

62-Language learning strategies (SILL) for foreign language learners: A sample from Gagauzia

Halil KÜÇÜKLER¹

APA: Küçükler, H. (2020). Language learning strategies (SILL) for foreign language learners:A sample from Gagauzia. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (Ö8), 795-807. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.827689.

Abstract

Learning strategies and their usage are brought under notice when studying about learners who study English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The learning strategies have been investigated for more than 35 years using various elicitation tools and methods. The objective of this study is to identify the learning practices of students who are learning their second languages at Foreign Languages and Culture Faculty in State University in Gagavuzia in the academic year 2019-2020 concerning the use of learning strategy inventory. The survey plays a significant role in helping educators to check the learners' awareness of the subject under discussion. A quantitative study was conducted at Foreign Languages Department in Komrat State University in Gagavuzia in the academic year 2019-2020 to examine and weigh the use of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning, (Oxford;1990). 581(182 female 399 male) students answered the questionnaire. After the questionnaire was completed, the common strategies of the group were identified as male and female under analysing gender. From the results of the study, it is clear that the foreign language learners both male and female, heavily rely on the learning strategies to boost their memory and mastery of vocabularies. However, the degree of use of the strategies significantly differs. The participants' attitudes towards the use of SILL learning strategies also vary based on the learning environment that they are exposed to. As such, SL educators should try to create a positive learning environment, especially for SL students, to enhance their learning capacities.

Keywords: Language learning strategies, foreign language learning, language teaching

Yabancı dil öğrenenler için dil öğrenme stratejileri (SILL): Gagauzya örneği

Öz

Yabancı Dil olarak İngilizce (EFL) okuyan öğrencilerle ilgili öğrenme stratejileri ve kullanımları dikkat çekiyor. Bu öğrenciler, çeşitli çözümleme araçları ve yöntemleri kullanılarak 35 yıldan fazla bir süredir araştırılıyor. Bu konuyla ilgili olarak Yabancı Dil öğreniminde Stratejileri inceleme ve araştırmalar günden güne artmaktadır. Bu çalışmada, Rebecca L. Oxford'un (1980) geliştirdiği dil öğrenmede dil stratejileri geliştirme anketi kullanılmıştır. Çalışma, 2019-2020 yılları arasında Gagauzya da bir devlet Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Bölümünde öğrenimlerini devam ettiren öğrencilerin katılımlarıyla sürdürülmüştür. Araştırmaya 182 kız öğrenci, 399 erkek öğrenci toplam 581 öğrenci katılmıştır. Bu çalışmada, öğrenme ve stratejilerini ortaya koymada nitel ve nicel yöntemler kullanılmıştır. Anket tamamlandıktan sonra, cinsiyet analizi altında grubun ortak stratejileri erkek ve kadın olarak belirlendi. Çalışmanın sonuçlarından, hem erkek hem de kadın yabancı dil öğrenenlerin, hafızalarını ve kelime dağarcığını artırmak için öğrenme stratejilerine büyük ölçüde güvendikleri ortaya çıkmıştır. Bununla birlikte, stratejilerin kullanım derecesi önemli ölçüde farklılık göstermektedir. Katılımcıların öğrenme stratejilerinin kullanımına yönelik

¹ Öğr. Gör. Dr., Balıkesir Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, Mütercim Tercümanlık Bölümü (Balıkesir, Türkiye), hkucukler2@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7674-540X [Makale kayıt tarihi: 09.09.2020-kabul tarihi: 20.11.2020; DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.827689]

Adres
Kırklareli Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi, Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı
Bölümü, Kayalı Kampüsü-Kırklareli/TÜRKİYE
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com

Address
Kırklareli University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of
Turkish Language and Literature, Kayalı Campus-Kırklareli/TURKEY
e-mail: editor@rumelide.com

tutumları da maruz kaldıkları öğrenme ortamına göre değişmektedir. Bu nedenle, dil eğitimcileri, öğrenme kapasitelerini geliştirmek için özellikle yabancı dil öğrencileri için olumlu bir öğrenme ortamı yaratmaya çalışmalıdır. Sonuç olarak, her strateji öğrenmede hayati bir rol oynadığından, bir yabancı dil öğrenirken birden çok stratejinin kullanılması gerektiğini anlamaya yardımcı olur. Etkileşim, sunum, kendini değerlendirme ve kendini değerlendirme, daha iyi bir kişilik geliştirmek için yapılması gereken temel şeylerden bazılarıdır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Dil öğrenme stratejileri, yabancı dil öğrenme, dil öğretimi

