overall average score showed a significantly higher usage of cognitive strategies by the monolinguals (mean±SD = 3.89±0.49 versus 3.49±0.54; $t(98) = 3.830$, $p < 0.001$). Among the 14 types of cognitive strategies assessed, the monolinguals used several strategies significantly more often than the bilingual respondents. The strategies in descending order of usage were watching English movies or TV shows (mean±SD = 4.74±0.53 versus 3.92±1.08; $t(98) = 4.807$, $p < 0.001$), read for pleasure in English (mean±SD = 4.44±0.88 versus 3.28±1.07; $t(98) = 5.910$, $p < 0.001$), write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English (mean±SD = 4.34±0.85 versus 3.26±1.10; $t(98) = 5.489$, $p < 0.001$), practice the sounds of English (mean±SD = 4.18±0.80 versus 3.82±0.96; $t(98) = 2.034$, $p = 0.045$), make summaries of information that they hear or read in English (mean±SD = 4.00±0.97 versus 3.42±0.97; $t(98) = 2.990$, $p = 0.004$), use the English words they know in different ways (mean±SD = 3.98±1.02 versus 3.24±0.96; $t(98) = 3.736$, $p < 0.001$) and lastly start conversations in English (mean±SD = 3.74±1.03 versus 3.00±1.05; $t(98) = 3.564$, $p = 0.001$). One interesting part of the findings in this section was that bilinguals were not in favour of reading for pleasure.

4.1.3. Compensation Strategies

Table 3 shows the outcome for compensation strategies usage among the respondents. The overall average score showed the usage of compensation strategies to be similar between the monolingual and bilingual users ($p = 0.937$). However, for individual strategies, bilinguals make up new words if they do not know the right ones in English, more often than the monolingual users (mean±SD = 3.74±1.10 versus 2.90±1.27; $t(98) = -3.538$, $p = 0.001$). None of the other compensation strategies usage differed significantly between the two group. It has been found that bilinguals are quite fond of making new words if they do not know the right words to be used in English. This could be due to the advantage of knowing more than one language whereby they have vast knowledge of vocabulary.

Table-2. Score of cognitive strategies usage among the monolingual and bilingual respondents, compared using independent sample t-test.

	Mean±SD		Statistic	
	Monolingual (n=50)	Bilingual (n=50)	t	p-value
Overall average score	3.89±0.49	3.49±0.54	3.830	<0.001**
Strategies				
I say or write new English words several times.	3.62±1.21	3.38±0.85	1.145	0.255
I try to talk like native English speakers.	3.72±1.07	3.66±1.08	0.279	0.781
I practice the sounds of English.	4.18±0.80	3.82±0.96	2.034	0.045*
I use the English words I know in different ways.	3.98±1.02	3.24±0.96	3.736	<0.001**
I start conversations in English.	3.74±1.03	3.00±1.05	3.564	0.001*
I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	4.74±0.53	3.92±1.08	4.807	<0.001**
I read for pleasure in English.	4.44±0.88	3.28±1.07	5.910	<0.001**
I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.	4.34±0.85	3.26±1.10	5.489	<0.001**
I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	4.16±0.84	3.84±1.11	1.621	0.108
I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	3.22±1.22	3.40±1.20	-0.746	0.457
I try to find patterns in English.	3.30±1.18	3.50±1.07	-0.885	0.378
I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	3.38±1.05	3.30±1.02	0.388	0.699
I try not to translate word-for-word.	3.66±1.02	3.88±0.92	-1.132	0.260
I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	4.00±0.97	3.42±0.97	2.990	0.004*

Note: * Significant p-value at 0.05; ** Significant p-value at 0.00

Table-3. Score of compensation strategies usage among the monolingual and bilingual respondents, compared using independent sample t-test.

