COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES OF ROMANIAN AND TURKISH STUDENTS

Hasan Arslan, PhD

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University

Georgeta Rata,PhD

B.U.A.S.V.M.

Aysun Yavuz,PhD

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University

A. Andreea Dragoescu, PhD

B.U.A.S.V.M.

Abstract

This comparative study mainly aims at describing the preferences in terms of language learning strategies of Turkish and Romanian college students at the Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University (Turkey) and the Banat University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine (Romania). The Oxford five-scale Likert type questionnaire, consisting of 50 items and five dimensions pertaining to the use of language learning strategies, was administered to 121 participants from the Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey and to 120 participants from the Banat University, Romania (from each of the two universities). The major targets of the study have been to identify [and compare] the learning strategies employed by students from both countries, as well as the relevance of gender and grade upon the use of strategies. The descriptive statistics indicate that the scores regarding the use of strategies are generally higher in the case of Romanian students than Turkish students. Furhermore, significant differences have been found between Romanian and Turkish students regarding the use of language learning strategies and in terms of grade levels.

Keywords: Learning strategy, language learning, university, Romania, Turkey

Introduction

Language learners use a variety of strategies to communicate more effectively (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992) and language learning strategies (LLSs) are highly relevant in the

case of English as a foreign language (EFL). When used appropriately, they help to improve learners' proficiency and self-confidence (Oxford, 1990). They were initially seen by Rubin (1975:43), a pioneer strategy researcher, as "techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge". Following this, Weinstein & Mayer (1986) and O'Malley & Chamot (1990) correlated learning strategies with behaviours. Furthermore, Oxford (1990, p. 8) expanded the definition of LLSs as "operations employed by the learner to aid acquisition, storage, retrieval, and use of information", by adding "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations".

In addition, the results of our questionnaire confirm that skilled learners generally seem to use more metacognitive strategies, which may also be correlated with findings in the field (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). Instructional models regarding strategy learning may be proposed based on such metacognitive strategies which appear to be preffered by proficient students. LLSs are considered cognitive, metacognitive, as well as socioaffective strategies (Oxford, 1990). Therefore, it is essential to promote awareness regarding the efficiency of such metacognitive strategies and their introduction into the class. Thus, students will be equipped with more effective learning skills, which will help them become independent learners, while consciously applying language learning strategies.

Categorization of Language Learning Strategies
Following the emergence of LLSs by the 1970s, researchers have endeavoured to classify them (Anderson, 2005; Carson & Longhini, 2002; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; O'Malley *et al*., 1985a; O'Malley *et al*., 1985b; Oxford, 1990; Rubin, 1981; Weinstein & Mayer, 1986). Unfortunately, there has not been a consensus on their classification. Yet, Oxford deserves appreciation for consistently questioning the classification in her Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (Hsiao & Oxford, 2002). Therefore, the classification of LLSs in the present study largely credits Oxford's research. Our research applies the EFL version of the SILL inventory, which is a tool used extensively across numerous cultural groups. The SILL provides ratings of proficiency by correlating language performance with grades and other complex factors such as sensory preferences. The wide-ranging rating scales are considered highly reliable and efficient in the assessment of language learning strategy use (Pavičić Takač, 2008: 52-54).

Oxford (1990, in Adams, 2006) divides LLSs into direct strategies (applying directly to the linguistic task and used by the learners to remember new information, to process information, and to maintain communication) – *memory strategies*, *cognitive strategies*, and

compensation strategies – and indirect strategies (helping the learner to manage the language learning process as a whole, i.e. to organise the learning experience, to cultivate a positive belief system about language learning, and to learn in a communicative setting) – *metacognitive strategies*, *affectivestrategies*, and *social strategies*.

Memory Strategies

Memory strategies are, together with *cognitive strategies* and with *compensation strategies*, direct LLSs (Adams, 2006).

Memory strategies– also called memory-related strategies(Oxford, 2001a) and memory strategies (Oxford, 2001b) – assist learners in making linkages between existing and new information and they are known to have been in use for a very long time. However, they do not guarantee deep understanding of the information (Oxford, 2001a). It should be kept in mind that there may not be a positive relation between memory strategies and second language (L_2) proficiency (Oxford, 2003) and it is important to differentiate *cognitive strategies* from memory strategies. On the one hand, *cognitive strategies* correlate existing and new information on a deep level, whereas memory strategies, on the other hand, make more superficial associations only on a surface level (Oxford, 2001b).

Nonetheless, these methods may also be put to use in vocabulary learning and recall, which is an indispensable process in mastering a foreign language. Memory enhancement becomes a significant approach all the more that it conditions the effectiveness of lexical knowledge acquirement. Therefore, memory strategies (rhyme using, making associations between sounds or words and images, reiteration practice) all facilitate acquisition and consolidatation of newly encountered words. One ofthe issues our study aims to gain more insight into relates to the degree to which memory strategies may or may not be overlooked and whether other strategies may be used in compensation.