Introduction

The objective of this study is to identify the learning practices of students who are learning their second languages at foreign languages in State University in Gagauzia in the academic year 2019-2020 concerning the use of learning strategy inventory. The survey plays a significant role in helping educators to check the learners' awareness of the subject under discussion. Therefore, the research paper performs an analysis of the relationship between the various Language strategies and the students' learning practices. The focus of the paper will be based on gauging the students' frequency of use of the SL strategies to aid their learning processes. The study seeks to provide valuable information for the SL educators and the learners that will be used to identify the need for improving the quality of classroom instruction. This study helps in understanding that multiple strategies need to be used when learning a foreign language as each strategy plays a vital role in learning.

Foreign language learners consciously use various learning strategies to aid their learning processes. As compared to weak language learners, excellent language learners tend to use a wide range of strategies as the understanding of these strategies has indicated necessary implications for the learners. The knowledge of learning strategies holds a considerable promise to the teaching process and for explaining the variations that occur among the second language learning students. However, the development of these strategies is considered to be at their infancy stages. Therefore, the learning strategies sometimes conclude with problems that need to be addressed for better use in the future. The use of learning strategies by second language learners may be considered a patched process since several authors have presented ideas that are stitched together without any proper coherence (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995). Thus, there is no systematic way that learning strategies have been presented.

The development of the learning strategies is based on the building of distinctions between language and its use. The distinction is necessary for the formation of the learning strategy inventory theoretical framework. The SILL is considered as an armchair listing of the learning strategies without any theoretical grounding and association of any specific language skill. However, the SILL remains to be the best instrument for using among learners and educators. Importantly, the learning environment that is dictated by the learners' cultural background hugely determines their choice of language learning strategies (Duvernay & You, 2018). The SILL has provided a comprehensive classification system which has been considered as the basis for the learning strategy inventory for Foreign Language learners. Besides, the SILL has been used to validate the efficacy of the language learning strategies as it provides a more descriptive inventory that includes evidence from learners in statement form to indicate the strategies that work best for them (Alhaysony, 2017). These strategies can help students, teachers and even people who work in their industry, understand and learn English as a foreign language better (Kazamia 2003). With SILL being a standard of language learning survey, its ultimate purpose is to bring forward the range of strategies that are used by learners and the various approaches in learning language. Such strategies can help students or learners to know exactly which

plan to follow and how to become better at a language; these strategies provide a flow of how to learn and which step to take when learning a second language.

1. Methodology

A quantitative study was conducted at Foreign Languages Department in State Universityin Gagauzia in the academic year 2019-2020. The objective of this study is to identify the learning practices of students who are learning their second languages at Foreign languages. The participants of the study were a group of 581 foreign language learners. The participants were administered with questionnaires in which they identified their written strategies. The survey was in the form of a questionnaire (SILL). The participants were asked to choose the frequency at which they used some written strategies. The SILL questionnaire had 50 items showing different strategies. Each question had 5 point Likert scale. The responses to the questions were scored from (1) 'Never or almost never of me' to (5) 'always or almost always true of me'. The results of this section were analysed according to Oxford's (1990) classification to averages. These strategies were then compared and find out against the strategies stated as part of SILL. Using this information, various results were achieved that imply possibilities for new strategies and amendments in the present ones. Table 1 below indicates the meaning of each score. The analysis of the results that were collected from the data of the questionnaires were done according to the classification of averages method stated in Oxford (1995). Each score had a meaning to it which was taken from the classification of SILL as follows:

Frequency	Description	Score
High	Always or almost always	4.5 to 5.00
	Generally used	3.5 to 4.4
Medium	Sometimes	2.5 to 3.4
	Generally not used	1.5 to 2.4
Low	Almost or almost never used	to 2.4

Table 1: The Classification of SILL (Oxford, 1990).

Table 1 is an indicator that reflects the bottom top and middle analysis evaluations of the data. Ethical considerations regarding the process of data collection and use were taken into account during the study (Iamudom & Tangkiengsirisin, 2020).

