The Correlation Between English Language Learning Strategies and Students' Thinking Style at The Second Grade of MAN 1 Kolaka

Ray Suryadi
Universitas Sembilanbelas November Kolaka
ray_suryadi@yahoo.com

Syamsinar
STIE Tri Dharma Nusantara Makassar
hinarishine@gmail.com

Indrayani Simpuruh
STIE Tri Dharma Nusantara Makassar
indrayanisimpuruh@gmail.com

Firdayana
Universitas Sembilanbelas November Kolaka
Firdayana12@gmail.com

Abstract

This study was conducted at MAN 1 Kolaka. The objective is to find out information and data weather there is any correlation between English language learning strategy and students' thinking style at the second grade AGAMA I of MAN 1 Kolaka. The research design is descriptive quantitative in nature. The data were collected through questionnaires. Findings revealed that the English Language Learning Strategy at the second grade AGAMA I of MAN 1 Kolaka were Metacognitive with the total frequency of 47% and Students' Thinking Style were Extrovert with the total percentage of 53%. The Population of the study was the second-grade students of MAN 1 Kolaka and the sample of the research was 1 class based on random sampling technique which consisted of 15 students. The data analysis used in this research was product moment formula which showed that there were no correlation between English Language Learning Strategy and Students' Thinking Style. It could be synthesized that hypothesis were r-count was lower than r-table. So H1 was rejected and H2 was accepted. The coefficient Correlation between English Language Learning Strategies and Students' Thinking Style did not have any significant correlation with the r-count = -0,218 was lower than r-table 0,514 at the significance level 5% and degree of freedom (df) was 15 (-0,218>0,514). Therefore, it was categorized as low correlation. H0 and H1 was rejected and H2 was accepted.

Keywords: correlative study, language learning strategies, thinking style

INTRODUCTION

The success of the learning process not only by good learning strategies and methods also depends on students' thinking styles. Students' right-thinking styles have an impact on the learning process. However, the thought process is also strongly influenced by the ability to regulate memory in memory and the perception of the stimulus that enters the process. This will cause humans to have varied and different thinking styles in response to the stimulus they receive. The ability to regulate information or data in a long term memory depends on a sequential (regular) arrangement or a random (random) arrangement. While the perception of the stimulus is related to whether the perception is concrete (real) or abstract (not visible). Perception itself is interpreted as an experience of objects, events, or relationships that are obtained by deducing information and interpreting messages.

There were good and bad factors that influence student learning in class. Dweck (2006) state that there are 2 kinds of approaches in students' thinking styles; they are a fixed mindset and a growth mindset. In a fixed mindset, students are always anxious and nervous about facing setbacks or criticism. Students with a growth mindset are eager to learn to improve their performance and enjoy exploring, experimenting and developing on their own. Students have a branching one, and it is referred to as their brain which starts to grow but is still not optimal. Usually, students learn more to get new information, science and from this process students can develop their brains again. Students who can focus on the learning process usually can get a lot of information from students.

Even English is the main language in whole this world does not mean that no one does not like English. Not all students like English. Some students take the English subject as obligatory. Students with that type usually when class starts they are busy with what they want to do or arrive late to class.

They often play their smartphone in class instead of listening to the teacher. This problem can be resolved when students are interested in learning strategies and from these strategies, students can change their thinking patterns. Furthermore, Coelho, Tesch, & Drozdenko (2011) stated that two factors can disrupt the focus of students in the class, namely internal and external factors. Internal factors come from himself such as talking to others, sending messages, playing cell phones, listening to music on his MP3. External factors are a type of disturbances made from others, it can be from friends, the teacher is difficult to understand, such as the teacher explains with unclear pronunciation or irregular grammar, also can be from outside the classroom, such as playing too much.

The way students act can explain how they think. Each student has differences in what they need in their language learning process and way of thinking. From this problem, the researcher sees they have their strategies for receiving information. There are several strategies in language learning strategies, namely Cognitive Learning Strategies, Metacognitive Learning Strategies, and Social Strategies. Naiman in Fatih (2018) stated that all types of language learning can grow well if we have enough knowledge about students and the learning and teaching process. Regarding these problems, teacher as the main component of education are challenged to be as creative as possible to provide opportunities for students to expose and strengthen student skills. To encourage students to practice their language, the researcher tries to help teachers to solve students' problems.