Adams (2006: 278) shows that, in study abroad contexts, college students having rated their *listening comprehension* improvement as "moderate" or "very much" significantly increased their use of memory strategies, and that memory strategies also help improve *writing* (Adams, 2006: 280). Memory strategies, together with *metacognitive strategies* and with *affective strategies* were most often related to self-reported gains in language learning success in study abroad contexts (Adams, 2006).

Cognitive Strategies

Cognitive strategies are, together with *memory strategies* and with *compensation strategies*, direct LLSs (Adams, 2006).

The cognitive approach to language teaching, which developed especially in the US in the 1980s, advocates conscious (cognitive) awareness of the structure of the targetlanguage and argues that study of rules of pronunciationand grammar will give learners apractical command of that language (McArthur, 1992).

Cognition is the first step of learning a skill (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990); thus, cognitive strategies are quite popular in language learning (Oxford, 1990). Gagné (1977, in Stern, 1986) distinguishes several varieties of learning: learning intellectual skills, concepts and rules; learning problem solving or cognitive strategies; verbal information learning; motor skill learning; and the learning of attitudes (Pavičić Takač, 2008). Although Anderson (1995) does not distinguish between learning strategies and other cognitive processes, his theoretical analysis of cognition includes a number of cognitive and some metacognitive strategies. For example, a cognitive process that fosters storing information in memory is imagery. Images are also helpful in recalling verbal materials, and relating verbal information to images is helpful in vocabulary learning (e.g. mnemonics such as the Keyword Method or the Loci Method). Another cognitive process that plays a key role in remembering meaningful materials is elaboration. It is also the foundation for development of transfer and deductive strategies that enable guessing from context. O'Malley and Chamot (1996) call for caution with regard to certain limitations of the application of Anderson's theory to viewing language acquisition as a complex cognitive skill, but at the same time emphasise the advantages of identifying mental processes that can be "presented" to learners as ways to facilitate learning (Pavičić Takač, 2008: 36).

By employing cognitive strategies, learners interact with language items in a variety of ways (Hedge, 2000) such as "reasoning, analysis, note-taking, summarizing, synthesizing, outlining, reorganizing information to develop stronger schemas (knowledge structures), practicing in naturalistic settings, and practicing structures and sounds formally" (Oxford, 2003: 12).

Cognitive strategies are known to be facilitating language learning (Chamot & O'Malley, 1987). Thus, according to Adams (2006: 284-285), "Students who indicated an increase in overall proficiency also reported using significantly more cognitive strategies. Students who reported only slight gains significantly decreased their use of cognitive strategies, while students who reported moderate gains did not significantly alter their use of cognitive strategies. The general increase in the use of cognitive strategies by students who rated their overall proficiency improvement as moderate or better indicates that increased use of strategies is related to higher second language proficiency for study abroad students." For

Višnja Pavičić Takač (Pavičić Takač, 2008), interlanguage is a single system composed of hypothetical rules that have been developed through different cognitive strategies and are tested and modified by the learner during the process of comprehension and production.

Metacognitive Strategies

Metacognitive Strategies are, together with *affective strategies* and with *social strategies*, indirect LLSs (Adams, 2006).

Students need to be aware of the strategies that led to their success to continue to be successful with learning tasks. This kind of awareness is generally referred to as metacognition or metacognitive awareness (Presley & Afflerbach, 1995; Rivers 2001): the greater the metacognitive awareness, the better the understanding of the similarities between current and previous learning tasks, the knowledge of strategies for successful learning, and success anticipation. Ormrod (2006: 46) states that "metacognition refers both to the knowledge people have about their own cognitive processes and to their internal use of certain cognitive processes to facilitate learning and memory"; therefore, it maximizes memory by knowing its limitations. LLSs are divided into two categories – metacognitive strategies (used for almost any tasks and based on reflecting on one's own thinking) and task-oriented strategies (determined by the specific nature of the task and the resources of the student) (Chamot, 1987). Chamot (1987) list four general metacognitive strategies – *organising/planning* (what to do before starting), *managing* (what to do while working on the task), *monitoring* (how to make sure the task is done correctly), and *evaluating* (what to do after finishing the task) one's own learning. Metacognitive strategies consist of four elements, namely, *planning*, *prioritising*, *setting goals*, and *self-management* (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990) by assisting learners to *regulate* (Rubin, 1981; Oxford, 1990), *orchestrate* (Brown & Campione, 1985), *arrange* (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989), *organize*, *plan*, *evaluate* (Richards & Lockhart, 1996), *monitor*, *control* (Busato *et al.*, 2000), and *co-ordinate* (Johnson, 2001) their own strategies and learning.

