# How Do English Language Learners Apply Language Learning Strategies in Different Proficiency Levels? A Case of Turkish EFL Students

## Seyed Ali Rezvani Kalajahi
## Vahid Nimehchisalem
## Bahar Pourshahian

===========================================================

## Abstract

This research study investigates the learning strategy use by adopting survey method. One hundred and ten male (72.7%) and female (27.3%) EFL Turkish students participated in this study. They were selected randomly from five levels of proficiency, namely, beginner, elementary, pre-intermediate, intermediate and upper-intermediate. The number of participants from each level was 22 students. A self-reported inventory, Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (ESL/EFL Version) developed by Oxford (1990), was used to determine the participants' perceived strategy use.

The results revealed that majority of the Turkish learners are medium users of language learning strategies (LLSs). Further, detailed analysis showed that almost one third of the learners used LLS frequently. Moreover, the findings indicated a relatively frequent use of metacognitive strategies but a relatively infrequent use of affective strategies by the learners. Finally, it was found that there was a significant difference in LLS use of Turkish learners of English in reference to their gender.

**Keywords:** Language leaning strategies, Turkish leaners, Proficiency levels, EFL.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com
12 : 10 October 2012
Seyed Ali Rezvani Kalajahi, Vahid Nimehchisalem and Bahar Pourshahian
How Do English Language Learners Apply Language Learning Strategies in Different Proficiency Levels? A Case of Turkish EFL Students 187

## 1. Introduction

Over the past two decades, research in second language (L2) education has largely focused on learner-cantered approaches to second language teaching in an effort to lead learners towards autonomous and independent language learning (Reiss, 1985; Wenden, 1991; Tamada, 1996). At the same time, a shift of attention has happened in second language acquisition research from the products of language learning to the processes through which learning takes place (Oxford, 1990). As a result of this change in emphasis, language learning strategies (LLSs) have emerged not only as integral components of various theoretical models of language proficiency (Bialystok, 1978; Canale and Swain, 1980; Ellis, 1985; Bachman and Palmer, 1996) but also as means of achieving learners' autonomy in the process of language learning (Oxford, 1990; Benson and Voller, 1997). Nevertheless, research in this area has shown that not all learners use LLSs in the same fashion. A number of variables, such as proficiency level, motivation and gender, have been shown to affect the type and frequency of the LLSs used by second/foreign language learners (O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Russo and Kupper, 1985; Oxford and Nyikos, 1989; Ehrman and Oxford, 1990; among others).

The existing research on LLSs has heavily relied on learners' strategy use in foreign language context. Research on LLSs has mostly been conducted in Asia where the context of language learning is quite different from context to context due to the diversity of the Asian countries. In Northern Cyprus, the context of this study, language teaching during high school years is mostly grammar-based with no attention paid to language use. Therefore, given the characteristics of the Turkish EFL context, further research into the LLS use of this group of EFL learners is needed. This study is a step in this direction. It addresses the problem through a comprehensive investigation of the variables that can best predict the strategy use by individuals in this group of EFL learners.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Language Learning Strategies

Learning strategies have been defined in various ways in literature and they are connected to several areas of language learning. In this section some of the different definitions of learning strategies are introduced. Furthermore, some other important aspects related to learning strategies are discussed in detail. These include, for example, classification of learning strategies and the role of learning strategies in successful language learning.

There are different definitions for language learning strategies (LLSs). For example, Takala (1996, as cited in Kristiansen 1998:44) defines strategies as "the behaviors that the learners engage in during learning that are intended to influence cognitive and affective processing." In addition, as O'Malley and Chamot (1990) put it, learning strategies are thoughts or behavior the learners use to comprehend, learn or retain new information. Cook (2001:126) describes learning strategy to be "a choice that the learner makes while learning or using the second language that affects learning." Ellis (1985:165) points out that native language speakers use the same strategy types as learners of second language. However, there are differences in the frequency of strategy use between native speakers and non-native speakers.

Even though some scholars agree that language learning strategies can be unconscious, Cohen (1998) states that consciousness distinguishes strategies from the processes that are not

strategic. Cohen (1998) continues that the element of choice is an important factor in language learning strategies and therefore there cannot be strategies which are unconscious. In this line, Oxford (1990) points out that learning strategies are usually seen as intentional and conscious actions made by the learner in order to take control of their own learning. However, in contrast to Cohen's (1998) view, Oxford (1990) states that some strategies can become automatic and unconscious when used for long periods.

According to Oxford (1990), language learning strategies are important since they create active and self-directed involvement in the learners and help to develop their communicative competence. Oxford (1990:9) mentions 12 features for language learning strategies:

> 1. Language learning strategies contribute to the main goal, communicative competence.
> 2. They allow learners to become more self-directed.
> 3. They expand the role of teachers.
> 4. They are problem-oriented.
> 5. They are specific actions taken by the learner.
> 6. They involve many (not just the cognitive) aspects of the learner.
> 7. They support learning both directly and indirectly.
> 8. They are not always observable.
> 9. They are often conscious.
> 10. They can be taught.
> 11. They are flexible.
> 12. They are influenced by variety of factors.