	Mean±SD		Statistic	
	Monolingual (n=50)	Bilingual (n=50)	t	p-value
Overall average score	3.73±0.62	3.74±0.65	-0.079	0.937
Strategies				
To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	4.32±0.87	4.08±0.97	1.307	0.194
When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	4.22±0.91	4.06±1.02	0.828	0.409
I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	2.90±1.27	3.74±1.10	-3.538	0.001*
I read English without looking up every new word.	3.26±1.12	3.28±1.03	-0.093	0.926
I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	3.38±1.14	3.14±1.05	1.095	0.276
If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	4.28±0.86	4.12±0.87	0.925	0.357

Note: * Significant p-value at 0.05.

4.1.4. Meta-cognitive Strategies

Table 4 shows the outcome for meta-cognitive strategies usage among the respondents. Meta-cognitive strategies are high level management skills and comprise skills such as planning, organization, monitoring and assessment. The monolingual students' more frequent use of meta-cognitive strategies which allow them to question and reflect his or her learning process based on passed linguistic experience. Similar to cognitive strategies, the overall average score for meta-cognitive strategies also showed a significantly higher usage by the monolinguals (mean±SD = 4.14±0.60 versus 3.80±0.58; $t(98) = 2.859$, $p=0.005$). Among the nine types of meta-cognitive strategies assessed, the monolinguals used five strategies significantly more often than the bilingual respondents. The strategies in descending order of usage were to notice their English mistakes and use that information to help in doing better (mean±SD = 4.44±0.64 versus 4.06±0.79; $t(98) = 2.630$, $p=0.010$), think about their progress in learning English (mean±SD = 4.38±0.92 versus 3.92±0.94; $t(98) = 2.463$, $p=0.016$), trying to find as many ways as can to use English (mean±SD = 4.30±0.79 versus 3.64±0.88; $t(98) = 3.961$, $p<0.001$), look for

opportunities to read as much as possible in English (mean±SD = 4.10±1.07 versus 3.24±1.06; $t(98) = 4.029$, $p < 0.001$), and also look for people with whom they can talk to in English (mean±SD = 3.96±1.01 versus 3.52±1.09; $t(98) = 2.092$, $p = 0.039$).

Table-4. Score of meta-cognitive strategies usage among the monolingual and bilingual respondents, compared using independent sample t-test.

	Mean±SD		Statistic	
	Monolingual (n=50)	Bilingual (n=50)	t	p-value
Overall average score	4.14±0.60	3.80±0.58	2.859	0.005*
Strategies				
I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	4.30±0.79	3.64±0.88	3.961	<0.001**
I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	4.44±0.64	4.06±0.79	2.630	0.010*
I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	4.46±0.73	4.42±0.67	.284	0.777
I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	4.50±0.71	4.22±0.79	1.867	0.065
I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	3.14±1.03	3.32±0.98	-0.896	0.373
I look for people I can talk to in English.	3.96±1.01	3.52±1.09	2.092	0.039*
I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	4.10±1.07	3.24±1.06	4.029	<0.001**
I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	3.98±0.98	3.88±1.00	0.504	0.615
I think about my progress in learning English.	4.38±0.92	3.92±0.94	2.463	0.016*

Note: * Significant p-value at 0.05; ** Significant p-value at 0.001.

4.1.5. Affective Strategies

Table 5 shows the outcome for affective strategies usage among the respondents. Affective strategies enable learners to control emotions and attitudes related to language learning. Similar to memory and compensation strategies, both the monolingual and bilingual respondents used the affective strategies similarly, based on their overall average score ($p = 0.544$). As of individual strategies, the bilinguals frequently notice if they are tense or nervous when studying or using English, more often than the monolingual users (mean±SD = 3.84±1.17 versus 2.70±1.22; $t(98) = -4.782$, $p < 0.001$). None of the other affective strategies' usage differed significantly between the two groups.

Table-5. Score of affective strategies usage among the monolingual and bilingual respondents, compared using independent sample t-test.