In study abroad contexts, for instance, "changes in overall proficiency were related to the use of cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies and overall strategies" (Adams, 2006: 284). The association of metacognitive strategies with proficiency gains is a complex phenomenon: the decline in the use of metacognitive strategies in study abroad contexts could be the result of students perceiving study abroad to be an opportunity to extend language learning from the classroom to more naturalistic settings (Adams, 2006).

Adams (2006: 278) shows that, in study abroad contexts, students having rated their *listening comprehension* improvement as "moderate" or "very much" significantly increased

their use of metacognitive strategies. Metacognitive strategies, together with *memory strategies* and with *affective strategies* were most often related to self-reported gains in language learning success in study abroad contexts (Adams, 2006: 287).

Memory Strategies

Memory strategies - also called *memory-related* and *mnemonic* strategies - assist learners in making linkages between existing and new information and they are known to have been in use for a very long time(Oxford, 2001a; 2001b). However, they do not guarantee deep understanding of the information (Oxford, 2001a). In should be kept in mind that there may not be a positive relation between memory strategies and L2 (second language) proficiency (Oxford, 2003) and it is important to differentiate 'cognitive' strategies from 'memory' strategies. On the one hand, cognitive strategies correlate existing and new information on a deep level, whereas memory strategies, on the other hand, make more superficial associations only on a surface level (Oxford, 2001b).

Nonetheless, these methods may also be put to use in vocabulary learning and recall, which is an indispensable process in mastering a foreign language. Memory enhancement becomes a significant approach all the more that it conditions the effectiveness of lexical knowledge acquirement. Therefore, memory strategies as described by the questionnaire items in Part A (rhyme using, making associations between sounds or words and images, reiteration practice) all facilitate acquisition and consolidatation of newly encountered words. One of the issues our study aims to gain more insight into relates to the degree to which mnemonic strategies may or may not be overlooked and whether other strategies may be used in compensation

Adams (2006: 278) shows that, in study abroad contexts, college students having rated their *listening comprehension* improvement as "moderate" or "very much" significantly increased their use of memory strategies, and that memory strategies also help improve *writing* (Adams, 2006: 280). Memory strategies, together with *metacognitive strategies* and with *affective strategies* were most often related to self-reported gains in language learning success in study abroad contexts (Adams, 2006: 287).

Compensation Strategies

Researchers have introduced the notion of *compensation strategies* to fill a void which illustrates L2 interraction regardless of specific lexis insufficiency. Through compensation strategies, learners can participate both in receptive and productive skills even if they have insufficient target language (TL) knowledge. For instance, questionnaire items in Part C exemplify methods of making up for linguistic voids: "When I can't think of a word

during a conversation in English, I use gestures" or "I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English". Moreover, making guesses and paraphrasing may also be added to these strategic actions. However, when such strategies are used for the productive skills of listening and writing, they are labelled *compensatory strategies*. They are also regarded as forms of communication strategies sooner than LLSs, given that they occur when a language is used rather than when it is learned (Cohen, 1998). Nonetheless, Oxford (2001b, 2003) considers that any compensation strategy equally assists language learners in their strategic use of EFL.

Affective Strategies

Affective Strategies are, together with *metacognitive strategies* and with *social strategies*, indirect LLSs (Adams, 2006).

Krashen's (1985) Affective Filter Hypothesis proposes that affective factors prevent new information reaching the language acquisition device (LAD). Affective strategies contribute learners to regulate attitudinal and emotional factors on their own. "Affective strategies, such as identifying one's mood and anxiety level, talking about feelings, rewarding oneself for good performance, and using deep breathing or positive self-talk" are considered to be having a positive impact on language learning (Oxford, 2003: 14). According to Adams (2006: 278), affective strategies also include lowering anxiety and carefully taking risks in language learning allowing students to focus on aural input.

Adams (2006: 278) shows that, in study abroad contexts, students having rated their *listening comprehension* improvement as "moderate" or "very much" significantly increased their use of affective strategies, and that students having rated it as "slight" also significantly decreased their use of affective strategies even though they used the most affective strategies at the beginning of the study. She also shows that affective strategies also help improve *writing*: students having rated their *writing proficiency* improvement as "very much" also had significantly increased their use of affective strategies, while students having rated their *writing proficiency* improvement as "slightly" or "moderately" did not significantly change their use of affective strategies (Adams, 2006: 280). Affective strategies, together with *memory strategies* and with *metacognitive strategies* were most often related to self-reported gains in language learning success in study abroad contexts (Adams, 2006: 287).

Gender seems to play an important role in the use of affective strategies, but this aspect will be analysed somewhere else.