Based on Ellis (1985), learning strategies and techniques can be divided into two groups: those involved in studying the second language and those involved in obtaining second language input. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) point out that in the early stages of learning strategy research, attention was mainly paid to differences between successful and unsuccessful language learners and the characteristics of good language learners. In addition, factors influencing strategy choice were also taken into consideration.

Many recent studies on L2 vocabulary concentrate on individual strategies or a small number of them (Fan, 2003). According to Jiménez Catalán (2003), during the last two decades studies of language learning strategies have aimed at determining the characteristics of good and poor language learners and the difference between language learning and communication learning strategies.

**2.2 Classification of Language Learning Strategies**

Language learning strategies have been classified in various ways. Oxford (1990:15–22) identifies six major groups of second language learning strategies:

Language in India www.languageinindia.com
12 : 10 October 2012
Seyed Ali Rezvani Kalajahi, Vahid Nimehchisalem and Bahar Pourshahian
How Do English Language Learners Apply Language Learning Strategies in Different Proficiency Levels? A Case of Turkish EFL Students                                                                189

1. *Cognitive strategies (direct)* enable the learner to use the language material in direct ways, e.g. through reasoning, analysis, note-taking and synthesizing.

2. *Metacognitive strategies (indirect)* are used to manage the learning process. They include identifying one's preferences and needs, planning, monitoring and evaluating the learning process.

3. *Memory-related strategies (direct)* include acronyms, images, key words and they help link one L2 item or concept with another but they do not necessarily involve deep understanding.

4. *Compensatory strategies (direct),* e.g. guessing from context and gestures, help make up for lack of knowledge in some fields of the language.

5. *Affective strategies (indirect)* help the learners manage their emotions and motivation. Affective strategies include, for instance, identifying one's mood and anxiety level, talking about feelings and rewarding oneself.

6. *Social strategies (indirect)* enable learning through interaction and understanding the target culture since they include asking questions, asking for clarifications, talking with native speakers and exploring culture.

Other classifications of language learning strategies are also available in the related literature. Cohen (1998), for example, identifies only four language learning strategy types: cognitive, metacognitive, affective and social strategies. Cohen (1998) describes cognitive strategies as strategies used in identification, grouping, retention and storage of language material. Furthermore, they include also the "language use strategies of retrieval, rehearsal and comprehension or production of words, phrases and other elements of language" (Cohen 1998:7).

According to Oxford (1990:8), metacognitive strategies help learners to regulate their own cognition and focus in addition to planning and evaluating their progress. Cohen (1998:7) states that metacognitive strategies deal with pre-assessment, pre-planning on-line planning and evaluation and post-evaluation of language learning activities and of language use events.

These strategies allow the learners to control their own learning and using of the language. In fact, Cohen (1998:8) points out that higher-proficiency student are more likely to use metacognitive strategies and they use them more effectively than the lower-proficiency students.

Affective strategies develop the learners' self-confidence and perseverance to be involved in language learning (Oxford, 1990). Affective strategies are used to regulate emotions, motivation and attitudes such as reducing anxiety and self-encouragement (Cohen, 1998).

Social strategies provide interaction and more empathetic understanding which also are two important factors in reaching communicative competence (Oxford, 1998). Social strategies include the actions the learner chooses to take in order to interact with other learners or native speakers of the language (Cohen, 1998). They can eventually act in specific ways to foster certain aspects of that competence, such as grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic elements (Oxford, 1990).

## 2.3 Studies on Language Learning Strategies

In the 1970s, the importance of individual variations in language learning was first noticed by researchers (Oxford and Nyikos, 1989; Ehrman and Oxford, 1989). They have studied factors in relation with to choice of language learning strategies.

Wu (2008) continues that "these factors include degree of metacognitive awareness, gender, level of language learning, language being learned, affective variables (e.g., attitudes, motivation and language learning goals), personality type, learning style, career choice, aptitude, number of years of language study, and language teaching methods. In most previous strategy research, gender difference in strategy use was neglected. Additionally, according to Gardner (1985), attitudes and motivation are the primary determining factors to individual language learning. The learners with high motivation to learn a language will likely use a variety of strategies (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989)".

Oxford (1993) put forward that a number of researchers distinguish successful learners from less successful learners according to on the useage of metacognitive strategies. In a correlational study which involved sixty Taiwanese graduate and undergraduate students at Indiana University, Chang and Huang (1999) found that memory strategies are related to extrinsic but not intrinsic motivation. Furthermore, studies of the listening strategies of successful language learners show that cognitive and metacognitive strategies are used by L2/FL listeners (DeFillipis, 1980; Laviosa, 1991a, 1991b; Murphy, 1985; O'Malley, Chamot, & Kupper, 1989; Rost & Ross, 1991; Vandergrift, 1992).

The factor, proficiency level, was addressed in studies related to language learning strategy by some researchers. In a study of 70 high-school students enrolled in ESL classes from three high schools in an Eastern metropolitan area in the United States, O'Malley et al. (1985) revealed that intermediate level students tended to use proportionally more metacognitive strategies than students with beginning level proficiency. Chamot, O'Malley, Küpper and Impink-Hernandez (1987) found that cognitive strategy use decreased and metacognitive strategy use rose as the foreign language course level increased, but social affective strategy use remained very low across all course levels. In addition, according to some research, proficiency level and gender affect the choice of language learning strategies (Politzer, 1983; Oxford and Nyikos, 1989; Ehrman and Oxford, 1989; Oxford, 1993; O'Malley et al., 1985; Chamot, O'Malley, Küpper and Impink-Hernandez, 1987).

