

=====

Strategies and Proficiency in Language Learning Among College Students in the New Normal

Marly P. Magnal^{1*}, Alrasser M. Arpa², Haidee Shane P. Oda³, Merafel Grace S. Abule, MAEd⁴

¹Department of Teacher Education, University of Mindanao Digos College, Philippines

²Department of Teacher Education, University of Mindanao Digos College, Philippines

³Department of Teacher Education, University of Mindanao Digos College, Philippines

⁴Department of Teacher Education, University of Mindanao Digos College, Philippines

Corresponding author's email: marlymagnal443@gmail.com

Abstract

Learning of English as second and even foreign language has been stressed out in all degrees of education. Consequently, academics and researchers have concentrated on depicting the outwardly discernible actions of linguists came after by making an effort to identify and name strategic actions, then connect them to language proficiency. This study was an exploration of college students' strategies and proficiency in language learning. Language proficiency of the students was significantly lower than anticipated, partially confirming the teacher's assessment of low proficiency levels as evidence of students' general inadequacy for studying English at national curriculum-required levels. This descriptive research involved 260 respondents who were randomly selected to respond to the adopted SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) questionnaire. Mean and Pearson r were used as statistical tools. The data revealed that the students practice high language learning strategies, specifically more on metacognitive and affective strategies. Meanwhile, a moderate level of language proficiency was found out. Statistically, there was no statistical evidence showing significant relationship between language learning strategies and language proficiency. The findings of the study suggest important implications for classroom instruction and learning content design. Students, especially those with low proficiency levels, can be assisted to improve their competence in English through strategy instruction.

Keywords: language learning strategies; English language proficiency; new normal

INTRODUCTION

Language proficiency is the ability to speak a language. Most students still struggle with language proficiency, particularly in secondary school. This is demonstrated by the findings of researchers (Nijat et al., 2019), who discovered that learners of a second language have difficulties speaking English. In addition, children who lack language proficiency tend to have poor listening and attention skills. Valderama (2019) mentioned in the Manila Times that a study conducted by Hopkins International Partners a few years ago revealed that college graduates from the Philippines had lower levels of English proficiency than Thai high school students' target level of English proficiency. In

order to implement a language learning technique in the classroom when planning lessons, teachers might employ a variety of strategy-type instructional methods for enhancing students' linguistic competence because there is no established best learning strategy. In Kalinga-Apayao, it was discovered that the English language proficiency of first-year students enrolled in the Institute of Teacher Education is classified as communicating fundamental, familiar topics with the vocabulary and sentence structures they have been taught previously. However, they must frequently improve word usage, pronunciation, and grammar (Leyaley, 2016).

Charoento (2017) stated that the reason for exploring language learning strategies is to encourage educational experiences and further develop proficiency levels. Research projects frequently manage language learning strategy use corresponding to language learning capability. In addition, inside the area of foreign language research, that is what various examinations show language learning strategies assume a critical part in effective language learning. Giang, 2018 guaranteed that learning strategies are emphatically connected with language acquisition. They might work on students learning the structures and functions expected for comprehension and creation. A study from De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines, stated that language strategies help in "planning, assessing, looking for valuable open doors, controlling uneasiness, expanding collaboration, and sympathy and different signifies in language learning" (Huang, 2016).

Theoretically, the Cognitive Learning Theory of Jean Piaget (1936) states that learning a language is a conscious, purposeful activity that involves using learning strategies. Learning strategies are unique approaches to information processing that improve understanding, learning, and memory of information or language proficiency. This language acquisition theory starkly contrasts the behaviorist theory, which views language acquisition as an unconscious, automatic process. This perspective results in a concentration in the classroom on applying learning methods seen in effective language learners and a view of the learner as an "information processor" who needs procedures to transfer knowledge into memory. Review and revision exercises, vocabulary packets in class, and using scaffolding, language and topic analysis and conversation, inductive methods, and learner training should all be used. It was supported by Jerome Bruner's Theory of Development (1976) is based on the assumption that we learn best when we go from concrete to abstract in a three-step process: First comes hands-on "Action," then learning with "Images" and finally students transform what they have learned into "Language ."Throughout the experience, we constantly revisit previously learned topics while teachers provide carefully structured guidance. Moreover, it works.