	Mean±SD		Statistic	
	Monolingual (n=50)	Bilingual (n=50)	t	p-value
Overall average score	3.20±0.59	3.27±0.56	-0.609	0.544
Strategies				
I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	4.00±0.81	3.86±0.93	0.805	0.423
I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	4.26±0.83	4.00±0.81	1.589	0.115
I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	2.98±1.19	3.22±1.25	-0.985	0.327
I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	2.70±1.22	3.84±1.17	-4.782	<0.001**
I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.	2.46±1.43	2.02±1.13	1.704	0.092
I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	2.80±1.26	2.68±1.22	.484	0.630

Note: * Significant p-value at 0.001.

4.1.6. Social Strategies

Table 6 shows the outcome for social strategies usage among the respondents. Parallel to cognitive and metacognitive strategies, the overall average score for social strategies also showed a significantly higher usage by the monolingual respondents (mean±SD = 4.13±0.62 versus 3.51±0.80; $t(98) = 4.362$, $p < 0.001$). The t value above

clearly indicated that monolingual are very inquisitive. They are always prepared to ask and learn new words. And bilinguals are quite contented with the existing linguistic knowledge and therefore are not motivated to be as inquisitive as the monolinguals. A total of six social strategies were enquired of which five were used by the monolinguals at frequency significantly higher than the bilinguals. The strategies in descending order of usage were practicing English with other students (mean±SD = 4.50±0.58 versus 3.94±1.02; $t(98) = 3.378$, $p=0.001$), asking questions in English (mean±SD = 4.38±0.70 versus 3.50±1.05; $t(98) = 4.923$, $p<0.001$), trying to learn about the culture of English speakers (mean±SD = 4.30±0.86 versus 3.82±1.06; $t(98) = 2.479$, $p=0.015$), asking help from English speakers (mean±SD = 3.76±1.17 versus 2.80±1.14; $t(98) = 4.150$, $p<0.001$) and also asking the English speakers to correct them when they talk (mean±SD = 3.70±1.20 versus 3.06±1.39; $t(98) = 2.464$, $p=0.015$).

Table-6. Score of social strategies usage among the monolingual and bilingual respondents, compared using independent sample t-test.

	Mean±SD		Statistic	
	Monolingual (n=50)	Bilingual (n=50)	t	p-value
Overall average score	4.13±0.62	3.51±0.80	4.362	<0.001**
Strategies				
If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	4.16±0.96	3.94±1.06	1.091	0.278
I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	3.70±1.20	3.06±1.39	2.464	0.015*
I practice English with other students.	4.50±0.58	3.94±1.02	3.378	0.001*
I ask for help from English speakers.	3.76±1.17	2.80±1.14	4.150	<0.001**
I ask questions in English.	4.38±0.70	3.50±1.05	4.923	<0.001**
I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	4.30±0.86	3.82±1.06	2.479	0.015*

Note: * Significant p-value at 0.05; ** Significant p-value at 0.001.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this world, speaking more than one language is just a natural necessity of everyday life, and finding pure monolinguals is not easy (Wardough, 1998). Therefore, it can be claimed that there is a significant difference between monolingual and bilingual students in terms of using language learning strategies. As evident in this study, it can be claimed that there is a positive correlation between the strategy use and the number of languages known to the learners. It can be suggested that a positive correlation exists between the use of the strategy and the number of languages that the learners know. The findings also suggest that a wide variety of language learning strategies are used by both monolingual Malaysian and bilingual Indonesian university students, with monolingual learners using more strategies than their bilingual peers. Recent argument that monolinguals display advanced learning abilities while learning a new language is given some support by this reporting of greater strategy use. This is a complete contrast to prior research that have revealed that bilinguals (McLaughlin and Nayak, 1989) employ more learning strategies than their monolinguals. Out of the 50 strategies in SILL, 34 of them were more frequently used by monolinguals compared to bilinguals who utilized only 14 items. This is not in line with prior research that found that bilinguals were linguistically more competent than monolinguals for learning a third language. *They have been found to know more readily and show more flexibility while seeking and utilizing strategies which are appropriate to the task.*