This section summarizes the results of the studies on overall strategy use as well as the strategy categories in EFL contexts. The majority of the studies cited below have used SILL as their instrument of data collection. Oxford (1990) suggests a mean of 2.4 and lowers for "low", a mean range of 2.5 to 3.4 for "medium," and a mean range of 3.5 to 5 for "high" levels of strategy use.

Noguchi (1991) administered SILL to Japanese university students and showed that they were medium strategy users, overall, and used all strategy categories at low to medium levels. Among the strategy categories, memory and cognitive strategies were more popular than metacognitive and affective ones. Social strategies turned out to be the least frequently used category of strategies among this group of Japanese students.

Chang (1991) also administered SILL to 50 Chinese students studying at the University of Georgia and found that they were medium strategy users. Compensation strategies were the most frequently used while affective ones were the least frequently used strategies among this group of Chinese students.

Green's (1991) preliminary study of 213 students at a Puerto Rican university showed that only one strategy category, metacognitive strategies, was used at a high level, while the other categories were used at a medium level with affective and memory categories being the least frequently used strategies. Overall, the participants of this study turned out to be medium strategy users.

Oh (1992) conducted a study with 59 EFL students studying in a Korean university and found that they used overall strategies at a medium level. With respect to strategy categories, the only strategy category that was used at a high frequency was metacognitive; whereas compensation, affective, and social strategies were used at a medium level and cognitive and memory strategies were used at a low level.

Another study investigating the strategy use of Korean students is Park (1997). In his study with Korean university students, he found that all strategy groups were used at a medium level. The highest frequency belonged to metacognitive strategies followed by compensation, memory, cognitive, social, and affective strategies.

Ok (2003), too, investigated the strategy use of Korean secondary school students. He found that compensation strategies were used the most frequently (at a medium level), followed by social, cognitive, memory, metacognitive, and affective strategies (at a low level). Yang (1994) investigated the strategy use of 68 Taiwanese university students. All strategy categories were used at a medium level except for compensation strategies which were slightly above the medium. The participants of the study were found to be medium strategy users.

Another study pertinent to the use of LLSs is Merrifield (1996). He examined the LLSs used by five adult learners. He found that these learners used LLSs at a medium level. The most frequently used strategy category was compensation while the least one was affective strategies, which were used at a low level.

Bremner (1999) studying the strategy use of a group of Hong Kong university students showed that compensation and metacognitive strategies were the most frequently used, while affective and memory strategies were the least frequently used strategies. Overall, the participants of the study turned out to be moderate strategy users.

Another study concerning the use of LLSs was done by Wharton (2000). The participants of this study were 678 undergraduate bilingual students studying Japanese or French at a university in Singapore. He used an earlier version of SILL with 80 items. The mean of overall strategy use was reported to be medium. The highest frequency belonged to social strategies, whereas the lowest frequency belonged to affective strategies.

Peacock and Ho (2003) studying the strategy use of 1006 Hong Kong university students, reported that the participants were medium strategy users with compensation category as the most frequently used strategies followed by cognitive and metacognitive strategies; then social, memory and affective strategies respectively.

Finally, Shamis (2003) studied the strategy use of Arab EFL English majors in Palestine. The results of his study showed that the participants were moderate strategy users with metacognitive strategies being the most and compensation strategies the least frequently used strategies. Table 1 summarizes the results of the studies reviewed above to give a general picture of the pattern of LLSs use among EFL learners.

The results of the studies reviewed above, most of which were conducted in Asia and with EFL learners, can be summarized as follows. Firstly, the participants of the studies perceived themselves as medium strategy users. Second, metacognitive/compensation strategies were reported as the most frequently used strategies while affective/memory strategies as the least frequently used ones. It is the intention of the present study to see how EFL learners from a different cultural background, namely, Turkey, perceive their pattern of strategy use given the fact that as Beauquis (2000, p. 55) stated "depending on their cultural backgrounds, learners may rely on certain strategies more than others." Bedell (1993 cited in Oxford and Burry-Stock, 1995) also summarized the findings of a number of studies and showed that different cultural groups use particular types of strategies at different frequency levels.

With respect to "culture" in the above quotations, it is worth mentioning that mainly learners' styles and approaches to learning in general, and language learning in particular are intended. Thus, Singleton (1991) defines culture as follows:

There are, in every society, unstated assumptions about people and how they learn, which act as a set of self-fulfilling prophecies that invisibly guide whatever educational process may occur there. They act as a kind of unintentional hidden curriculum. Likewise, Hofstede (1986) describes differences in learning styles directly based on cultural needs and values.

Oxford (1990), thus, believes that culture affects the development of overall learning style, and this, in turn, helps to determine the learners' choices of LLSs. It is, therefore, helpful to review briefly some of the studies that have attended to the general learning features of learners from Asian countries as well as Turkey to help us develop a general picture of their cultural differences.