	Factors	Full scale
Mnemonic Strategies(A)	,760	
Cognitive Strategies(B)	,889	
Compensation Strategies(C)	,728	,955
Metacognition Strategies(D)	,906	
Affective (E)	,733	
Social (F)	,786	

Table 2: Cronbach α coefficients of the scale used and the scale's factors.

Table 2 indicates the reliability coefficients of the scale and subdimensions used in the research. It was concluded that the α coefficients of the validity of the scale were over .70 and therefore the questionnaires were reliable (Büyüköztürk,2006).

2. Result and discussion

The table 3 gives the responses of the group mnemonic strategies that are based on the group.

	M	Sd	Number
1	3,38	1,08	581
2	3,31	1,17	581
3	3,27	1,20	581
4	3,04	1,19	581
5	3,12	1,18	581
6	2,12	1,19	581
7	2,99	1,25	581
8	3,01	1,19	581
9	3,08	1,16	581

Table 3: Mnemonic strategies of all the students

The table 3 indicates the most commonly used items by both the groups' participants. The most commonly used is item 1 and the least used item is 6. The item result reflects that students use less flashcard in vocabulary learning. The overall average mean of mnemonics of all students is 2.9. This result shows that mnemonic levels are medium. A p value of .760 indicates that there is no significant difference in this research and other research. As such, there is a positive correlation in the students' use of mnemonics and other language strategies to aid their learning. The table 4 gives the responses of the gender mnemonic strategies that are based on the group.

	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	T	Df	P
s1	Female	399	3.3283	1.04424	-.535	579.000	.593
	Male	182	3.3791	1.09957			
s2	Female	399	3.2581	1.19926	-.627	579.000	.531
	Male	182	3.3242	1.12695			
s3	Female	399	3.2431	1.15334	-.249	579.000	.804
	Male	182	3.2692	1.22092			
s4	Female	399	3.0401	1.19815	-.654	579.000	.514
	Male	182	3.1099	1.18415			
s5	Female	399	3.2055	1.14430	.021	579.000	.983
	Male	182	3.2033	1.24705			
s6	Female	399	2.1203	1.21571	-.312	579.000	.755
	Male	182	2.1538	1.16981			
s7	Female	399	2.9749	1.24786	-1.574	579.000	.116
	Male	182	3.1484	1.19621			
s8	Female	399	2.8371	1.15224	-.777	579.000	.437
	Male	182	2.9176	1.16998			
s9	Female	399	2.9574	1.14114	-.904	579.000	.366
	Male	182	3.0495	1.13351			

Table 4: Gender table formulation for mnemonics strategies of the students

According to the table 4, mnemonics have a high correlation with the language learning strategies that the students use (Zarrabi, 2020). The students frequently use mnemonics to enhance their learning process. The use of mnemonics by SL students helps them to develop a connection between new and previous ideas, which is a concept that is supported by various studies on SL students' learning strategies (Amerstorfer, 2018). Mnemonics are majorly used by learners to boost their ability to remember concepts. The p value for the gender analysis is greater than 0.05 indicating no significant difference in the male and female students' use of mnemonic based on gender. For items 7, 8, and 9, tabulated t-value is slightly greater than t-calculated implying that there is a statistical difference in the means and standard deviation for male and female students' use of mnemonics (Psaltou-Joycey, et al., 2017). For items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, the t-tabulated is slightly less than t-calculated implying a slight difference in the students' use of mnemonics to aid their SL learning. Mean for the female students is 2.9 and that for male students is 3.0, supporting the idea that there is no statistical difference between the students' use of mnemonics to aid their learning process. As such, there is a positive correlation in the students' use of mnemonics and other language strategies to aid their learning. The p value also indicates that there is no statistical difference in the students' of mnemonics as a SL learning strategy based on gender (Omar &Kussin, 2017). The following table gives the responses of the cognitive strategies that are based on the group.

	M	Sd	Number
10	2,93	1,23	581
11	3,06	1,32	581
12	3,00	1,25	581
13	2,81	1,27	581
14	2,29	1,20	581
15	3,15	1,23	581
16	3,45	1,38	581
17	2,17	1,22	581
18	2,97	1,36	581
19	2,81	1,29	581
20	2,81	1,26	581
21	2,87	1,23	581
22	3,14	1,33	581
23	2,62	1,23	581

Table 5: Cognitive strategies of all the students

The table indicates that the overall average mean of cognitive strategies of all students is 3.0. The items most commonly used are 11,12,15,22. The least used item is 17. This result shows that cognitive strategies levels are medium. The following table gives the responses of the cognitive strategies that are based on the group.

