

The use of Learning Strategy in Reading of Reflective Learners

Nabila Ayu Nisa^{1✉}

¹*Master of English Education, University of Lampung, Lampung*

✉ email: nabilaayu96@gmail.com

Received:

11 March 2022

Revised:

28 April 2022

Accepted:

28 April 2022

Published:

02 August 2022

ABSTRACT

The goal of this study was to see if there was a significant difference between the three types of reflective learners' reading learning strategies. The participants were 35 Senior High School students in Bandar Lampung, who were in the 12th grade. The Matching Familiar Figure Test (MFFT) was used to categorize students into reflectivity/impulsivity, and the Language Learning Approach Questionnaire (LLSQ) was administered to determine students' learning strategy preferences. The data was analyzed using One Way ANOVA with a significance level of 0.05. The findings revealed that reflective learners' reading strategies differed significantly from those utilized by non-reflective learners. According to the finding, Reflective learners used more metacognitive reading methods that were related to their own prior experience and knowledge.

Keywords: *Language, Learning Strategies, Reflective Learners, Reading.*

INTRODUCTION

Unconsciously, learners are expected to be reflective people in the future, to develop the skill of problem-solving and to be successful in their studies. Reflective people are those who always reflect on their past experience and knowledge to solve current and future tasks or problems. Furthermore, reflective people always choose wise and better alternatives and choices than non-reflective people. This is crucial when learners are given multiple-choice exams, such as reading comprehension tests. In the conceptual tempo of individual difference, Kagan (1966) primarily described a domain that is responsible for the decision time variable and indicates the time the subject takes to study many options before committing to one of them in a situation with significant response uncertainty. Students are split into two groups, according to his theory: reflective and impulsive learners. In education development, learners are, however, expected to be reflective which is related to not only education situations but also real-life problem-solving situations.

Various studies have revealed that between both groups (Reflective and Impulsive), reflective learners are considered to be more successful in reading (Doron, 1973; Kagan, 1965; Soltani et al., 2015). Impulsive students make rapid decisions and report them with little care for accuracy, whereas reflective students are more concerned with accuracy but take longer to make a decision (Kagan, 1966). In other words, impulsive people tend to jump at the first response whereas reflective people rethink their choices. Reflective learners, according to Fontana (1995) make fewer errors, especially on tough and

difficult tasks like reading examinations, since they have a strong desire to get it right the first time and appear to be able to bear the ambiguity of a long silence in front of the class.

Generally, learners have many different ways of approaching problems encountered during completing tasks. This approach is usually known as a learning strategy. Wenden & Rubin (1987) define language learning strategy as "the language learning activities that learners participate in to learn and regulate the study of a second or foreign language." It means that the strategies are able to change the learners' behavior, especially positive behavior including reflective behavior. But in the real condition, we can see many language students were passive and accustomed to learning only from the teacher. Therefore, education has an important role in influencing one's abilities (Maskur et al., 2020).

In this case, language learning strategies play an important role in various fields (Rahmawati et al., 2021) for all language skills especially receptive skills, such as reading. Good reading skills will help very much those who want to continue their study to a higher level or to get a job (Annury et al., 2019). Some tactics have been discovered that obstruct the readers' ability to deduce meanings (Sutarsyah, 2013). It is assumed that the students who used good strategies will be able to answer the reading test items and comprehend the message well. This also works for reflective learners particularly. There are different ways of classifying the LLS. In this research, the writer focused on the LLS taxonomy of O'Malley et al., (1985). They divide LLS into three main subcategories, namely: metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, and socio-affective strategies.

Meta-cognitive strategies are a term used in information-processing theory to characterize cognitive activities like planning for learning, thinking about the learning process while it occurs, monitoring one's production or comprehension, and evaluating learning once an activity is accomplished. Some of the most popular metacognitive approaches are advanced organizers, selective attention, self-management, functional planning, self-monitoring, delayed production, and self-evaluation (O'Malley et al., 1985).