Social Strategies

Social strategies are, together with *metacognitive strategies* and with *affective strategies*, indirect LLSs (Adams, 2006).

Language is a device which enables people to communicate through interaction; therefore, learning a language should involve this interaction. Social strategies provide learners with the means to interact with other people through improving their understanding and enhancing language production. Social strategies not only foster learning but also help learners become aware of the new culture (Oxford, 2001b). Asking questions to get confirmation, asking for clarification of a confusing point, asking for help in performing a language task, talking with a native-speaking conversation partner, or exploring cultural and social norms can be examples of such strategies (Oxford, 2003).

In addition, socially-mediated strategies imply cooperating with peers and picking up body language and other types of social cues. Proficient learners are more likely to use such strategies, as they are willing to expose themselves to the target language with a view to practicing their EFL skills. The better equipped they are from a linguistic point of view, the more confident they tend to be while actively seeking social situations for this purpose.

Methodology

The research on the use of learning strategies emphasizes such strategies as being extremely valuable for FL learning. Thus, students should employ them. Therefore, the present study mainly aims to describe learning strategy preferences of Turkish and Romanian students. Moreover, a number of various factors such as gender and grade were also involved.

The three main research questions addressed were as follows:

1. What are the most frequently used LLSs among Romanian and Turkish students?

2. Is there a significant difference between the use of LLSs among Romanian and Turkish students in terms of grade?

Setting

The comparative study was conducted at Banat University Agriculture of Science, Veterinary Medicine and at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, School of Education. Data were collected from Romanian and Turkish participants who were non-native speakers of English.

Participants

A total number of 120 Romanian and 121 Turkish participants from a variety of different classes from first grada to fourth grade,participated in the study. The participants were young adults whose ages varied from 17 to 25. At the time of data collection, they had studied English for 5-18 years.

Materials

To collect data, Oxford's (1990) SILL, consisting of six groups of items on learning strategies, was delivered to the participants. The six groups are given below.

Group A: Memory strategies (Remembering more effectively)

Group B: Cognitive strategies (Using all mental processes)

Group C: Compensation strategies (Compensating for missing knowledge)

Group D: Metacognitive strategies (Organizing and evaluating learning)

Group E: Affective strategies (Managing emotions)

Group F: Social strategies (Learning with others)

The participants were also required to give demographic information about their *age, period of study of English, class,* and *gender*.

Method of Data Analysis

The data collected through the questionnaire were entered into computer through SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences, version 15.0). The data were analysed by descriptive statistics, independent samples t-test, oneway ANOVA test, and post hoc multiple comparisons Tukey tests.

Findings

Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Test of The Scale was applied to the data. Reliability results ranged from 0.71 to 0.91. The reliability score was 0.81 in memory strategies, 0.90 in cognitive strategies, 0.71 in compensation strategies, 0.90 in metacognitive strategies, 0.74 in effective strategies and 0.86 in social strategies. The overall reliability of the scale was 0.96. Data indicate that the scale has a high reliability (Table 1).

Table 1. Dimensions and Cronbach's Alpha Scores

Dimensions	Cronbach's Alpha
A. Memory Strategies	0.81
B. Cognitive Strategies	0.90
C. Compensation Strategies	0.71
D. Metacognitive Strategies	0.90
E. Affective Strategies	0.74
F. Social strategies	0.86
Total	0.96

As indicated in Table 2, Romanian college students use social strategies ($\overline{X}$=3.47) the most, followed by metacognitive strategies ($\overline{X}$=3.38), cognitive strategies ($\overline{X}$=3.29), by compensation strategies ($\overline{X}$=3.23), memory strategies ($\overline{X}$=2.81) and affective strategies ($\overline{X}$=2.60). Romanian college students mostly preferred social strategies in learning English, while affective strategies were listed at the bottom of the list by the participants. Results in

Table 2 indicate that memory strategies, along with affective strategies, were the least preferred ones.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Use of Strategies in Romanian and Turkish Students

Dimensions	Country	N	$\overline{X}$	SS
A.Memory strategies	Romania	114	2.92	0.74
	Turkey	110	2.81	0.72
B. Cognitive Strategies	Romania	111	3.29	0.70
	Turkey	110	2.42	0.80
C. Compensation Strategies	Romania	116	3.23	0.77
	Turkey	121	2.48	0.73
D. Metacognitive Strategies	Romania	114	3.38	0.79
	Turkey	117	2.62	0.79
E. Affective Strategies	Romania	113	2.60	0.82
	Turkey	113	2.48	0.87
F. Social strategies	Romania	117	3.47	0.89
	Turkey	121	2.55	0.97

Turkish college students use memory strategies ($\overline{X}$=2.81) the most, unlike Romanian college students, followed by metacognitive strategies (X=2.62), social strategies ($\overline{X}$=2.55), compensation strategies and affective strategies ($\overline{X}$=2.48), and cognitive strategies ($\overline{X}$=2.42). However, the mean scores of Turkish college students are lower than the mean scores of Romanians college students in all dimensions. After the researchers found out the differences of mean scores in all dimensions, t-tests were applied to the data to see whether there were significant differences between Romanian and Turkish college students in the use of LLSs.