	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	T	Df	P
s10	Female	399	2.8396	1.20898	.295	579.000	.768
	Male	182	2.8077	1.20833			
s11	Female	399	2.8672	1.26009	-1.777	579.000	.076

	Male	182	3.0714	1.33808			
s12	Female	399	2.9624	1.21386	.106	579.000	.915
	Male	182	2.9505	1.31828			
s13	Female	399	2.6391	1.22989	-1.835	579.000	.067
	Male	182	2.8462	1.32901			
s14	Female	399	2.1053	1.20048	-1.641	579.000	.101
	Male	182	2.2802	1.17221			
s15	Female	399	3.1429	1.24495	-.395	579.000	.693
	Male	182	3.1868	1.24299			
s16	Female	399	3.2581	1.36578	-1.248	579.000	.212
	Male	182	3.4121	1.40656			
s17	Female	399	2.0451	1.18532	-1.515	579.000	.130
	Male	182	2.2088	1.25717			
s18	Female	399	2.8622	1.33132	.408	579.000	.683
	Male	182	2.8132	1.36177			
s19	Female	399	2.7544	1.25206	-.425	579.000	.671
	Male	182	2.8022	1.26770			
s20	Female	399	2.6516	1.28244	-2.259	579.000	.024
	Male	182	2.9066	1.21549			
s21	Female	399	2.8471	1.22748	-1.678	579.000	.094
	Male	182	3.0330	1.26098			
	Female	399	3.0426	1.30353	.881	579.000	
	Male	182	2.9396	1.31782			
s23	Female	399	2.5138	1.17733	.436	579.000	.663
	Male	182	2.4670	1.24666			

Table 6: Gender formulation table for cognitive strategies of the students

Table 6 shows clearly a p value of .242 is greater than 0.05. This implies that there is not significant statistical difference in the students' use of cognitive strategies to aid their learning process. The p value also indicates a highly positive correlation between this research and previous research. According to the study, students, both male and female rely on cognitive strategies to aid their mastery of vocabularies and other concepts (Kamalizad& Samuel, 2018). The p value also indicates that the two groups under study have no significant difference in their use of cognitive strategies to aid their learning. Therefore, there is a high correlation between cognitive strategies and other learning strategies (Hakan, Aydin& Bulent, 2015). This is because the cognitive strategies help the learners to reflect on the concepts that they learn in class and apply them effectively. The means for male and female students are 2.8 and 2.9 indicating a difference of 0.1, which is negligible. As such, there is a positive correlation in the male and female students' use of cognitive strategies to aid their SL learning process (Marina, 2017).

	M	Sd	Number
24	3,20	1,19	581
25	3,14	1,23	581

26	2,64	1,25	581
27	2,84	1,36	581
28	2,92	1,26	581
29	3,14	1,30	581

Table 7: Compensation strategies of all the students

Table 7 indicates the compensation strategies have a p value that is greater than 0.05. This indicates that there is no statistical difference in the students' use of compensation strategies to aid their learning. The overall average mean of compensation strategies of all students is 2.9. The level of the compensation strategies shows that they are medium. The items most commonly used are 24,25. The least used item is 26.

	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	T	Df	P
s24	female	399	3.1905	1.17717	-1.007	579.000	.314
	Male	182	3.2967	1.18456			
s25	female	399	3.1479	1.19281	.742	579.000	.459
	Male	182	3.0659	1.32383			
s26	female	399	2.5589	1.23431	-.704	579.000	.482
	Male	182	2.6374	1.27028			
s27	female	399	2.6165	1.28807	-1.121	579.000	.263
	Male	182	2.7473	1.33870			
s28	female	399	2.8020	1.21481	-.103	579.000	.918
	Male	182	2.8132	1.22056			
s29	female	399	3.0702	1.30137	.513	579.000	.608
	Male	182	3.0110	1.26574			

Table 8: Gender table formulation for Compensation strategies of the students

Table 8 shows the students' gender analysis also has a p value that is greater than 0.05, indicating that there is no significant difference in the students' use of compensation strategies based on gender (Hajar, 2019). The p value for the compensation strategies provides an indication that there is a significant positive correlation between the students' use of compensation learning strategies with the SILL (Zaker, 2015). The various compensation strategies are majorly used by learners to improve their understanding of the second language that they are learning (Duvernay & You, 2018). The results also indicate that there is no significant difference between this study and other previous SILL studies.