According to Bruner, children actively engage with learning in a way that corresponds to the level of their cognitive development. Therefore, to maximize the learning experience, educators should optimize the presentation mode rather than the content. Bruner believed that children could learn complex topics and that even adult learners can learn new concepts if the presentation method is arranged in three stages: the enactive, iconic, and symbolic.

Thus, the findings of this study may be beneficial to school administrators as a guide for the awareness of the aftermaths of shifting to new learning and teaching mode of English language subjects that necessitates real-time classes, facilitation, and demonstration. Furthermore, it can help the English language teachers of the university to know about the reasons for some students not doing well in the English language class, which can help them in planning out necessary learning strategies, programs, and remediation to ensure that the learners still earn mastery and competency after the course despite being physically distanced. Finally, the study's findings will help future researchers make their investigations scholarly and data-driven. They may use this study as reference material and related literature for their future academic endeavors relating to this topic. As a result, future researchers, teachers, and students should be informed of English language learning strategies and language proficiency.

This study aimed to determine the level of learning strategies and college student's proficiency. Specifically, this study aimed:

1. To determine the level of language learning strategies UMDC College students' used in terms of:
 - 1.1. Memory strategy;
 - 1.2. Affective strategy;
 - 1.3. Metacognitive strategy;
 - 1.4. Cognitive strategy;
 - 1.5. Compensation strategy; and
 - 1.6. Social strategy.
2. To describe the level of language proficiency of UMDC college students.
3. To assess if there exists a significant relationship between language learning strategies and the level of proficiency among college students in the new normal.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Meanings of language learning strategies shed light on what students think and do during language learning. In this unique circumstance, it was characterized that the idea of learning methodology is an endeavor to create phonetic and sociolinguistic ability in the objective language. Not long after, Cohen (2019) expressed that learning methodologies are intentionally chosen processes by students and which might bring about activities taken to improve the learning and proficiency or utilization of a second or unknown dialect through the capacity, maintenance, review, and utilization of the data about language. Richards and Platt (2020) pronounced that learning strategies are "purposeful way of behaving and contemplations utilized by students during advancing to all the more likely assist them with understanding, learn or recall new data." He expressed that the term learning procedure is subject to the suspicion that students deliberately take part in exercises to accomplish specific objectives and learning techniques can be viewed as extensively imagined purposeful bearings and learning strategies. A language study hall climate was seen as an issue it is probably going to address circumstances where students confront new assignments and difficulties given by their educators. To succeed in the undertakings, students need to find the fastest or least demanding method for doing what is required. Therefore, the utilization of language learning strategies is totally important whether intentionally or unknowingly.

According to Amir (2018), one cannot measure how one affects the other. A much more focused approach is required to gain a deeper understanding of this relationship. Such research could begin with instruments like the SILL, which provide a general idea of which strategies have significant levels of association with proficiency. After that, it would be necessary to figure out what these strategies mean to students in their particular learning environment, and then it would be necessary to find a way to turn them into teachable techniques whose effects could be measured over time with different groups of students. The SILL provides a snapshot, but we can only understand the potential effects of language learning strategies on proficiency by employing more longitudinal methods. Magogwe and Oliver (2007) conducted an intriguing study with students from primary, secondary, and tertiary education levels as their subjects. Their goal was to address the need for more research on the influence of age on the choice of language learning strategy. The study found that language learners with higher proficiency typically employ language learning strategies and that the strategy employed correlates with successful language learning.

Moreover, explicitly in the setting of Thai EFL students, Suwanarak (2019) observed that there was no critical distinction between students' utilization of LLS in everyday learning and English learning, a positive relationship was seen between students' language learning strategy and their English learning proficiency and comparative learning techniques were found in high and low performing understudies with a distinction on recurrence. The most recent review from Iamudom and Tangkiengsirisin (2020) uncovered that state-funded school understudies utilize more LLS than those in worldwide schools with accentuation on remuneration methodologies.