To answer research question 1, Table 3 illustrates t-test statistics in terms of perceptions of Romanian and Turkish college students on LLSs to examine whether there is a difference in the use of LLSs. Table 3 indicates whether these differences are significant or not, and it presents the results in six groups along with the overall value.

Table 3. Independent Samples T-Test Statistics for Period of English Learning in Romain and Turkey

Dimensions	Country	N	$\overline{X}$	S	t	df	P
Memory Strategies(A)	Romania	114	2.92	0.74	-1.10	222	0.27
	Turkey	110	2.81	0.72			
Cognitive Strategies (B)	Romania	111	3.29	0.70	-8.54	219	0.00
	Turkey	110	2.42	0.80			
Compensation Strategies (C)	Romania	116	3.23	0.77	-4.65	235	0.00
	Turkey	121	2.48	0.73			
Metacognitive Strategies (D)	Romania	114	3.38	0.79	-6.59	229	0.00
	Turkey	117	2.62	0.79			
Affective Strategies (E)	Romania	113	2.60	0.82	-1.05	224	0.29
	Turkey	113	2.48	0.87			
Social strategies (F)	Romania	117	3.47	0.89	-7.59	236	0.00
	Turkey	121	2.55	0.97			

There are no significant differences in the use of memory strategies and of affective strategies. The mean scores of these LLSs are quite low in both countries. However, there are significant differences between Romanian and Turkish college students in the use of cognitive strategies (t=8,27; p=0.00), of metacognitive strategies (t=4,65; p=0,00) and of social strategies (t=7,35; p=0,00). The mean scores of Romanian college students are higher than those of Turkish college students.

Table 4. The Anova Tests of Romanian and Turkish College Students in terms of Grade I

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Difference between grades
A. Memory Strategies	*Romania*	Between Groups	6.947	3	2.316	4.53	0.01	Grade 3-4
		Within Group	56.205	110	0.511			
		Total	63.162	113				
	Turkey	Between Groups	4.425	3	1.475	2.96	0.04	Grade 1-3
		Within Group	52.233	105	0.497			
		Total	56.658	108				
B. Cognitive Strategies	*Romania*	Between Groups	3.263	3	1.088	2.29	0.08	-------
		Within Group	50.571	107	0.474			
		Total	53.974	110				
	Turkey	Between Groups	4.785	3	1.595	2.53	0.61	-------
		Within Group	66.189	105	0.630			
		Total	70.974	108				
C. Compensation Strategies	*Romania*	Between Groups	8.497	3	2.832	5.24	0.00	Grade 1-4 Grade 3-4
		Within Group	60.516	112	0.540			
		Total	69.012	115				
	Turkey	Between Groups	5.524	3	1.841	3.61	0.02	Grade 2-3 Grade 3-4
		Within Group	59.086	116	0.509			
		Total	64.610	119				

To answer the second research question, Table 4 one-way ANOVA test for the grade level examines whether there is a significant difference in the use of LLSs in terms of different grades. Results in Table 4 indicate a significant difference in the use of memory strategies [F=4.53; p<.005] in Romanian college students. The difference comes from grades 3 and 4. However, even if there is a significant difference in the use of memory strategies [F=4.42; p<.035] in Turkish college students, the difference comes from grades 1 and 3.

To answer the third research question, Table IV oneway ANOVA test for the grade level examines whether there is a significant difference on the use of strategies in terms of different grades. In Table IV, the results indicate a significant difference for the use of 'memory strategies' [$F = 4.53$; $p < .005$] in Romanian students. The difference comes from grade 3 and 4. However, even if a significant difference on the use of memory strategies' [F

= 4.42; $p < .035$] in Turkish students, the difference comes from between grade 1 and grade 3 strategies'.

There is a significant difference in the use of compensation strategies in Romanian college students LLSs [F=4.53; p<.002] and in Turkish college students LLSs [F=3.61; p<.001]. The significant difference occurs between grades 1 and 4 and between grades 3 and 4 in Romanian college students, respectively between (and from) grades 2 and 3 and between grades 3 and 4 in Turkish college students in terms of *post hoc* comparisons Tukey's test. However, ANOVA test does not indicate significant differences in the use of cognitive strategies in Romanian college students [F=2.29; p>.08] or in Turkish college students [F=2.53; p<.61].