	M	Sd	Number
30	3,22	1,26	581
31	3,29	1,26	581
32	3,79	1,23	581
33	3,59	1,29	581
34	2,72	1,26	581
35	3,23	1,39	581
36	3,15	1,36	581

37	3,53	1,34	581
38	3,45	1,31	581

Table 9: Metacognition strategies of all the students

Table 9 depicts the overall average mean of metacognition strategies of all students is 3.3. The level of the metacognition strategies shows that they are medium but higher than the other strategies. The items most commonly used are 37,38. The least used item is 34.

	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	T	Df	p
s30	female	399	3.0551	1.21836	-.988	579.000	.323
	male	182	3.1648	1.28968			
s31	female	399	3.1153	1.22032	-1.333	579.000	.183
	male	182	3.2637	1.29883			
s32	female	399	3.6441	1.21905	-1.494	579.000	.136
	male	182	3.8077	1.23546			
s33	female	399	3.4436	1.25262	-.298	579.000	.766
	male	182	3.4780	1.37743			
s34	female	399	2.6241	1.21093	-.021	579.000	.983
	male	182	2.6264	1.28870			
s35	female	399	3.1003	1.36171	.726	579.000	.468
	male	182	3.0110	1.40240			
s36	female	399	3.0175	1.32133	-.174	579.000	.862
	male	182	3.0385	1.38805			
s37	female	399	3.3509	1.31562	-.514	579.000	.607
	male	182	3.4121	1.36267			
s38	female	399	3.3333	1.35493	-1.659	579.000	.098
	male	182	3.5330	1.32403			

Table 10: Gender table formulation for Metacognition strategies of the students

Table 10 indicates that there is no significant statistical difference between the two groups' use of metacognition strategies to aid their learning process and other SILL strategies. Therefore, from the data, it is clear that the learners depend on the use of all the metacognition strategies together with different SILL strategies because these strategies help in boosting their ability to remember concepts learned in class (Gavriliadou&Mitits, 2016). The t-tabulated values for items 30, 31, 32, 35, 37, 38 are less than t-calculated value implying that there is no statistical difference between the two groups use of various metacognition items to aid their SL learning process. The mean for items under female group is 2.8 and that for males is 2.9. There slight difference, 0.1, between the two items implies that there is no significant difference in the use of metacognition for both male and female students. The results also indicate that there is no significant statistical difference between this research and previous SILL research on students' use of metacognition to aid their learning process (Alnujaidi, 2017).

	M	Sd	Number
39	3,25	1,30	581
40	3,12	1,38	581
41	2,96	1,40	581
42	3,14	1,36	581
43	1,71	1,17	581
44	2,45	1,31	581

Table: 11: Affective strategies of all the students

Table 11 shows that the overall average mean of affective strategies of all students is 2.7. The level of the affective strategies shows that they are medium. The items most commonly used are 39,40,42. The least used item is 43. The item of writing students feelings in a diary has been a less preferred in English language learning.

	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	T	df	P
s39	female	399	3.1253	1.27572	-.586	579.000	.558
	male	182	3.1923	1.28370			
s40	female	399	2.9098	1.35687	-1.370	579.000	.171
	male	182	3.0769	1.38045			
s41	female	399	2.8596	1.36185	1.182	579.000	.238
	male	182	2.7143	1.40469			
s42	female	399	3.0551	1.34387	-.314	579.000	.754
	male	182	3.0934	1.40522			
s43	female	399	1.6140	1.09884	.214	579.000	.831
	male	182	1.5934	1.03505			
s44	female	399	2.3659	1.29802	.507	579.000	.613
	male	182	2.3077	1.25432			

Table 12: Gender table formulation for Affective strategies of the students.

From the table it is understood that for the affective strategies, p value is significant at .914. The p value is greater than 0.05 implying that there is not significant statistical difference between the female and male gender of the group. The two groups have similar mean range indicating that there is no significant statistical difference between the two groups (Gavrilidou&Mitits, 2016). Therefore, all the affective items for the two groups fall under the same medium class. Besides, it is deduced that the t-tabulated value for the items is less than the t-calculated value providing further indication that there is no significant statistical difference between the two groups. The p value for the affective strategies also provides an indication that there is no statistical difference between this study and previous SILL studies (Saks &Leijen, 2018).