## 2.4 Language Learning Strategies and Good Language Learner

Kristiansen (1998:11) states that according to studies of learning strategies, the amount of training, and the time used in training and the degree of difficulty of the task as such are not conclusive factors in learning. That is why it is important to study what kind of training would be most beneficial to learning. The aim is to create a permanent situation and learn how to apply the acquired knowledge in order to successfully learn the language.

The studies of language learning strategies often refer to the concept of good language learner strategies. As Cook (2001) puts it, good language learner strategies are the strategies employed by people who are known to be good at second language learning. Cook (2001:127–128) summarizes the study of Naiman, et al. (1995) about the six broad strategies shared by good language learners the following way:

1. Good language learners find a learning style that suits them best by adapting or modifying the strategies they encounter.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com
12 : 10 October 2012
Seyed Ali Rezvani Kalajahi, Vahid Nimehchisalem and Bahar Pourshahian
How Do English Language Learners Apply Language Learning Strategies in Different Proficiency Levels? A Case of Turkish EFL Students                                                  193

2. Good language learners include themselves in the language learning process by participating actively in learning situations.
3. Good language learners develop an awareness of language both as a system and as a communication.
4. Good language learners pay constant attention to expanding their language knowledge.
5. Good language learners develop the second language as a separate system, not relating everything to their first language.
6. Good language learners pay attention to the demands that second language learning imposes.

Different learning strategies can be combined during practice. Some strategies are easier to use if one has good knowledge of some other strategies (Kristiansen, 1990). Wenden (1991, as cited by Kristiansen, 1998:13) stresses the fact that learner should become aware which strategies are effective in learning a language. This means that the learner needs to be aware of his/her metacognitive skills which include, in addition to learning strategies, reflecting his/her own learning and realizing his/her limitations (Kristiansen 1998). Cook (2001) guides the teachers to develop the students' independence and make them aware of the range of strategies they can adopt.

In addition, Cook advises that providing specific training in particular strategies and remembering the similarities and differences between learning a second language and other school subjects can prove to be useful. Many factors have an effect on the choice of different learning strategies. These factors include degree of awareness, stage of learning, teacher expectations, age, sex, nationality or ethnicity, general learning style, personality traits, motivation and purpose for learning the language (Oxford 1990:13). Also Jiménez Catalán (2003), summarizing previous research, points out that language learning strategies may be associated with other individual factors (e.g., type of memory, learning style, motivation and culture). Even though gender affects the choice of strategies, it has not been studied widely (Jiménez Catalán, 2003). More highly motivated learners use a greater range of learning strategies than less motivated learners. Different language tasks also require different strategies; one can not use the same language learning strategies with working on a matriculation examination and talking with a friend in a café.

In addition, the main goal in language learning, for example, whether one wants to learn to communicate fluently using another language or just learn basic greetings, can have an impact on strategy choice (Oxford, 1990).

**2.5 The Importance of Language Learning Strategies in Language Education**

Language learning strategies are good indicators of how learners approach tasks or problems encountered during the process of language learning. Language learning strategies give language teachers valuable clues about how their students assess the situation, plan, select appropriate skills so as to understand, learn, or remember new input presented in the language classroom.

Metacognitive strategies improve organization of learning time, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation. Cognitive strategies include using previous knowledge to help solve new problems. Socioaffective strategies include asking native speakers to correct their pronunciation, or asking a classmate to work together on a particular language problem.

Therefore developing language skills in these three areas can help the language learner build up learner-independence and autonomy whereby he/she can take control of his/her own learning.

According to Lessard-Clouston (1997), language learning strategies contribute to the development of the communicative competence of the students and those are used to refer to all strategies foreign language learners use in learning the target language and communication strategies. Language teachers aiming at developing the communicative competence of the students and language learning should be familiar with language learning strategies.

The study will address the following research questions:

1) Were Turkish Learners of English high, medium, low users of language learning strategies?
2) What was the frequency use of categories of language learning strategies?
3) Is there any difference of language learning strategies use between male and female Turkish learners of English?
4) What were the language learning strategies of students at beginner, elementary, pre-intermediate, intermediate, and upper intermediate levels?

## 3. Methods

This research investigates learning strategy use among EFL Turkish students by adopting survey method. This section describes the participants of the study and the instrument used to collect the data.

### 3.1 Participants

One hundred and ten EFL Turkish students, studying English in School of forging languages at Eastern Mediterranean University, North Cyprus, participated in this study. Both male (72.7%) and female (27.3%) students were selected randomly from five levels of proficiency, namely, beginner, elementary, pre-intermediate, intermediate and upper-intermediate. The number of participants from each level was 22 students (20%). The age range of the participants was 18 to 25. As for their nationality, a few (29.1%) were from Northern Cyprus while most (70.9%) were from Turkey.

### 3.2 Instrument

A self-reported inventory, Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (ESL/EFL Version) developed by Oxford (1990), was used to determine the participants' perceived strategy use. The SILL is a 50-question, self-rating survey for EFL learners. It examines the frequency of the strategy usage for L2 learning. SILL has six sections including memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social each of which aims at measuring one strategy type in particular. According to Ellis (1994), Oxford's taxonomy of language learning strategies is the most comprehensive classification. The SILL has undergone significant revisions and has been translated into numerous languages, with multiple reliability and validity checks performed (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995). In this study, the

translated Turkish version of SILL (Bundak, 2006) was used so facilitate the comprehension of the items for the subjects. To ensure the reliability of the questionnaire, the present researchers ran Alpha Cronbach reliability analysis through IBM SPSS 19.0. The reliability analysis revealed a coefficient of .907 which is indicative of high reliability of the questionnaire.