METHODS

Participants

	Profile	F	%
College Year Level			
1 st Year		16	6.2
2 nd Year		51	19.6
3 rd Year		145	55.8
4 th Year		48	18.5
Gender			
Male		66	25.4
Female		194	74.6
Age			
18-20 yrs. Old		57	21.9
21-23 yrs. Old		164	63.1
24-26 yrs. Old		20	7.7
27-30 yrs. Old		12	4.6
31-35 yrs. Old		7	2.7

The total number of respondents in this survey was 260 college students. This study used simple random sampling to choose individuals who became the sample population (Creswell, 2012, p. 142). The respondents are UMDC students at all year levels under the Department of Teachers Education. Respondents not currently enrolled in BSEd in any major, BEED, BTVTEd, and Bachelor of Special Needs Major in Early Childhood Education, were not permitted to participate in this survey. Furthermore, respondents who chose not to participate in the study were free to withdraw and stop participating at any moment.

Table 1. *Demographic Profile of the Respondents*

Table 1 shows the characteristics of the 260 DTE students who willingly participated in the study. Sixteen of them were first year, 51 of them were second year, 145 of them were third year, and 48 of them were fourth year. Concerning their age, 57 students were 18-20 years old, 164 were 21 to 23 years old, 20 were 24-26 years old, 12 were 27-30, and seven were 31-35. Lastly, 66 male students participated in the study, while the female was 164.

Two main instruments were adopted to collect the data required to answer the research questions, i.e., Strategies of Language Learning of UMDC college students in terms of Memory Strategy, Affective Strategy, Metacognitive Strategy, Cognitive Strategy, Compensation Strategy, and Social Strategy, and the level of Proficiency of Language Learning of UMDC college students in the New Normal. Strategies Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) of Oxford 1990 was utilized.

The research respondents answered the Language Learning Strategies Questionnaire adapted from Oxford's Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), describing their strategies used in language learning in the new normal: participants read the statement one by one and checked the box to specify their level of agreement related to their language learning strategy used in the new mode of learning on a 5-point Likert scale: (1) Strongly disagree; (2) Disagree; (3) Neutral; (4) Agree; (5) Strongly Agree. This section contained 27 items of Oxford's SILL which concern six (6) categories: Memory Strategy, Affective Strategy, Metacognitive Strategy, Cognitive Strategy, Compensation Strategy, and Social Strategy.

	Value	Range
Strongly Disagree	1	1.00-1.80
Disagree	2	1.81-2.60
Neutral	3	2.61-3.40
Agree	4	3.41-4.20
Strongly Agree	5	4.21-5.00

By applying the Weight Mean Score (WMS) method (Yamane), the criteria for interpreting the findings are as follows:

Rating	Range	Descriptive Levels	Interpretation
--------	-------	--------------------	----------------

5	4.21-5.00	Very High	This provision indicates a very high level of language learning strategy utilization.
4	3.41-4.20	High	This provision indicates a high level of language learning strategy utilization.
3	2.61-3.40	Moderate	This provision indicates an average level of language learning strategy utilization.
2	1.81-2.60	Low	This provision indicates a low level of language learning strategy utilization.
1	1.00-1.80	Very Low	This provision indicates a very low level of language learning strategy utilization.

They were asked to answer the ten (10) items Proficiency Test, and the basis of the level of proficiency interpretation was based on CERF (2001).

Proficiency Level			
Score	Range	English Language Levels Description	Interpretation
10-8	6.5 -10.0 (C1-C2)	Proficient User	High
7-5	4. 0-6.4(B1-B2)	Independent User	Moderate
4&below	0.0-3.9 (A1-A2)	Basic User	Low

The learners' English proficiency tests assessed learners' proficiency levels, including grammar, spelling, vocabulary, and comprehension. In addition, the results are generated in the form of scores translated into A1-A2 or 0.0-3.9 (garnered a score of 4 and below), B1&B2 or 4. 0-6.4 (garnered a score of 7-5), and C1-C2 or 6.5 -10.0 (garnered a score of 10-8) according to Waluyo, 2019. The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2001) is an international standard for describing language ability. It describes language ability on a six-point scale, from A1 for beginners to C2 for those who have mastered a language. The three broad levels are A1/A2 ("Basic User"), B1/B2 ("Independent User"), and C1/C2 ("Proficient User").

This study employs a descriptive correlational research design that investigates relationships between variables without the researcher controlling or manipulating any of them. This research entails everything from conceiving a problem to formulating research questions. Most importantly, this also includes collecting, analyzing, interpreting, and report writing the data (Creswell, 2018). The survey questionnaire was

utilized for the data collection procedure online. This design was considered because it enabled the researchers to develop data through normal data collection procedures based on research instruments, well-defined study concepts, and related variables.