One interesting part of the findings in cognitive strategies was that bilinguals were not in favour of reading for pleasure in English. The more accurate reason for this needs further exploration. The same goes for writing notes, messages, and letters. There is a significant difference between these two groups. This could be due to the fact that bilinguals (UNY TEFL students) were quite confident with the number of languages known to them and therefore there was no urgent requirement for them to read and write simple notes in English. For the same reasons, Indonesian bilinguals were also not interested in watching English language movies compared to monolinguals. On

the other hand, we also have to take note that unlike Malaysia, Indonesia was colonized by the Dutch and therefore English was not spoken and used officially until it was introduced in schools.

The findings of previous studies revealed learning strategies are generally used at a moderate level by university students. As shown in this study, monolingual Malaysian students use metacognitive strategies more often than the bilingual Indonesian students. Metacognitive strategies are considered high-level management skills and encompass many crucial skills such as organization, planning, monitoring, and assessment. While relying on their previous linguistic experience, using metacognitive strategies more frequently allows monolingual students to reflect and question their learning process. This was an unexpected finding and quite motivating factor for monolingual learners. On the contrary, in terms of regularly used language learning strategies, previous research have revealed different findings. Monolinguals are also more inquisitive compared to bilinguals. The current study has also revealed that monolingual students make more use of cognitive strategies compared to bilinguals. This finding is not also in line with findings of some previous studies (Tuncer, 2009); (Qasimnejad and Hemmati, 2014) and Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006). Furthermore, bilingual undergraduates majoring in the English language, have some linguistic skill obtained in using their native language and therefore are more prone to use a variety of language learning strategies. Learning another language is an added advantage for them as they can draw parallel lines between the languages to be newly learnt and the ones already known. Paradoxically, this did not take place among the Indonesian students.

In conclusion, it is suggested that Indonesian bilingual students need some other governmental motivation to learn a third language (English language). Further research is mandatory to address this phenomenon. Unless the Ministry of Education in Indonesia does something to address this issue, the standard of English in the country is expected to deteriorate.

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.

Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Acknowledgement: Both authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study.

REFERENCES

- Alwasilah, A.C., 2005. Policy on foreign language education in Indonesia. *International Journal of Education*, 7(1): 1–19.
- Bruen, J., 2001. Strategies for success: Profiling the effective learner of German. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34(3): 216-225. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2001.tb02403.x>.
- Ellis, R., 1985. *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garcia, E. E. (2005). *Teaching and learning in two languages: Bilingualism and schooling in the United States*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gerami, M.H. and S.M.G. Baighlou, 2011. Language learning strategies used by successful and unsuccessful Iranian EFL students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29: 1567-1576. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.399>.
- Hong-Nam, K. and A.G. Leavell, 2006. Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System*, 34(3): 399-415. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.02.002>.
- Kostic-Bobanovic, M. and M. Bobanovic, 2011. A comparative study of language learning strategies used by monolingual and bilingual EFL learners. *Metodickiobzori*, 6(3): 41-53. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.32728/mo.06.3.2011.03>.
- McLaughlin, B., 1987. *Theories of second language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- McLaughlin, B. and N. Nayak, 1989. Processing a new language: Does knowing other language make a difference? In H. Dechert & M. Raupach (Eds.), *Interlingual processes*. Reutlingen, Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag Tubingen. pp: 5–16.
- McLaughlin, B. and N. Nayak, 1989. Processing a new language: Does knowing other languages make a difference. *Interlingual Processes*, 1(5): 179-187.