## 4. Results and Discussion

To determine the participants' perceived strategy use, Oxford's (1990) rating scheme was utilized. Descriptive analysis was conducted to answer the first research question. According to Oxford's calculating method, the mean from 1.0 to1.4 stands for never using this strategy; the mean from 1.5 to 2.4 stands for usually not using this strategy; the mean from 2.5 to 3.4 stands for sometimes using this strategy; the mean from 3.5 to 4.4 stands for usually using this strategy; and the mean from 4.5 to 5.0 stands for always using this strategy. The mean from 1.0 to 2.4 means a low frequency; the mean from 2.5 to 3.4 means a medium frequency and the mean from 3.5 to 5.0 means a high frequency. Table 2 presents the frequency score for Turkish LLS use.

As the table indicates, majority of the leaners are medium users of LLS (63.6%) whereas only about one in three (31.8%) of them is a high user of strategies. It is also evident that a negligible number of learners (4.6%) are low users of strategies.

To be clearer regarding the category of the learners, further analysis was conducted. Table 3 shows that 63.6% of the learners sometimes use LLSs while 29.1% reported that they usually use LLSs. Moreover, it is evident that 2.8% always apply LLSs whereas 4.5% indicated that they generally do not use LLSs.

Table 4 summarizes the descriptive statistics of the participants' responses to the SILL categories. Based on Oxford's (1990) rating scheme, the mean range of 2.5 to 3.4 means that the learners sometimes use strategies and they are labeled as 'medium strategy users'.

As Table 4 reveals, the participants of the study are medium strategy users of the mentioned categories except for the metacognitive and social category in which they appeared to be high users. The reported strategies which have the highest frequency are metacognitive (M=3.55) social (M=3.54) compensation (M=3.49), whereas memory (M=3.19) cognitive (M=3.14) and affective (M=2.97) strategies are the least frequent ones.

To test the statistical significance of the difference between male and female students, independent t-test was run. Table 5 shows the result of independent t-test for male and female participants. Table 6 also presents independent sample t-test results. As can be seen from the mean score of table 5, there is a difference between male and female use of LLSs. As is shown in tables 5 and 7, there is a significant difference in scores for male (M=3.26, SD=.47), t(108)=.98,p<.05, but the magnitude of the difference in the means was very small (eta squared = .008). In contrast, Tahriri and Divsar (2011) found that that the differences between males and females are not statistically significant.

In order to answer the last research question, the learners' use of LLSs in reference to their level of proficiency was identified. Table 7 represents to what extent Turkish learners of English at various proficiency levels apply LLSs. As the table indicates, pre-intermediate

Turkish learners of English make use of LLS slightly greater than the other groups (M=3.41). Next, the mean scores show that beginner and upper-intermediate learners use almost the same proportion of LLSs (M=3.31) as the intermediate learners (M=3.28). In contrast, elementary learners make less use of LLS compared with the other groups (M=3.15). The overall mean score does not really indicate any increase or decrease in the learners' frequency of LLS use across the different levels of proficiency. The use of LLSs by these learners followed a fluctuating trend rather than a gradual growth or decline, as the mean scores in table 7 indicate.

## 5. Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications

It can be concluded that majority of the Turkish learners are medium users of LLSs. Further, detailed analysis showed that almost one third of the learners use LLSs frequently. Moreover, it is found that metacognitive strategy was used relatively more frequently than affective strategies. As for gender difference, it was found that there was a significant difference between male and female Turkish learners of English in LLS use.

It does not sound logical to assume that all language learners should use the same good language learning strategies or should be trained in using and developing the same strategies to become successful learners. Even though the teachability of strategies of communication such as compensation strategies is still a matter of controversy (Kasper & Kellerman, 1997) and although the direction of causality in relation to language proficiency and strategy use remains unresolved, the linear relationship between proficiency level and learners' perceived strategy use found in this study underlines the importance of strategy teaching in EFL contexts. Effective use of strategies is likely to influence language achievement and lead to the improvement of second language proficiency (Vann & Abraham, 1990).

What learners know about themselves and about their own learning process can affect their use of language learning strategies (Wenden, 1986). Chamot and her colleagues (1987) discovered that effective learners reported a greater frequency and range of strategy use. Learners' level of strategy awareness also influences strategy use. Nyikos (1987) found that learners used only a narrow range of strategies and were generally unaware of the strategies they used. Therefore, in order to improve students' language learning, EFL teachers need to understand what language learning strategies students use and encourage lower proficiency EFL students to use language learning strategies in their learning process. Moreover, teaching methods often influence how students learn. Teachers should become more aware of their students' learning strategies in order to orient teaching methods more appropriately. It is believed that future research should focus on methods to integrate language learning strategy training into language instruction. Discovering strategies other than the six types of language learning strategies discussed in this study might enhance students' language learning and the effect of strategy instruction on language learning.