Table 5 indicates that one-way ANOVA test for the grade level examines whether there are significant differences in the use of LLSs in terms of different grades. Results in Table 5 indicate a significant difference in the use of metacognitive strategies [F=3.69; p<.0014] in Romanian students' scores, as well as other variations in LLSs between grade 2 and grade 3. Students in the 3rd grade tend to have lower mean scores because at this point they start paying attention to other things besides their school curricula, as they prepare to graduate and make their way on the labour market. A plausible explanation is that they are likely to spend less time learning for school, but more time looking for jobs and perhaps trying to establish a family. Some other discrepancies in mean scores have been found among Romanian students in grades 3 and 4, with grade 4 students improving significantly their LLSs as compared to the previous year of study. On the other hand, Turkish (take out the word 'college') students have (instead of show) a significant difference in the use of cognitive strategies [F=3.44; p<.019] and the difference occurs between (instead of comes from) grade 2 and grade 3.

Table 5. The Anova Tests of Romanian and Turkish College Students in terms of Grade II

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Differences
D. Metacognitive Strategies	*Romania*	Between Groups	6.603	3	2.201	3.69	0.014	Grade 3-4
		Within Group	65.524	110	0.596			
		Total	72.127	113				
	Turkey	Between Groups	8.477	3	2.826	3.44	0.019	Grade 2-3
		Within Group	91.992	112	0.821			
		Total	100.469	115				
E. Affective Strategies	*Romania*	Between Groups	8.336	3	2.779	4.43	0.006	Grade 2-4 Grade 3-4
		Within Group	68.223	109	0.626			
		Total	76.559	112				
	Turkey	Between Groups	3.036	3	1.012	1.34	0.265	----
		Within Group	81.505	108	0.755			
		Total	84.541	111				

F. Social Strategies	*Romania*	Between Groups	9.486	3	3.162	4.276	0.007	Grade 1-4
		Within Group	83.548	113	0.739			Grade 2-4 Grade 3-4
		Total	93.034	116				
	Turkey	Between Groups	8.136	3	2.712	3.00	0.033	Grade 1-3
		Within Group	104.608	116	0.902			
		Total	112.744	119				

Table V indicates that oneway ANOVA test for the grade level examines whether there is a significant difference on the use of strategies in terms of different grades. In Table V, the results indicate a significant difference in the use of 'metacognitive' [$F = 3,69$; $p < .0014$] in Romanian students' scores. The difference comes from grade 3 and 4. Also, Turkish students have a significant difference on the use of c'metacognitive' strategies strategies' [$F = 3,44$; $p < .019$] and the difference comes from between grade 2 and 3.

There is a significant difference for the use of 'effective strategies' in Romanian students strategies' [$F = 4.43$; $p < .006$] and the significant deference comes from grade 2 and grade 4, and grade 3 and grade 4 in Romanian students. However, there is no significant deference in the use of 'effective strategies' in Turkish students [$F =1,34$ 3; $p > .05$].

ANOVA test indicates significant differences on the use of 'social strategies' in Romanian students [$F = 4,27$; $p < .007$] and post hoc multiple comparisons Tukey different grades for the use of 'social strategies' [difference, grade 1-4, grade 2-4, and grade 1-4]. Table V shows that there is significant difference on the use of 'social strategies' in Turkish students [$F = 3,00$; $p < .003$] and difference between grade 1 and grade 3 in terms of post hoc Tukey tests.

Conclusion and Discussion

As discussed in the literature review, Language learning strategies are highly significant in learning a language. Based on the assumption of strategy use by students, findings indicate the high frequency of LLS use by the participants in general. Although they employ a variety of LLSs in learning English, the most commonly used ones appear to be social and cognitive strategies in Romanian students and memory and metacognitive strategies in Turkish students. Therefore, it may be concluded that the participants displayed a tendency of preferring social and cognitive strategies in the case of Romanian students, but memory and metacognitive ones over others in the case of Turkish students.

The data gathered from Turkish participants are compatible with the findings of previous studies carried out in Turkey (Uztosun, 2010; Dursun, 2007; Hiçyılmaz, 2006; Yalçın, 2006) regarding learners' preferences of using particular strategies. Results indicated that metacognitive strategies and language proficiency have (a) positive correlation since findings revealed that low proficient learners use fewer metacognitive strategies than high