Before taking the survey, each participant was provided an Information Form that briefly explained the study's intention and the charge they anticipated to complete. Their permission was given to guarantee their privacy if risks and embarrassment occurred. They were filled out anonymously by the participants through Google Forms. The information they provided in the questionnaires would be kept confidential and used only for academic purposes. The participants were asked to fill out personal details like complete name, age, gender, course, and year level through their mobile phones or gadgets. Next was the tabulation of the responses of the respondents. After the data was collected from the online survey, the questionnaire with answers was given to the statistician subjected to the tabulation of the responses using the statistical tool Simple Random Sampling. Then, the analysis and interpretation of the data. After tabulation, the data were analyzed and interpreted using the **Mean** to determine the average level of language learning strategies (IV) and its respective indicators and proficiency in the language (DV) of the college students enrolled in the Department of Teachers Education program. **Pearson r** was used to determine the significance of the relationship between language learning strategies (IV) and language proficiency (DV).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the level of language learning strategies. The result revealed an overall mean score of 3.94 (SD = 0.45), indicating that the level of language learning strategies of the students was high. According to Oxford (1990), university students in Thailand appear to use a high language learning strategy. The conclusion is in line with other studies (Bonyadi et al., 2012) that looked at other contexts to see how frequently EFL students used LLSs (Habok & Magyar, 2018; Kunasaraphan, 2017; and Rardprakhon, 2019). In addition, Thai university students used LLS logically, with affective being the most common, followed by metacognitive, compensation, cognitive, social, and memory strategies. Notably, the current findings corroborate previous findings that students use a variety of strategies to learn English, but to varying degrees (Toomnan, 2019).

Level of Language Learning Strategies

Table 1. *Level of Language Learning Strategies among college students*

Indicators	Mean	SD
Memory Strategy	4.13	0.54
Affective Strategy	3.54	0.76
Metacognitive Strategy	4.36	0.57
Cognitive Strategy	3.82	0.53
Compensation Strategy	3.80	0.64
Social Strategy	3.97	0.61
OVERALL	3.94	0.45

Memory Strategy. This indicator obtained a mean score of 4.13 (SD=0.54), verbally described as high in language learning strategy utilization. This means that the higher the memory strategy, the higher it helps the learner store new information and retrieve it later.

Memorization was also found to be the least utilized strategy among Thai university students. This suggests that rather than storing and recalling new information, the students spent significantly more time controlling and managing their learning. This finding is consistent with widely accepted accounts of Thai students' learning methods. Indeed, previous research has demonstrated that memorization is a learning strategy that Thai students are more likely to employ. For instance, Khamkhien (2011) observed that Thai students focused primarily on the words and phrases they were studying, with little thought given to the texts' overall structure. According to Kunasaraphan (2015), even though Thai university students were less likely to use memory strategies, their teachers frequently encouraged them to memorize and repeat texts to demonstrate comprehension. They also did translation exercises and routinely remembered grammar rules.

On the other hand, the current findings make it abundantly clear that the students should have used specific methods or mnemonic devices to improve their memorization efforts. However, it is commonly believed that Thai students use memorization techniques. However, it could also be that the students needed to be made aware of the specific memory strategies mentioned in the questionnaire. These strategies included using visual or auditory techniques to improve memory, categorizing the lessons and linking them to background knowledge, reviewing the studies in textbooks, reviewing the lessons on electronic devices, and taking notes (Tieocharoen & Rimkeeratikul, 2019).

Affective Strategy. It is presented in Table 1 that affective strategy as one of the indicators obtained a mean score of 3.54 (SD=0.76), which was verbally described as high. This means that the affective strategy was highly used. Affective strategies, often known as self-motivational techniques, help students deal with personality traits that are thought to be to impede their proficiency with the language, such as anxiety, low self-esteem, and negative attitudes. In addition, it aids students in learning, develops emotional stability, and keeps it during learning. In summary, employing affective strategies encourages students to develop their independence and awareness of the best learning methods efficiently, as these methods assist EFL students in controlling their emotions and attitudes toward learning and how to interact with others successfully.