===================================================================
## References

Alptek, C. (2007). Foreign language learning strategy choice: naturalistic vs instructed language acquisition. *Journal of theory and practice in education*, 3 (1): 4-1.

Anderson, N. J. (2003). Metacognitive reading strategies increase L2 performance. *The Language Teacher*, 27, 20-22.

Bachman, L.F. and A.S. Palmer. (1996). *Language testing in practice.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Beauquis, C. (2000). Language learning strategies: A Pandora's "black box"? Should the use of language learning strategies be taught in language classes? *The Western Journal of Graduate Research*, 9, 52-60.

Benson, P. and P. Voller (eds.). (1997). *Autonomy and independence in language learning.* London: Longman.

Bialystok, E. (1978). A theoretical model of second language learning. *Language Learning*, 28, pp. 69–83.

Bown, J. (2006) Locus of learning and affective strategy use: Two factors affecting success in self-instructed language learning. *Foreign Language Annals,* 39 (4), 640–659.

Bremner, S. (1999). Language learning strategies and language proficiency: Investigating the relationship in Hong Kong. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 55,* 490-515.

Bundak, S. (2006). *Effects of strategy-based instruction on the speaking performance of ELT learners*. Unpublished thesis. Eastern Mediterranean University.

Canale, M. and M. Swain. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1–47.

Chamot, A., O'Malley, J. M., Küpper, L., & Impink-Hernandez, M. V. (1987). *A study of learning strategies in foreign language instruction: First year report.* Rosslyn, VA: InterAmerican Research Associates.

Chang, S. F., & Huang, S. C. (1999). Taiwanese English learners' learning motivation and language learning strategies. *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on English Teaching and Learning, ROC*, 111-123.

Chang, S. J. (1991). *A study of language learning behaviors of Chinese students at the university of Georgia and the relation of these behaviors to oral proficiency and other factors*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Georgia, Athens, the USA.

Chen, I.J. (2002). *Language learning strategies used by high and low English proficiency students in a technology college.* Unpublished master's thesis, Changhua Normal University, Changhua, Taiwan.

Cohen, A. (2007) Coming to terms with language learner strategies: Surveying the experts. *In A. Cohen and E. Macaro (eds) Language Learner Strategies: 30 Years of Research and Practice* (pp. 29–46). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Language learning: Insights for learners, teachers, and researchers*. Boston, Mass.: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Cook, V. (2001). *second Language Learning and Language Teaching* (3$^{rd}$ ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press Inc.

Coock, V. (2001). *Second language learning and language teaching*. Third edition. London: Hodder Arnold, pp. 126-132.

DeFillipis, D. A. (1980). *A study of the listening strategies used by skillful and unskillful college French students in aural comprehension tasks*. Unpublished Thesis, University of Pittsburgh.

Dehghan, F. (2006). Effects of foreign language learning beliefs and proficiency level on the use of language learning strategies by Iranian female EFL learners. *Journal of social science and humanities of Shiraz University,* 23(1), 1-10.

Deneme, S. (2008). Language learning strategy preference of Turkish students. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 4, (2), 1-11.

Ehrman, Madeline E., Leaver, Betty Lou & Oxford, Rebecca L., (2003). A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning. *System* 31, 313–330.

Ehrman, M. and R. Oxford. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *Modern Language Journal*, 74, 311–326.

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fan, May Y. (2003). Frequency of use, perceived usefulness, and actual usefulness of second language vocabulary strategies: a study of Hong Kong learners. *Modern Language Journal*, 87, 222–241.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychological aspects of language learning: the role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Green, J. M. (1991). *Language learning strategies of Puerto Rican university students*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Puerto Rico Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Hall, J. K. (2001). *Methods for teaching foreign languages*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Hofstede, G. (1996). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10,* 301-320.

Hsiao, T. Y., and Oxford, R. L. ( 2002). Comparing theories of language learning strategies: A confirmatory factor analysis. *Modern Language Journal*, 86 (3): 368-383.

Ikeda, M, Takeuchi, O. (2003). Can strategy instruction help EFL learners to improve their reading ability? : An empirical study. *JACET Bulletinu*, 37, 49-60.

Jiménez Catalán, Rosa María, (2003). Sex differences in L2 vocabulary learning strategies. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 13, 54–77.

Kristiansen, I. (1998). *Tehokkaita oppimisstrategioita esimerkkinä kielet*. Vantaa: WSOY.

Laviosa, F. (1991a). *A preliminary investigation of the listening problem-solution process and the strategies of five advanced learners of Italian as a second language*. Unpublished master's thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Laviosa, F. (1991b, October). *An investigation of the listening strategies of advanced learners of Italian as a second language*. Paper presented at Bridging Theory and Practice in the Foreign Language Classroom Symposium, Loyola College, MD.

Lessard-Clouston, M. (1997). Chinese teachers' views of culture in their EFL learning and teaching. *Language, Culture and Curriculum,* 9(3), 197-210.

Ling, Wu Ya. (2008). Language learning strategies used by students at different proficiency levels. *Asian EFL Journal*, 10(4), 75-95.

Macaro, E. (2004). *Fourteen features of a language learner strategy.* Working Paper 4. Oxford: Department of Educational Studies, University of Oxford.

MacLeod, P. (2000). Take two language learners: A case study of the learning strategies of two successful learners of English as a second language with instrumental motivation. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 1, 1-13.