This research aimed to find out a significant relationship between language learning strategies and students' thinking styles by distributing questionnaires to students of MAN 1 Kolaka as participants of this study, especially for learning English. For this reason, the researcher estimation that sharing a questionnaire might be useful for knowing the results. Based on the arguments that have been discussed, the researcher thought that it is necessary to observe and focus on language learning strategies and students' thinking styles.

Some previous researches as comparison has been done before such as: First, Mahmood, Hashemnezhad & Javidi (2013) the results obtained were there was a significant difference between males and females in terms of strategy choice. It was found that the differences between the strategy used of male and female are meaningful for memory, metacognitive, compensation, cognitive. In other words, males used more memory, cognitive, compensation and metacognitive strategies compared with females, but there was no significant difference between males and females with regard to the affective and social strategy use. Second, Barruansyah (2018). the result of this research were, the first alternative hypothesis was accepted, which means there was a significant correlation between learning styles and students' motivation in learning English. The second hypothesis was accepted, which means there was a significant correlation between language learning strategies and students' motivation in learning English. The third hypothesis was accepted, in the Beta score, it also revealed that language learning strategy gave more influence than learning styles.

The comparison among two of previous research before is this research focused on the types of language learning strategies (Metacognitive, cognitive and social) while in student thinking style focused on student thinking style (external and internal).

Language Learning Strategies

Hardan (2013) defines language learning strategies as steps, behaviors, and techniques used by learners to enhance and facilitate language acquisition. Language learning strategies invoke some aspects such as behavior, thought, technique, and step. While Cohen (2007) defined that the purpose of language learning strategies is to develop learning, to work with specific tasks, to cope with specific problems, to make learning easier, faster, and more enjoyable and to compensate for a deficit in learning. Both of them referred to language learning strategies as actions, behaviors, skills, steps, thought, or techniques of the learners during the language learning in order to embark better learning.

Basically, there were three major categories of language learning strategies, they were: Cognitive, Metacognitive, and Socio-Affective Strategies (Setiyadi, 2011). To know more about the types of language learning strategies as follows:

Metacognitive Strategy, according to Setiyadi (2016) metacognitive involve self-awareness to plan or direct, monitor, evaluate or correct what has been done in learning English. These strategies also referred to as self-management strategies, are utilized by learners to oversee and manage their learning (Wenden in Setiyadi, 2016). English students need to know how important metacognitive learning strategy, If the student know their learning strategy in English, it will make them easy to understand English. By using metacognitive strategies, learners are aware of and control their efforts to use particular skills and strategies. The learners use their capacity to monitor and direct their own success of the task at hand, such as recognizing that comprehension

has failed, using fix-up strategies, and checking an obtained answer against estimation (Jones in Setiyadi, 2016). Even though there are some metacognitive terms were defined not exactly same but still have relation each other under metacognitive category involves some ways such as planning for learning , thinking about their learning process, self-correctness, and evaluating learning after an activity is completed.

Cognitive Strategies, in reading comprehension cognitive strategies involve comprehending a passage, composing an essay, making a decision, solving a problem, and creating a playing. In language learning, cognitive strategies may include many activities that take place in the brain while the language tasks are at hand. The cognitive category can be classified into sub-categories: deep level cognitive and surface level cognitive strategies. With deep level cognitive strategies, students learned something by relating it to previous knowledge, other topics and personal experience By using deep level cognitive strategies, the students involved comprehending texts, synthesizing parts of sentences, analyzing sentences and applying rules. In using surface level cognitive category students not only recalling knowledge but also other strategies that are regarded as rote learning. This strategy involves direct learning process about the learning process itself and have limited specific learning task.

Socio-Affective Strategies, this kind strategy has close relationship with social activity and interacting with other people. The example of socio affective strategies are cooperation and question for clarification. There were three social strategies, namely, a) joining a group, b) give the impressions- with a Few well-chosen words- that you can speak the language, and c) count on yourfriends. O'Malley in Setiyadi (2016) also introduced the category of social strategy and classified it under a heading social mediation. In their Study this group only contained one strategy, namely, cooperation (work- ing with one or more peers to obtain feedback, pool information, or model language). Social strategies were also developed by Oxford In Setyadi (2016). The strategies she introduced under this category were a) asking questions, b) cooperating with others and c) empathizing with others, while Wenden in Setiyadi (2016) classified social strategies under "retrieving information" of cognitive strategies. The social category developed in this research includes not only all processes that take place in groups, but also includes individual activities in social settings aimed to acquire another language. An example of this would be reading letters from friends in order to have the opportunity to practice English.

