

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

A. Finding

1. The learners' Classification According to Their SES Level

47

In order to check and investigate the normal distribution assumption, the Kolmogorov Smirnov test was used. The result (see *Appendix 10 (table 4.2 Normality Assumption)*) showed that the statistical significant (Asymp. Sig. (2-Tailed)) for Socio-Economic Status and All different language learning strategy showed indexes more than 5% or 0,05 (Asymp. Sig. > 0,05). For more simple see table 4.3.

Variable	Asymp. Sig. (as)	Alpha (A)	Condition	Conclusion
SES	0.054	0.05	(ss) more than (A)	Normal
Memory	0.633		(ss) more than (A)	Normal
Cognitive	0.114		(ss) more than (A)	Normal
Compensatory	0.057		(ss) more than (A)	Normal
Metacognitive	0.152		(ss) more than (A)	Normal
Affective	0.274		(ss) more than (A)	Normal
Social	0.197		(ss) more than (A)	Normal

[illegible]

The illustration of Socio-Economic status and language learning strategy distribution was shown in the normal curve, however the skewness indicate as little positive (see **appendix 11 (figure 4.1 and 4.2))**).

Figure 4.2 described that average learners in English education department had quite good language learning strategy, it was indicated from the top of the line. But there were some learners with high language learning strategies. It was indicated on the tail in the right side which was lower and longer.

It was one of requirement before performing MANOVA and Correlation Product Moment, because both of them was categorized of Parametric statistic. The function of homogeneity test was to check the equal data of variable (it was come from homogeny sample or not). Levene's test was run to check it.

Memory strategy	= 0,158 (mean) > 0,05 = Homogeny
Cognitive Strategy	= 0,719 (mean) > 0,05 = Homogeny
Compensatory Strategy	= 0,319 (mean) > 0,05 = Homogeny
Metacognitive Strategy	= 0,368 (mean) > 0,05 = Homogeny
Affective Strategy	= 0,576 (mean) > 0,05 = Homogeny
Social Strategy	= 0,368 (mean) > 0,05 = Homogeny

The function of homogeneity assumption was to minimize or it could prevent the error when the parametric statistic was applied. So when the data was analyzed by using parametric statistic, it could be more confidence and accurate, because the level of error was reduced or had been anticipated.

In MANOVA there was two test was carried out first was MANOVA and Between Subject-Effect test was the second.

Memory	= 0,000 (<i>sig</i>) < 0,05 (<i>Alpha score</i>)
Cognitive	= 0,002 (<i>sig</i>) < 0,05 (<i>Alpha score</i>)
Compensatory	= 0,000 (<i>sig</i>) < 0,05 (<i>Alpha score</i>)
Metacognitive	= 0,000 (<i>sig</i>) < 0,05 (<i>Alpha score</i>)
Affective	= 0,000 (<i>sig</i>) < 0,05 (<i>Alpha score</i>)
Social	= 0,000 (<i>sig</i>) < 0,05 (<i>Alpha score</i>)

5. Pearson Correlation Product Moment

- ❖ 0 = no correlation
- ❖ $> 0 - 0,25$ = very weak correlation
- ❖ $> 0,25 - 0,5$ = enough correlation
- ❖ $> 0,5 - 0,75$ = Strong Correlation

value of correlation was shown in 0,798** scale. it was mean that it had very strong positive correlation. while the two stars indicate it was categorized as two tailed significant (it could be positive or negative correlation).

The Metacognitive strategy had a correlation with each strategy of language learning and Socio-Economic status. The value of correlation was shown in 0,879** scale. it was mean that it had very strong positive correlation. while the two stars indicate it was categorized as two tailed significant (it could be positive or negative correlation).

The affective strategy had a correlation with each strategy of language learning and Socio-Economic status. The value of correlation was shown in 0,862** scale. it was mean that it had very strong positive correlation. while the two stars indicate it was categorized as two tailed significant (it could be positive or negative correlation).

The social strategy had a correlation with each strategy of language learning and Socio-Economic status. The value of correlation was shown in 0,902** scale. it was mean that it had very strong positive correlation. while the two stars indicate it was categorized as two tailed significant (it could be positive or negative correlation).

And the result of *Correlation Pearson Product Moment* indicated the linier positive correlation between Socio-Economic status and language learning strategies. It was mean that More high the level it was

consideration variable that had significant contribution in academic performance.²

Secondly, the researcher took an analogy of this study. An academic achievement/performance was argued as a bread in a bread's shop. Socio-Economic as Jimmy and language learning strategies as Emely was people who work on that shop. Both of them influence the quality of the bread. When jimmy had a good performance Emely would have a good performance, and the bread would be produced would had a good quality. And when the bread had a good quality, it was mean a good benefit for Jimmy.

It could mean that when the Socio-Economic status of learners was good, the language learning of them also good, and the academic achievement/performance also good. But what was the impact of SES in every strategy in language learning, it needed more study and investigation.

In sum, it was found the guidance that could be used to further research deeply. When there was known that one variable had significant

[illegible]