	M	Sd	Number
45	3,43	1,20	581
46	3,25	1,25	581
47	2,66	1,26	581

48	3,22	1,21	581
49	2,56	1,25	581
50	3,25	1,30	581

Table 13: Social strategies of all the students.

Table 13 shows that the overall average mean of social strategies of all students is 3.0. The level of the social strategies shows that they are medium. The item most commonly used is 45. The least used item is 49.

	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	T	df	P
s45	female	399	3.3860	1.17615	.217	579.000	.828
	male	182	3.3626	1.25277			
s46	female	399	3.1679	1.23572	-1.106	579.000	.269
	male	182	3.2912	1.26920			
s47	female	399	2.5088	1.21312	-.272	579.000	.786
	male	182	2.5385	1.23760			

Table 14: Gender table formulation for Social strategies of the students.

Table 14 depicts that the social learning strategies have a significant p value that is greater than 0.05. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the students' use of social learning strategies and previous research findings (Dmitrenko, 2017). Therefore, the social learning strategies have a high correlation with SILL strategies. The social learning skills enable the learners to take an active part in interacting with fellow learners through the sharing of knowledge (Isemonger, 2016). The social strategies correlate with SILL strategies as they help the learners to develop confidence in their language skills and learning progress that they make.

	Gender	N	\bar{X}	Ss	Sh \bar{X}	t Test		
						t	sd	P
Mnemonic Strategies	F	399	3,00	0,70	0,04	-1,033	579	,302
	M	182	3,06	0,73	0,05			
Cognitive Strategies	F	399	2,75	0,81	0,04	-1,171	579	,242
	M	182	2,84	0,82	0,06			
Compensation Strategies	F	399	2,90	0,82	0,04	-,419	579	,676
	M	182	2,93	0,84	0,06			
Metacognition Strategies	F	399	3,19	0,96	0,05	-,834	579	,405
	M	182	3,26	0,99	0,07			
Affective	F	399	2,65	0,83	0,04	-,108	579	,914
	M	182	2,66	0,83	0,06			
Social	F	399	2,97	0,83	0,04	-,439	579	,661
	M	182	3,01	0,91	0,07			

Table 15: Gender analysis of the students in the study.

Table 15 shows that the overall gender analysis of the students' use of all the learning strategies has p values that are greater than 0.05. The research indicates lack of gender differences in the use of the

SILL strategies by the students to aid their learning process. From the study, both male and female students use various learning strategies although in varying measures. However, female students frequently use learning strategies as compared to male students (Naidu & Kumar, 2018).

		Ss.	A	B	C	D	E	F
Mnemonic Strategies(A)	3,03	0,69	1	,682**	,561**	,582**	,439**	,528**
Cognitive Strategies(B)	2,86	0,81		1	,721**	,755**	,600**	,668**
Compensation Strategies(C)	2,98	0,83			1	,658**	,513**	,577**
Metacognition Strategies(D)	3,33	0,98				1	,642**	,704**
Affective (E)	2,77	0,86					1	,650**
Social (F)	3,06	0,87						1

Table 16: Overall results of correlation table of participants regarding SILL.

Table 16 indicates that correlation coefficient when the relations between the the factors; It is interpreted that if $r < 0.2$ is very weak relationship, if it is between $0.2-0.4$, weak relationship is between $0.4-0.6$, if it is medium level relationship is between $0.6-0.8$, if it is high level relationship is $0.8 >$ very high level relationship. From this survey of Strategy Inventory for Language Learners, six major strategies were highlighted; these included social strategies, cognitive strategies, metacognition strategies, mnemonic strategies, affective strategies and compensation strategies. However, the degree of use of different strategies differs. Using the statistical analysis it was determined that the most preferred strategy from the six is the meta-cognition strategy and the least commonly used strategy is affective.