Language learners should use appropriate strategies to improve their knowledge and skill. Hismanogulu in Lestari (2015) asserted that language learning strategies help language teacher to know how their students asses their condition in learning process, plan, select skill to understand, learn and remember information in the language classroom. Language learning strategies considered as important aspect in learning foreign language. Language learners need to know their learning strategies to enhance and embark their skill in new language.

Conceptualizing Thinking Style

Thinking style is the learner's way to process and call information deal with their task. Sternberg & Zhang (2005) described thinking styles as the think done when using ability or a way of preference of thinking. Thinking style in common relate to the way how people think, produce, get, accept and store information. Nikoupur Alam & Tajbakhsh (2012) asserted

thinking style as a learner variable has been considered as a determinant factor to predict learner's success or failure. In short, thinking style is ability of individual in managing their ideas that derives persons' behavior and goals.

Every single person has different way of thinking style based on their intelligence; Intelligence refers to individual potentials and abilities, therefore thinking style refer to individual preferences (Seif, 2008). Heidarie & Bahrami (2012) define that thinking style relate to the preferred manner of utilizing one's own abilities. Thinking styles correlated positively with a student success in a variety of academic tasks. Successes and failure attributed to abilities often stem from styles. Thinking style defined students' success because thinking style are preferred manner of utilizing abilities and correlate with student success in academic task.

Thinking styles have a relationship with problem-solving, decision-making, academic achievement, and variables such as culture, gender, and age (Negahi M, Nouri N and Khoram A, 2015). Strenberg in Sriwarsiti (2017) divided thinking styles dimensions into two categories as follows:

a. Internal Styles

Internal individuals are concerned with internal affairs - that is to say, these individuals turn inward. They tend to be introverted, task-oriented, aloof, and sometimes socially less aware. They like to work alone. Essentially, their preference is to apply their intelligence to things or ideas in isolation from other people.

b. External Styles

External individuals tend to be extroverted, outgoing, and people-oriented. Often, they are socially sensitive and aware of what is going on with others. They like working with other people wherever possible.

The importance thinking style were students think about something that makes them more enjoyable so that they can accept every lesson and material well and recognizing of thinking styles helps people or students to adapt their thinking to the different thinking styles which makes them faster in capturing material.

The majority of people tend to focus on ideas, facts, data, outcome, action, and to be oriented towards the big picture or details. Our individual thinking styles determine how we perceive information, how we make decisions, solve problems, plan for our future and communicate with other people more effectively. Every single person has different thinking styles in terms of functionality. When we know our thinking style, we know what naturally energizes us, why certain types of problems are challenging or boring, and what we can do to improve in areas that are important to reach our goals. System thinking is a holistic approach to comprehend how things influence one another within a whole or how it works over time and within the context of larger systems. System thinker delves into principles including the interdependence of things and hierarchy that objects and notions are consisted of smaller subsystems.

METHOD

This research categorized into correlative type. Correlation research is the research intended to determine whether there is a relationship between two or several variables (Arikunto, 2010).

In this research, this research has two variables such as: Language Learning Strategies (X) and Students' Thinking Styles (Y). The researcher used a quantitative research approach to collect and analyze the data to get the result of the correlation between language learning strategies ad students thinking styles.

This research conducted in MAN 1 Kolaka. The population of this research was students at the second grade of MAN 1 Kolaka. 15 students at the second grade class Agama I of MAN 1 Kolaka as the research participants in this research.

The researcher used a questionnaire as the instrument to collect the data. The questionnaire consisted of 25 questions and divided into 2 variables. The first variable was language learning strategies consisted 15 items and the second one was the questionnaires of thinking style consisted 10 items.

The questionnaire used Likert scale form; a scale with some points, usually at least three but no more than seven. Five points of scale ranging which used, such as: Strongly Agree, SA (Sangat Setuju, SS), Agree, A (Setuju, S), Fair, F (Cukup, C) Disagree, D (Tidak Setuju, TS), and Strongly Disagree, SD (Sangat Tidak Setuju, STS). The degree of the scale was described in the table below:

Table 1. Likert Scale

Statement	SA	A	F	D	SD
Positive scale	5	4	3	2	1
Negative Scale	1	2	3	4	5

(Sugiono, 2012)

To collect and obtain the data from the students, the researcher used questionnaires as the instrument. The questionnaire included two questionnaires such as language learning strategies and thinking style. Procedure of collecting the data is as follows:
1. Constucting language learning strategies and thinking style questionaires.
2. distributing language learning strategies questionnaire.
3. distributing thinking style questionnaire.
4. analyzing the data.