proficient learners. Therefore, it is essential for language teachers to provide activities to perform metacognitive strategies which can promote learner autonomy and self awareness on learning processes in order to develop planning, organising, goal-setting, self-monitoring and self evaluation skills. It is also essential for teachers to provide authentic materials for Turkish learners who cannot practise English outside the classroom setting. They reported that they feel nervous when they speak English and use compensation and social strategies such as asking for repetition and slowing down (Dursun, 2007; Hiçyılmaz, 2006; Yalçın, 2006). These findings reveal that Turkish learners of English mainly deal with problems due to incompetency in productive skills of listening and speaking which are vital for authentic communication. Razı's (2012) study indicated that Turkish participants mostly preferred compensation and metacognitive strategies. On the other hand, affective and social strategies were the least preferred strategies by the learners. A significant difference was found between preparatory class and 3rd year students in terms of use of strategies which again justifies other findings in which more proficient learners use more variety of strategies than less proficient ones. Alptekin's (2007) study investigated the tutored learning of English in a formal setting and the non-tutored acquisition of Turkish in a non-formal setting by international university students at a Turkish University. The results indicated that although the students make use of all types of learning strategies, the compensation strategy was the one most frequently used in both tutored and naturalistic learning. On the other hand, a significant difference was observed in tutored English learning in which students made more use of metacognitive strategies, whereas in non-tutored Turkish acquisition they often used social strategies. Therefore, explicit strategy training which would potentially develop communicative competences can be implemented in the foreign language curriculum. However, Dörnyei (2005) is sceptical about the teachability of communication strategies since they are related to speech production which can be assessed by comparing post-treatment speech data. He states that learning strategies are related to the process of learning and other variables such as motivation, aptitude and even peer influence. Therefore, he suggests combining strategy training with awereness raising so that learners become aware of their style preferences and appropriate strategies to accomplish the language learning tasks. Gürses and Adıgüzel's (2011) research findings indicate that there are significant differences between low and high proficient language learners in using strategies regarding the number, variety and appropriateness of the strategy use depending on the context and situation. So, learners need to be knowledgeable not only about the learning strategies but they also need to know how to use them accordingly (Anderson, 1999; Koda, 2007). Thus, firstly language

teacher education programmes need to supply strategy training to future teachers who can transfer the relevant knowledge and skills into strategy training while teaching English as a foreign language. Secondly, foreign language curricula and materials can be restructured which allow students to learn and practice language learning strategies in relevant contexts and situations.

Some of the main aspects the reasearch analyzed are related to general study skills, functional skills, conceptual and mnemonic abilities, learner/ speaker confidence, and speaker interaction patterns. Oxford's assumptions that the present research draws upon have been confirmed by our questionnaire results concerning patterns of reported language learning strategy (LLS). Results suggest that the respondents in both study centres exhibited similar levels of desired and achieved interactiveness. Both Romanian and Turkish learners appeared positive about their learning experiences and interested in enhancing practical skills, especially language used contextually. Regarding learner confidence, there are no statistically significant differences for most of the questionnaire items 39-50 (Part E and F) reflecting low to average use of socioaffective strategies.

Moreover, the results reflect various attitudes to learning and learner motivation, indicating that high-scoring respondents generally have a tendency to organize newly acquired knowledge effectively and to integrate it in their previously acquired mental schemas. Romanian learners of EFL appear to have attained such strategic abilities, as substantiated by high scores in questionnaire items like "I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English", "I try to find patterns in English", etc. Both student groups have developed low to average self-management strategies, as indicated by items 30-38 (Part D). Though many have been positive in general statements such as "I think about my progress in learning English", the scores are much lower in more detailed items like "I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English". Thus, learner planning and goal setting assist learners only to a limited amount, depending on whether they are seriously put into effect.

The use of cognitive strategies which allow students to organize and control their own learning styles is given evidence by average to high scores in Part A and B of the applied questionnaire in both cases. It is particularly noteworthy that Romanian students are adept at reorganizing information so as to help them build up stronger cognitive schemas or knowledge structures. This is corroborated by the high scores achieved for questionnaire statements like "I try to find patterns in English" or "I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand". On the other hand, Romanian students tend not to

focus on applying mnemonic strategies illustrated by statements like "I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word", "I use rhymes to remember new English words", etc. The fact that such items display very low scores, even in the case of students with high grades, indicates the fact that Romanian learners discriminate between mnemonic and conceptual strategies and manifest an obvious preference for the latter. This is also a case in point verifying Oxford's differentiation between the two sets of strategies, as well as her premise that there may not be a positive relation between memory strategies and L2 proficiency (Oxford, 2003).

The high preference for metacognitive strategies generally indicates that learners are able to manage their own learning. As metacognitive strategies allow learners to plan their learning, such strategies support classroom language learning. This finding also parallels the relevant literature in the field, as Oxford (1990) considers them essential for successful language learning. Nevertheless, Anderson (1991) demonstrates that in order to become successful, knowledge of LLSs alone is not sufficient; students also need to know how to use them. Similarly, Carrell (1989) also calls attention to the importance of raising learners' awareness of LLSs. She indicates that strategy training should also teach why such strategies are important, when and how they can facilitate their learning. Finally, as hypothesized by both Carson & Longhini (2002) and Ehrman & Oxford (1990), affective strategies were among the least preferred LLSs in our reasearch, revealing an area in which learners and trainers should work on together.