On the other hand, cognitive approaches are limited to certain learning tasks and need more direct manipulation of the learning material. The cognitive strategy includes repetition, resourcing, translation, grouping, note-taking, deduction, recombination, imagery, auditory representation, keyword, contextualization, elaboration, transfer, and inference.. Socio-affective techniques, on the other hand, are concerned with social mediating and connecting with people. Cooperation, such as working with one or more peers to gain feedback, pool information, or model, and questioning for clarification, such as asking a teacher or other native speaker for repetition, paraphrase, explanation, and/or examples, are the most common socio-affective methods.

Hadidi, et al. (2017) investigated whether there were any significant relationships between metacognitive knowledge of reading technique and students' reflective and impulsive behavior. Reflective learners are more metacognitively aware of reading technique use, according to the findings. As a result, the more reflective they are, the more metacognitively aware of their reading strategy selection they become. On the

other hand, according to Naimie et al., (2010), there was a significant influence on the choice of learning strategies, which included memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies being the most important (Naimie et al., 2010).

Based on the foregoing description, The goal of this study was to see if there was a significant difference between the three types of reflective learners' reading learning strategies.

METHOD

The ex-post facto design was used in this research by comparing three strategies applied by reflective learners. The Matching Familiar Figure Test from Kagan (1965) was used to distinguish reflective students depending on their reflectivity/impulsivity domain. After that, students' learning method preferences were assessed using the Language Learning Strategy Questionnaire for Reading Skills (Setiyadi & Mahpul, 2016). All of the tests had been proven to be valid and reliable. The population of the research was 35 samples of twelve-grade students which had been determined using simple random sampling. The data were analyzed using One Way ANOVA of SPSS 16 at the significant level of 0.05 in which the hypothesis is approved if Sig. < α .

H0 = There was a significant difference between the three categories of language learning strategies employed by reflective learners

H1 = There was no significant difference between the three categories of language learning strategies employed by reflective learners

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

ANOVA

Means of LS

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.769	2	1.385	5.217	.009
Within Groups	13.536	51	.265		
Total	16.305	53			

Figure 1. ANOVA Test Results

According to the statistical computation above, the table shows that the result of significance of Means of Learning Strategies is 0.009. Since $0.009 < 0.05$, it can be stated that the three different language acquisition strategies for reading have a considerable difference. To evaluate which procedure is superior to the other, a Post Hoc Test was undertaken. The Post Hoc Test results are listed below.

Multiple Comparisons

Means of LS
Tukey HSD

(I) Learning Strat egy	(J) Learning Strat egy	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	-.3833	.1717	.075	-.798	.031
	3	.1556	.1717	.639	-.259	.570
2	1	.3833	.1717	.075	-.031	.798
	3	.5389*	.1717	.008	.124	.953
3	1	-.1556	.1717	.639	-.570	.259
	2	-.5389*	.1717	.008	-.953	-.124

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Figure 2. The Post Hoc Test results

There was a substantial difference in the types of Language Learning Strategies used by reflective learners, according to the findings. The Sig. of Strategy 2 (Metacognitive Strategy) is 0.008, which is lower than 0.05, as seen in the Multiple Comparisons table above. Therefore, it can be seen that the strategy which shows different means is Strategy 2 (Metacognitive Strategy).

To summarize, reflective learners employed more metacognitive strategies than the other students. This is in line with Chamot (2008), who asserts that strategic learners, specifically reflective learners, have metacognitive knowledge of their own thinking and learning processes. They have a good grasp of what a task requires and the ability to organize techniques that best suit the work demands as well as their individual learning abilities. Furthermore, higher metacognitive awareness of learners allows for improved reading comprehension (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002)

Then, based on the results of Hadidi, et al. (2017) said that reflective learners are more metacognitively aware of reading strategy use so the more reflective they are, the more metacognitively aware they become of their reading strategy use. Logically, learners who are reflective will call for their understanding of certain similar situations including their experience and knowledge in reading comprehension. They will re-read and reflect on several questions to themselves such as "Do I understand the text?" to help them comprehend the text.