In analyzing the data the researcher used correlational quantitative research. The researcher used Correlation Product Moment which was developed by Carl Pearson to know the correlation between two variables. The formula used was:

$$r = \frac{N\left(\sum XY\right) - \left(\sum X\right)\left(\sum Y\right)}{\sqrt{[(\sum X^2) - (\sum X)^2][n\left(\sum Y^2\right) - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

r = Pearson"s Correlation Coefficient
N = Number of Participants
X = Students" Language Learning Strategies
Y = Students" Thinking Styles

∑X = The Sum of Language learning Strategies
∑Y = The Sum of Students Thinking Styles
∑X2 = The Sum of Squared Language Learning Strategies
∑Y2 = The Sum of Squared Student"s Thinking Styles
∑XY = The Sum of Multiplied Scores between X and Y
To interpret the index scores of correlation "r" product moment between variable X and Y (rxy), the researcher uses the interpretation as follows:

Table 2. The Coefficient Correlation

Coefficient Interval	Interpretation
0.00 – 0.199	Very low correlation.
0.20 – 0.399	Low correlation
0.40 – 0.599	Moderate correlation
0.60– 0.799	High correlation
0.80- 1.000	Very high correlation

To determine the result of statistic calculation Rxy with the degree of freedom (df) at the degree of significance 5% with the formula:
Df = N-nr

Where:
Df = Degree of fredom
N = Number of participant
nr = Number of variable (X and Y)

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS
The researcher obtained two kinds of data namely learning language strategies and students' thinking style which were discribed as follows:

Descriptive Statistic Analysis
1. **Descriptive Statistic of Language Learning Strategies**
The questionnaires were distributed to 15 students of MAN 1 Kolaka especially in the class of XI-Agama I. The way to indicate the major students' language learning strategy is by seeing one of the highest scores among three kinds of learning language strategies. The students'

language learning strategies were distributed to 15 students of MAN 1 Kolaka in class of XI-Agama I. The result of the students' language learning strategies on the table as follows:

Table 3. The classification score of the students language learning strategies

No	Classfication	Freq	Percentage
1	Cognitive Strategies	6	40%
2	Metacognitive Strategies	7	47%
3	Socio – Affective Strategies	2	13%

The results of each student language learning strategies was known and determined. The data included of 15 students resulted three kinds of language learning strategies are as follows: 6 students have cognitive strategies, 7 students have Metacognitive strategies and others with the total 2 students have socio – affective strategies. The data showed most of students in MAN 1 Kolaka especially in the class XI-Agama 1 was dominated by metacognitive strategies with the total frequency 7 participants have metacognitive strategy with 47% percent.

2. Descriptive statistic of students' thinking style

The students thinking style questionnaires were distributed to 15 students of MAN 1 Kolaka in class of AGAMA I. Based on the data, the researcher concluded the higher scores to determine students' thinking style by comparing students' score between two kinds of students' thinking styles. The description of students' thinking style could be seen on the table below.

Table 4. The classification score of the students' language learning strategies

No	Classfication	Freq	Percentage
1	Cognitive Strategies	6	40%
2	Metacognitive Strategies	7	47%
3	Socio – Affective Strategies	2	13%

Based on the data it was found that there were 2 kinds of students' thinking styles such as: There were 7 introvert students and 8 extrovert students. The data summed up extrovert students were superior to introvert students with the total percentage was 53% for extrovert student while 43% for introvert students.

Inferential Statistical Analysis Correlation Between Language Learning Strategies and Students Thinking Style

To find out the coefficient Correlation between English Language Learning Strategies and Students' Thinking Style at the second grade AGAMA I of MAN 1 Kolaka the researcher used Pearson product-moment formula. The result of the computation of Correlation between English Language Learning Strategies and Students' Thinking Style at the second grade AGAMA I of MAN 1 Kolaka was in low correlation. Criteria for evaluation and interpretation of correlation coefficient by Sugiyono (2012) is used to categorize the relationship level. As shown in tabel 4 below.