It may thus be concluded that, while Romanian students have developed slightly more efficient cognitive strategies, both learner groups exhibit comparable levels of all other language learner strategies, with Turkish students rating high in mnemonic strategies. Although the findings are of great service in the assessment of proficiency, trainers need to further reflect upon them with a view to putting more emphasis on items which displayed low scores. As significantly, the study enables trainers to find ways to sustain successful factors expressed by the high learner scores and to enhance them correspondingly.

References:

Alptekin, C. (2007). Foreign language learning strategy choice: Naturalistic vs. instructed language acquisition. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education, 3*(1), 4-11.

Adams, R. (2006). Language Learning Strategies in Study Abroad Context (pp. 259-293) in M. A. DuFon and E. Churchill (Eds) *Language Learners in Study Abroad Contexts*. Clevedon-Buffalo-Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Anderson, N. J. (2005). L2 learning strategies (pp. 757-771)in E. Hinkel (Eds), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Anderson, N. (1999). *Exploring Second Language Reading: Issues and Strategies*. Canada: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Brown, D. H. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Harlow-London-New York: Longman-Pearson.

Busato, V. V., Prins, F. J., Elshout, J. J., and Hamaker, C. (2000). Intellectual ability, learning style, personality, achievement motivation and academic success of psychology students in higher education. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29*, 1057-1068.

Carson, J. G., and Longhini, A. (2002). Focusing on learning styles and strategies: a diary study in an immersion setting. *Language Learning, 52,* 401-438.

Carrell, P. L. (1989). Metacognitive awareness and second language reading. *Modern Language Journal, 73*, 120-134.

Chamot, A. and O'Malley, M. (1987). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A bridge to the mainstream. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*, 227-249.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language.* London: Longman.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *ThePsychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dursun, E. (2007). *An Investigation into research of gender differences in foreign language success at university level prep classes.* Unpublished MA thesis. Çanakkale: Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University.

Ehrman, M. E. and Oxford, R. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *The Modern Language Journal, 74*, 311-327.

Gürses, Ö. M. and Adıgüzel, O. C. (2011). University French Preparatory Class Students' Opinions on Reading Comprehension Strategies Use. *Journal of Çukurova University Institude of Social Sciences, 20*(2), 95-109.

Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hiçyılmaz, A. (2006). *Yabancı dil olarak İngilizceyi öğrenen orta öğretim 9. sınıf öğrencileriyle üniversite hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin kullandıkları dil öğrenme stratejilerinin karşılaştırılması.* Unpublished MA thesis. İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik University.

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

Hurd, S. and Lewis, T. (Eds) (2008). *Language Learning Strategies in Independent Settings*. Clevedon-Buffalo-Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Johnson, K. (2001). *An introduction to foreign language learning and teaching.* London: Longman.

Ishihara, N. and Cohen A. D. (2010). *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics: Where Language and Culture Meet*. Harlow-London-New York: Longman-Pearson.

Koda, K. (2007). *Insights into second language reading: Cross-linguistic approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Beverly Hills: Laredo.

McArthur, T. (Eds) (1992). *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford-New York: Oxford Universiy Press.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Küpper, L. and Russo, R. P. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. *Language Learning, 35,* 21-46.

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

O'Malley, C. and Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* New York: Newbury House Publishers.

Oxford, R. L. (2001a). Language learning styles and strategies in M. Celce-Murcia (Eds) *Teaching English as a second or foreign language.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Oxford, R. L. (2001b). Language learning strategies (pp. 166-172) in R. Carter and D. Nunan (Eds) *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. (2003). *Language learning styles and strategies: An overview*. Oxford: GALA. [Online]:   http://web.ntpu.edu.tw/~language/workshop/read2.pdf   (Retrieved   October   12, 2011)

Pavičić Takač, V. (2008). *Vocabulary Learning Strategies and Foreign Language Acquisition*. Clevedon-Buffalo-Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Pressley, M. and Afflerbach, P. (1995). *Verbal protocols of reading: The nature of constructively responsive reading.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Razı, S. (2012). Turkish EFL Learners' Language Learning Strategy Employement at University Level. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education, 8*(1), 94-119.

Richards, J. C. and Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. and Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional Development for Language Teachers. Strategies for Teacher Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly, 9*(1), 41-51.

Scarcella, R. and Oxford, R. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: The individual in the communicative classroom.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Weinstein, C. E. and Mayer, R. E. (1986). The teaching of learning strategies (pp. 315-327) in M. Wittrock (Eds), *Handbook of research on teaching*. New York: Macmillan.