Merrifield, J. (1996). *Examining the language learning strategies used by French adult learners.* Unpublished MSc Dissertation. Aston University, the USA.

Murphy, J. M. (1985). *An investigation into the listening strategies of ESL college students*. Paper presented at the 19th Annual TESOL Convention, New York, NY.

Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H., & Todesco, A. (1995). *The Good language Learner. Clevelond*: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Noguchi, C. T. (1991). *Questionnaire for Learners*. Tottori, Tottori University, Japan.

Oh, J. (1992). Learning Strategies used by university EFL students in Korea. *LanguageTeaching,1,* 3-53.

Ok, L. Y. (2003). The relationship of school year, sex and proficiency on the use of learning strategies in learning English of Korean junior high school students. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(3), 1-36.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston:Heinle & Heinle.

Oxford, R. and M. Nyikos. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 291–300.

Oxford, R. (1993). Research on second language learning strategies. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13,* 175-187.

O'Malley, J., Chamot, A., & Küpper, L. (1989). Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics, 10*, 418-437.

O'Malley, J. & Chamot, A. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Malley, J.M., A.U. Chamot, G. Stewner-Manzanares, R.P. Russo and L. Küpper (1985). Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 557–584.

Park, G. (1997). Language learning strategies and English proficiency in Korean university students. *Foreign Language Annals, 30,* 211-221.

Peacock, M. and B. Ho. (2003). Student language learning strategies across eight disciplines. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13,* 179–200.

Paige, R., Cohen, A. and Shively, R. (2004) Assessing the impact of a strategies based curriculum on language and culture learning abroad. Frontiers: *The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 253–276.

Rahimi, M. (2004). *An investigation into the factors affecting Iranian EFL students' perceived use of language learning strategies.* Doctoral dissertation, Shiraz University, Iran.

Rao, Z (2002). Bridging the gap between teaching and learning styles in East Asian context. *TESOL Journal*, 11(2), 5-11.

Reiss, M.A. (1985). The good language learner: Another look. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 41, pp. 511–523.

Riazi,A., Rahimi,M. (2005). Iranian EFL learners' pattern of language learning strategy use. *The journal of Asia TEFL*, 2(1), 103-129.

Rost, M., & Ross, S. (1991). Learner use of strategies in interaction: Typology and teachability. *Language Learning, 41*, 235-273.

Singleton, J. (1991). The spirit of gramburu. In A. E. Imamura & J. J. Tobin (Eds.), *Transcending stereotypes: Discovering Japanese culture and education* (pp.120-125). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Shamis, W. A. (2003). Language learning strategy use in Palestine, *TESL-EJ, 7*(2), 33.

Shu-Feng, T. (2005). Language Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Education. *WHAMPOA – An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 49, 321-328.

Tamada, Y. (1996). The relationship between Japanese learners' personal factors and their choices of language learning strategies. *Modern Language Journal*, 80, 120– 131.

Tahriri, A., & Divsar, H. (2011). Male and female EFL learners' self-perceived strategy use across various educational levels: a case study. *English Language Teaching, 4*(4), 181-194.

Vandergrift, L. (1992). *The comprehension strategies of second language (French) listeners*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta.

Vann, R.J. and R.G. Abraham. 1990. Strategies of unsuccessful language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 177–198.

Wenden, A.L. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning*, 50, 203-243.

Wu, L. (2008). Language Learning Strategies Used by Students at Different Proficiency Levels. *Asian EFL Journal, 10*( 4), 75-91.

Yang, N-D. (1994). *An investigation of Taiwanese college students' use of English learning Strategies*. Research report, National Taiwan University, Taiwan.

======================================================================

**Table 1: Summary of the Results of the Studies Investigating LLSs Use**

| Study | Nationality of participants | Level of LLSs use | The highest strategy category used | The lowest strategy category used |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Noguchi, 1991 | Japanese | Medium | Memory and cognitive | Social |
| Chang, 1991 | Chinese | Medium | Compensation | Affective |
| Green, 1991 | Puerto Rican | Medium | Metacognitive | Affective and memory |
| Oh, 1992 | Korean | Medium | Metacognitive | Cognitive and memory |
| Yang, 1994 | Taiwanese | Medium | Compensation | Other categories |
| Merrifield, 1996 | French | Medium | Compensation | Affective |
| Park, 1997 | Korean | Medium | Metacognitive | Affective |
| Bremner, 1999 | Hong Kongers | Medium | Compensation | Affective |
| Wharton, 2000 | Singapore | Medium | Social | Affective |
| Peacock and Ho, 2003 | Hong Kongers | Medium | Compensation | Memory and Affective |
| OK, 2003 | Korean | Medium | Compensation | Affective |
| Shamis, 2003 | Palestinian | Medium | Metacognitive | Compensation |

**Table 2: Category of LLS use by Turkish leaners**

| Category | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Low | 5 | 4.6 |
| Medium | 70 | 63.6 |
| High | 35 | 31.8 |
| Total | 110 | 100.0 |

Language in India www.languageinindia.com
12 : 10 October 2012
Seyed Ali Rezvani Kalajahi, Vahid Nimehchisalem and Bahar Pourshahian
How Do English Language Learners Apply Language Learning Strategies in Different Proficiency Levels? A Case of Turkish EFL Students                    201