Table 5. Coefficient Interval and Relationship Level

Coefficient interval	Level of relationship
0,00 – 0,199	Very low correlation
0,20 – 0,399	Low correlation
0,40 – 0,599	Medium correlation
0,60 – 0,799	Strong correlation
0,80 – 1,00	Very strong correlation

From the result of statistic calculation, It compared that rxy with the degree of freedom (df=N-nr) is 28-4 = 24. Where:

df = degree of freedom
nr= number of variable
at the degree of significant of 5%

The Statistic Hypothesis of Language Learning Style
The statistic hypothesis of learning style in this research as follows:
1. If r count > r table, in the significant of 0.05, H1 was accepted and H0 was rejected. It means that there was a significant correlation between students' language learning strategies and students thinking style.
2. If r count < t table, in significant of 0.05, H0 was accepted and H1 was rejected. It means that there was no any significant correlation between students' language learning strategies and students thinking style.

Descriptive Statistic Coefficient Correlation Between Language Learning Strategies and Students' Thinking Style

Table 6. Correlation between language learning strategy and students' thinking style

		Language learning strategies	Thinking style
Language learning strategies	Pearson Correlation	1	-,218
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,434
	N	15	15
Thinking style	Pearson Correlation	-,218	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,434	
	N	15	15

The result of the data calculation of correlation coefficient language learning strategies and students' thinking style were obtained r count = -0.218 and can be interpreted as low correlation.

The value of significant correlation coefficient between learning language strategies and students' thinking style were obtained 0,434. Furthermore, the hypothesis testing of language learning strategies and students' thinking style compared r count and r table. The hypothesis were proven with r count was lower than r table (-0.218<0,514) by used the significance 0.05. Based on the data H0 was accepted and H1 was rejected. It means that there was no any significant correlation between learning language strategies and students' thinking style.

The result of the hypothesis were r count was low than r table and the score of learning language strategies and students' thinking style has opposite direction. So H0 and H1 were rejected and H2 was accepted. It means that there was a negative correlation between Learning Language Strategies and Students' Thinking Style at the second grade of MAN 1 Kolaka in academic year 2020/2021.

This research is not in line with Mahmood, Hashemnezhad & Javidi (2013). They were revealing that there was a significant difference between males and females in terms of strategy choice. It was found that the differences between the strategy used of male and female are meaningful for memory, metacognitive, compensation, cognitive. In other words, males used more memory, cognitive, compensation and metacognitive strategies compared with females, but there was no significant difference between males and females with regard to the affective and social strategy use.

Another researcher was conducted by Barruansyah (2018), revealed that there was a significant correlation between learning styles and students' motivation in learning English. The second hypothesis was accepted, it means that there is a significant correlation between language learning strategies and students' motivation in learning English. The third hypothesis was accepted, in the Beta score, it also revealed that language learning strategy gave more influence than learning styles.

From the result of the research, it was found that there was no any Correlation between English Language Learning Strategies and Students' Thinking Styles. It could be synthesized that hypothesis were r count is low than r table. So H0 was rejected and H2 was accepted. The coefficient correlation between language learning strategies and students' Thinking Style did not have significant correlation with the r count = -0,218 lower than r table 0,514 at the significance level 5% and degree of freedom (df) was 15 (-0,218>0,514). It was categorized as low correlation. H0 & H1 was rejected and H2 was accepted.

Discussion

The data shows that English language Learning Strategies of the second grade AGAMA I at MAN 1 Kolaka are dominated by Metacognitive. From the questionnaire they filled out, with the total frequency 7 participants have metacognitive strategy with 47% percent. In which they used more self-awareness to plan or direct, evaluate or corrected what they had done in Learning English. in managing their learning (Wenden in Setiyadi, 2016).

The results of the data show that Student's Thinking Style at the Second Grade AGAMA I of MAN 1 Kolaka are dominated by Extrovert total percentage were 53% extrovert student while 43% Introvert students. Extrovert prefer to be people oriented, they are often socially sensitive and aware of what is going on with other people. They like to interact with the surrounding environment (Strenberg in Sriwarsiti 2017).

Based on the result of testing hypothesis, the null hypothesis (H0) which explained that there was no any significant Correlation between English language Learning Strategies and Student's Thinking Style, the alternative hypothesis (H2) which explained that there was a negative Correlation English Language Learning Strategies and Students' Thinking Style at the second grade AGAMA I of MAN 1 Kolaka was accepted.