Furthermore, according to Naimie et al. (2010), the memory strategies of grouping and imagery, the cognitive strategies of practicing, analyzing, and summarizing, the compensation strategies of guessing, the metacognitive strategies of planning, paying attention, and self-evaluating, the affective strategies of anxiety-reduction and self-encouragement, and the socials (Naimie et al., 2010).

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the data analysis and discussion, it can be stated that reflective learners' language learning processes differ significantly when undertaking reading activities. Moreover, most reflective learners use metacognitive reading

strategies including self-monitoring, direct and specific oriented, self-evaluation, etc which can help them comprehend text and be successful in reading tests.

In order to help students to gain a successful target language learning, language teachers should insert the individual differences among students as the main consideration of creating a successful learning process. Language learning strategy, as an important component determining learning success, can assist teachers to create a better learning environment in which students can appropriately use their preferred approach to support the language learning process, in addition to sustaining a better learning process. Furthermore, the researcher suggests finding out whether reflective learners' characteristics can be successful in other skills too for further research.

REFERENCES

- Annury, M. N., Mujiyanto, J., Saleh, M., & Sutopo, D. (2019). The Use of Metacognitive Strategies in EFL Reading Comprehension. *First International Conference on Administration Science (ICAS 2019)*, 343, 62–66. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icas-19.2019.13>
- Doron, S. (1973). *Reflectivity-impulsivity and their influence on reading for inference for adult students of ESL*. University of Michigan.
- Fontana, D. (1995). *Psychology for teachers* (3rd Ed.). Macmillan.
- Kagan, J. (1965). Reflection-Impulsivity and Reading Ability in Primary. *Child Development*, 36(3), 609–628.
- Kagan, J. (1966). Reflection-Impulsivity: The generality and dynamics of conceptual tempo. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 71(1), 17–24.
- Maskur, R., Sumarno, Rahmawati, Y., Pradana, K., Syazali, M., Septian, A., & Palupi, E. K. (2020). The Effectiveness of Problem Based Learning and Aptitude Treatment Interaction in Improving Mathematical Creative Thinking Skills on Curriculum 2013. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 9(1), 375–383. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.9.1.375>
- Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. A. (2002). Assessing students' Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(2), 249–259. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.2.249>
- Naimie, Z., Abuzaid, R. A., Siraj, S., Shagholi, R., & Hejaili, H. Al. (2010). Do you know where I can find the new center which is called “Cognitive styles and language learning strategies link”? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 497–500. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.051>
- O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Russo, R. P., Küpper, L., & Kupper, L. (1985). Learning Strategy Applications with Students of English as a Second Language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(3), 557. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586278>
- Rahmawati, Y., Pradana, K. C., Novalia, Rinaldi, A., & Syazali, M. (2021). Curiosity and creative characters: The impact on students' munerical ability. *Desimal: Jurnal Matematika*, 4(2), 231–246. <https://doi.org/10.24042/djm>
- Setiyadi, A. B., & Mahpul. (2016). *Language Learning Strategy Questionnaire (LLSQ): a measurement to identify students' learning strategies and prepare the success of learning*

- English in the Indonesian context (empirical evidence)*. Graha Ilmu.
- Soltani, K., Tamjid, N. H., & Seifouri, Z. (2015). Iranian EFL learners' reflectivity/impulsivity styles and their metacognitive awareness of reading strategy use across gender. *Journal of Instruction and Evaluation*, 8(21), 103–124.
- Sutarsyah, C. (2013). *Reading Theories and Practice*. Lembaga Penelitian Universitas Lampung.
- Wenden, A., & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learning strategies in language learning*. Practice-Hall International.