Conclusion

From the summary of correlation table for participants regarding students' use of SILL strategies, it is evident that there is a high correlation among the six categories of learning strategies. The students, both male and female use all the learning strategies to boost their memory and overall performance. However, the degree of use of the learning strategies differ with mnemonics being the most frequently used learning strategy. Social strategy is the least frequently used learning strategy. From the results of the study, it is clear that the SL students, both male and female, heavily rely on the learning strategies to boost their memory and mastery of vocabularies. However, the degree of use of the strategies significantly differs. The participants' attitudes towards the use of language learner strategies also vary based on the learning environment that they are exposed to. As such, foreign language educators should try to create a positive learning environment, especially for SL students, to enhance their learning capacities. These strategies can help students, teachers and even people who work in their industry, understand and learn English as a foreign language better (Kazamia 2003). Such strategies can help students or learners to know exactly which plan to follow and how to become better at a language; these strategies provide a flow of how to learn and which step to take when learning a second language.

References

- Alhaysony, M. (2017). Language learning strategies use by Saudi EFL students: The effect of duration of English language study and gender. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7(1), 18-28.
- Alnujaidi, S. (2017). Factors influencing college level EFL students' language learning strategies in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of English and Linguistics*, 7(1), 69-84.
- Amerstorfer, C. M. (2018). Past its expiry date? The SILL in modern mixed-methods strategy research. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(2), 497-523.
- Büyüköztürk. Ş. (2006). Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı, Ankara: Pegem publishing.
- Chang, C. H. (2018). Foreign Language Learning Strategy Use Profile of University Students in Taiwan and Japan. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 15(2).
- Chuin, T. K., & Kaur, S. (2015). Types of language learning strategies used by tertiary english majors. *Teflin Journal*, 26(1), 17-35.
- Dmitrenko, V. (2017). Language learning strategies of multilingual adults learning additional languages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14(1), 6-22.
- Duvernay, N. Y., & You, S. H. (2018). Gender and Strategy Frame Shift in Collaborative Group Discussions for Korean EFL Learners. *응용언어학*, 34(3), 169-192.
- Gavriilidou, Z., & Mitits, L. (2016). Adaptation of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) for students aged 12-15 into Greek: Developing an adaptation protocol. *Selected papers on theoretical and applied linguistics*, 21, 588-601.
- Gavriilidou, Z., & Mitits, L. (2016). Adaptation of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) for students aged 12-15 into Greek: Developing an adaptation protocol. *Selected papers on theoretical and applied linguistics*, 21, 588-601.
- Hajar, A. (2019). A Critical Review of Research on Language Learning Strategies Used by Arab Learners of English.
- Hakan, K., Aydin, B., & Bulent, A. (2015). An investigation of undergraduates' language learning strategies. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 1348-1354.
- Iamudom, T., & Tangkiengsirisin, S. (2020). A Comparison Study of Learner Autonomy and Language Learning Strategies among Thai EFL Learners. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(2).
- Isemonger, I. (2016). A confirmatory approach to the structural validity of scores generated by the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL).
- Kamalizad, J., & Samuel, M. (2018). Cross context role of language proficiency in learners' use of language learning strategies. *MOJES: Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(1), 1-13.
- Kazamia V. (2003). Language learning strategies of Greek adult learners of English. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Leeds, United Kingdom.
- Marina, M. (2017). Language Learning Strategy of Students in Intensive English Language Institute (IELI) of Flinders University. *Englisia Journal*, 4(2), 66-78.
- Naidu, R., & Kumar, C. (2018). *Gender differences in the use of language learning strategies among ESL students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya).
- Omar, A., & Kussin, H. (2017). Language learning strategies customary: learners and teachers approach and notion. *AJELP: The Asian Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, 5(1), 1-10.
- Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System*, 23(1), 1-23.
- Psaltou-Joycey, A., Agathopoulou, E., Petrogiannis, K., & Gavriilidou, Z. (2017). Teachers' and learners' reported language learning strategy use: how do they match. *Language Learning Strategies: Theoretical Issues and Applied Perspectives*, 71-95.

- Saks, K., &Leijen, Ä. (2018). Adapting the SILL to measure Estonian learners' language learning strategies: the development of an alternative model. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(5), 634-646.
- Zaker, A. (2015). EFL learners' language learning strategies and autonomous learning: Which one is a better predictor of L2 skills. *Journal of Applied Linguistics-Dubai*, 1(1), 27-39.
- Zarrabi, F. (2020). Investigating the Relationship between Learning Style and Metacognitive Listening Awareness. *International Journal of Listening*, 34(1), 21