Correlation between English Language Learning Strategies and Students' Thinking Style did not have significant correlation with the r count = -0,218 low than r table 0,514 at the significance level 5% and degree of freedom (df) was 15 (-0,218>0,514)

Berdasarkan hasil penelitian tersebut dapat disimpulkan bahwa language learning strategies previous showed that Metacognitive as the dominant English Language Learning Strategies. As what Jones in Setiyadi (2016) said that by using metacognitive strategies, learners are aware of and control their efforts to use particular skills and strategies. The learners use their capacity to monitor and direct their own success of the task at hand, such as recognizing that comprehension has failed, using fix-up strategies, and checking an obtained answer against estimation. And for the students'thinking style, it showed that students' Extrovert more superior than Introvert based on what Seif (2008) has said that every single person has different way of thinking style based on their intelligence; Intelligence refers to individual potentials and abilities, therefore thinking style refer to individual preferences.

CONCLUSION

Based on the previous explanation, it could be concluded that there was no any correlation between Language Learning Strategies and their Thinking Style at the second grade of MA Negeri 1 Kolaka. From the result of analysis descriptive statistic of language learning strategies and their thinking style. It could be seen from the table of the language learning strategies previous showed that Metacognitive as the dominant English Language Learning Strategies and the students' Thinking Style showed that students' Extrovert more superior than Introvert .

As on the result it could be synthesized that hypothesis were r count low than r table. So H0 H1 was rejected and H2 was accepted. The coefficient Correlation between English Language Learning Strategies and Students' Thinking Style did not have significant correlation with the r count = -0,218 lower than r table 0,514 at the significance level 5% and degree of freedom (df) was 15 (-0,218>0,514). It was categorized as low correlation.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher concluded that English Language Learning Strategies did not correlates with students' Thinking Style at the second grade AGAMA I of MAN 1 Kolaka

REFERENCES

Barruansyah, T, R. (2018) The Correlation between Learning Styles, Language Learning Strategies, and English Learning Motivation of the Sixth Semester Students of STIBA Persada Bunda. *Journal of English for academic J-SHMIC*, Vol 5, No 1, February 2018

Cohen, A.D. (1996). *Second Language Learning And Use Strategies: Clarifying The Issues. Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition*. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Dweck, C.S (2006) *The New Psychlogy of Success*. United States: Random House

Fatih, N.I (2018) The Correlation Between Language Learning And Students Thinking Style. *Unpublished Thesis*

Hardan, A.A (2013) *Language Learning Strategies*; A General Overview. Ira: Elesevier Ltd.

Heidairie, F. (2012) The relationship between Thinking style and metacognitive awareness among Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4(3), 721-733

Lestari, O.N. (2015) Language Learning Strategies of English Education Departemen FITK (A Comparison Descriptive Study at The Fourth and Sixth Students). *Unpublished Thesis*

Mahmood, K B, Hashemnezhad, H & Javidi, S, (2013) The relationship between language learning strategies and thinking styles of Irania EFL learners. *International journal of Rererach Studies in Language Learning*. 2013 October, Volume 2 Number 4, 3-19

Negahi, M., Nouri., & Alireza K. (2015) The Study of Learning Style, Thinking Styles and English Lanuage Academic Self-efficacy among Students of Islamic Azad University of Behbahan considering their field of study and gender. *Theory and Pratice in Language Studies,* 5(8), 1722- 1729. ISSN: 2243-7754

Nikoupour, J., Alam, M., &Tajbakhsh. (2012). Thinking style and achievement motivation: a survey study among Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of English and Literature*, 2(3), 89-104.

Seif, A. (2008). *Educational psychology*. Tehran, Iran: Davaran Publication.

Setiyadi, et.al. (2016) How Successful Learners Employ Learning Strategies in an EFL Setting in the Indonesian Context. *English Language Teaching*; Vol. 9, No. 8

Sriwarsiti, E., (2017) The Correlation between Thinking Style and Academic Achievement of Undergraduate English Study Program Students of UIN Raden Fatah Palembang. *Unpublished Thesis*. UIN Raden Fatah Palembang

Sternberg, R. J., & Zhang, L. (2005). Styles of Thinking as a Basis of Differentiated Instruction. *Theory and Pratice in Language Studies*, 44(3), 245-253. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4403_9

Sugiyono (2012) Metode Penelitian Kualitatif, Kuantitatif dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta

Tesch, F., Coelho, D, & Drozdenko, R (2011). We Have Met the Enemy and He Is Us: Relative Potencies of Classroom Distractions. *Business Education Innovation Journal*, Volume 3, Issue 2.