- Nation, R. and B. McLaughlin, 1986. Novices and experts: An information processing approach to the “good language learner” problem. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 7(1): 41-55. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0142716400007177>.
- Nayak, N., N. Hansen, N. Krueger and B. McLaughlin, 1990. Language-learning strategies in monolingual and multilingual adults. *Language Learning*, 40(2): 221-244. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1990.tb01334.x>.
- Oxford, R., 1990. *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Paris, S.G. and P. Winograd, 1990. How metacognition can promote academic learning and instruction. In Jones, B.F., Idol, L. (Eds.). *Dimensions of thinking and cognitive instruction*. Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ. pp: 15-51.
- Psaltou-Joycey, A. and Z. Kantaridou, 2009. Foreign language learning strategy profiles of university students in Greece. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 25(1): 107-127.
- Qasimnejad, A. and F. Hemmati, 2014. Investigating the language learning strategies used by Iranian monolingual (Persian) and Bilingual (Persian_Turkish) speakers as EFL learners. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136: 26-30. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.281>.
- Ramsay, R., 1980. Language-learning approach styles of adult multilinguals and successful language learners. In V. Teller and S. White (Eds.), *Students in child language and multilingualism*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences. pp: 73-96.
- Shabani, M.B. and S.S. Najafi, 2009. The study of learning strategies used by male/female monolingual and bilingual speakers as EFL learners. Paper Presented at the First Annual National Conference, Technology in ELT. Charotar Institute of Technology, Changa: India.
- Tuncer, U., 2009. How do monolingual and bilingual language learners differ in use of learning strategies while learning a foreign language? Evidences from Mersin University. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1): 852-856. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.153>.
- Wardough, R., 1998. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. 3rd Edn., Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Wharton, G., 2000. Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning*, 50(2): 203-243. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00117>.

APPENDIX

Version for Speakers of Other Languages Learning English

Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL) © R.L.Oxford, 1989

Directions

This form of the STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING (SILL) is for students of English as a second or foreign language. You will find statements about learning English. Please read each statement. On the worksheet, write the response (1,2,3,4, or 5) that tells HOW TRUE OF YOU THE STATEMENT IS.

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.

NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE OF ME

Means that the statement is very rarely true of you.

USUALLY NOT TRUE OF ME.

Means that the statement is true less than half the time.

SOMEWHAT TRUE OF ME.

Means that the statement is true about half the time.

USUALLY TRUE OF ME

Means that the statement is true more than half the time

ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE OF ME

Means that the statement is true of you almost always.

Answer in terms of how well the statement describes you. Do not answer how you think you should be, or what other people do. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Put your answers on the Worksheet. Please make no marks on the items. Work as quickly as you can without being careless. This usually takes 20 – 30 minutes to complete. If you have any questions, let the teacher know immediately.

EXAMPLE:

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.

Read the item, and choose a response (1 through 5, as above). And write it in the space after the item.

I actively seek out opportunities to talk with native speakers of English.

You have just completed the example item. Answer the rest of the items on the Worksheet.

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning

Version for Speakers of other Languages Learning English

Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL) © R.L.Oxford, 1989

Korean version prepared by Park Bun-seon, Kwon Mi-jeong, Hwang Jung-hwa, 1998

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.

Part A

1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.
2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.
3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.
4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.
5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.
6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.
7. I physically act out new English words.
8. I review English lessons often.
9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.

Part B

10. I say or write new English words several times.
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.
12. I practice the sounds of English.
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.
14. I start conversations in English.
15. I watch English language TV shows or go to movies spoken in English.
16. I read for pleasure in English.
17. I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.
18. I first skim an English passage (read it quickly) then go back and read carefully.
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.
20. I try to find patterns in English.
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.
22. I try not to translate word-for-word.
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.
 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.

Part C

24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.
25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.
26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.
27. I read English without looking up every new word.
28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.
29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.

Part D

30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.
38. I think about my progress in learning English.

Part E

39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.
40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.
41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.
42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.

43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.
44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.

Part F

45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or to say it again.
46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.
47. I practice English with other students.
48. I ask for help from English speakers.
49. I ask questions in English.
50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.

Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the author(s), International Journal of Asian Social Science shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.