**Table 3: Detailed analysis of the LLS category use**

|        |                          | Frequency | Percent |
|--------|--------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Low    | Never or almost never used | 0         | 0       |
|        | Generally not used       | 5         | 4.5     |
| Medium | Sometimes used           | 70        | 63.6    |
| High   | Usually used             | 32        | 29.1    |
|        | Always or almost always used | 3     | 2.8     |

**Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of responses to SILL categories**

|               | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---------------|-----|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| Memory        | 110 | 1.89    | 5.00    | 3.19 | .58            |
| Cognitive     | 110 | 1.71    | 4.71    | 3.14 | .55            |
| Compensation  | 110 | 1.33    | 5.00    | 3.50 | .70            |
| Metacognitive | 110 | 1.56    | 5.00    | 3.55 | .71            |
| Affective     | 110 | 1.33    | 4.67    | 2.97 | .72            |
| Social        | 110 | 1.50    | 5.00    | 3.54 | .80            |

**Table 5: Group Statistics**

|     | Gender | N  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-----|--------|----|------|----------------|-----------------|
| LLS | Female | 30 | 3.37 | .57            | .10540          |
|     | Male   | 80 | 3.26 | .47            | .05307          |

**Table 6: Independent Samples Test**

|                             | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|------|------|-------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------|
|                             | F     | Sig. | t    | df    | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
|                             |       |      |      |       |                |                 |                      | Lower | Upper |
| Equal variances assumed     | 1.453 | .231 | .979 | 108   | .330           | .105            | .107                 | -.10  | .31   |
| Equal variances not assumed |       |      | .895 | 44.52 | .375           | .105            | .118                 | -.13  | .34   |

**Table 7: Use of LLS by level of proficiency**

| Level of proficiency | | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Beginner | Overall | 22 | 2.62 | 4.50 | 3.31 | .48 |
| | memory | 22 | 2.11 | 4.00 | 3.18 | .50 |
| | cognitive | 22 | 2.29 | 4.71 | 3.12 | .60 |
| | compensation | 22 | 2.50 | 5.00 | 3.33 | .55 |
| | metacognitive | 22 | 2.22 | 5.00 | 3.68 | .70 |
| | affective | 22 | 1.50 | 4.67 | 2.96 | .71 |
| | social | 22 | 2.17 | 4.83 | 3.68 | .81 |
| Elementary | Overall | 22 | 2.10 | 3.88 | 3.15 | .52 |
| | memory | 22 | 2.11 | 3.89 | 3.02 | .47 |
| | cognitive | 22 | 2.21 | 3.79 | 2.97 | .49 |
| | compensation | 22 | 1.33 | 4.67 | 3.37 | .88 |
| | metacognitive | 22 | 1.56 | 4.44 | 3.36 | .75 |
| | affective | 22 | 1.67 | 4.50 | 2.94 | .71 |
| | social | 22 | 1.67 | 5.00 | 3.44 | .88 |
| Pre-intermediate | overall | 22 | 2.76 | 4.32 | 3.41 | .38 |
| | memory | 22 | 2.11 | 3.89 | 3.31 | .47 |
| | cognitive | 22 | 2.07 | 4.00 | 3.23 | .47 |
| | compensation | 22 | 2.50 | 5.00 | 3.65 | .61 |
| | metacognitive | 22 | 2.44 | 5.00 | 3.70 | .60 |
| | affective | 22 | 2.00 | 4.17 | 3.09 | .69 |
| | social | 22 | 2.67 | 4.83 | 3.65 | .64 |
| Intermediate | overall | 22 | 2.06 | 4.70 | 3.28 | .65 |
| | memory | 22 | 1.89 | 5.00 | 3.23 | .82 |
| | cognitive | 22 | 2.14 | 4.57 | 3.24 | .61 |
| | compensation | 22 | 2.00 | 4.67 | 3.33 | .72 |
| | metacognitive | 22 | 2.44 | 5.00 | 3.54 | .86 |
| | affective | 22 | 1.33 | 4.67 | 2.93 | .85 |
| | social | 22 | 1.50 | 5.00 | 3.37 | .94 |
| Upper-intermediate | overall | 22 | 2.54 | 4.16 | 3.31 | .44 |
| | memory | 22 | 2.11 | 4.22 | 3.20 | .58 |
| | cognitive | 22 | 1.71 | 4.07 | 3.13 | .55 |
| | compensation | 22 | 2.33 | 5.00 | 3.75 | .63 |
| | metacognitive | 22 | 2.44 | 4.56 | 3.47 | .63 |
| | affective | 22 | 2.00 | 4.50 | 2.94 | .66 |
| | social | 22 | 2.67 | 5.00 | 3.55 | .71 |

==========================================================

Seyed Ali Rezvani Kalajahi (Corresponding author)
Department of Language and Humanities Education
Faculty of Educational Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia
ali.rezvani85@gmail.com

Vahid Nimehchisalem
Department of Language and Humanities Education
Faculty of Educational Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia
nimechie22@yahoo.com

Bahar Pourshahian
University of Jahrom, Jahrom, Iran
bpourshahian@yahoo.com