This was supported by (Phonhan, 2016). Due to an underlying self-motivation to learn English, Thai university students may use affective strategies most frequently. Students can monitor their emotional attitudes, behaviors, and motivation with the assistance of affective strategies. Affective strategies, for instance, can be used to control anxieties or to motivate oneself in the face of disappointing test results. In addition, (Khamkhien, 2011) said that language learners might set learning objectives and reward themselves when test scores are satisfactory. It is interesting to note that, compared to other strategies, affective strategies are less frequently utilized in the Thai EFL context. However, this could be due to differences in the learning conditions and contexts students are exposed to while learning the target language or in the learning strategies measured in the various studies (Kunasaraphan, 2015).

Metacognitive Strategy. In Table 1, it is shown that this indicator obtained a mean of 4.36(SD=0.57), which was described as very high. This means that the metacognitive strategy was very highly used. Metacognitive strategies are methods used to help students understand how they learn; in other words, it means processes designed for students to "think" about their "thinking." Students who use metacognitive strategies can positively impact developing an appropriate plan for learning information, which can be memorized and eventually routine. Students will use these

techniques to effectively learn new material as they become more conscious of their learning processes, leading to their development as independent thinkers and language proficiency improvement.

Such a finding was supported by a review by Nampanya (2017). The learner's English studies can be planned, monitored, and evaluated using these strategies, which involve executive processes that regulate and manage learning. In this study, university students used this knowledge to evaluate and modify their comprehensive language practice approach to English learning. According to the participants' responses, some of the most common metacognitive strategies they employed included identifying their errors in English and using that information to improve them, collaborating with friends who are proficient in English, determining how to become better English learners, and considering their progress. These findings are consistent with previous findings (Giang & Tuan, 2018) that students are incredibly self-aware and analytical about improving their English. Flavian (2016) added that high utilization of this procedure permits students to be more independent, increase their self-controlled learning, and recognize their assets and shortcomings. Thus, assuming understudies realize their way of learning and become mindful of metacognitive techniques, they will be bound to shape it as indicated by their learning styles and study propensities.

Cognitive Strategy. As shown in the table below, this indicator obtained a mean score of 3.82 (SD=0.53), verbally described as high. This means that cognitive strategy was indicated as highly used. One form of learning method that students employ to study more effectively is cognitive strategy. These include memorization techniques, including repetition, grouping new vocabulary, summarizing meaning, inferring meaning from context, and using imagery.

It was supported by the claim of Kanchai (2019) university students in Thailand prefer to use electronic tools like electronic dictionaries or automatic translation tools to improve their English language skills and to read and translate English texts into Thai, their native language. Electronic dictionaries are now the primary method and source for learning a language, especially English, which is not used in everyday life or communication in Thailand. Using electronic devices is more hands-on and valuable than using a printed dictionary. In addition (Terry, 2017), using electronic dictionaries may be the quickest way to learn the meanings of unfamiliar words, their parts of speech, and related words. Therefore, it should be clear that Thai EFL university students heavily rely on electronic dictionaries to learn English (Hashim, 2018).

Compensation Strategy. This indicator obtained a mean score of 3.80 (SD=0.64), verbally described as high. Language users employ these techniques to convey a desired meaning when they need the correct linguistic forms that the translation requires. Compensation EFL teachers could implement techniques to aid students in improving their translation skills. According to Oxford (1990), compensation strategies are those that "enable despite not being able to produce or comprehend in the new language, Compensation strategies are designed to make up for a knowledge limitation inadequate knowledge of grammar, especially in the area of vocabulary."

In the study of Rardprakhon (2016), compensation strategies came in at number three. Even if students have a limited vocabulary, these strategies enable them to speak and write English. For instance, they can make up for their lack of vocabulary by using linguistic clues to guess what they mean or by using words based on linguistic clues. Thai EFL university students used such tactics in moderation to make up for the English knowledge they lacked due to a lack of vocabulary. Therefore, high-level compensation

strategies successfully reduce the number of language rules, particularly vocabulary rules (Syafryadin, 2020).

Social Strategy. It is presented in Table 1 that social strategy as one of the indicators obtained a mean score of 3.97 (SD=0.61), which was verbally described as high in the level of language learning strategy utilization. Social connections are a part of the forging strong relationships among group members. This connection promotes participation among the students and increases class conformity. In conclusion, the student has the chance to apply what they have learned to real life and the living language. Success is necessary to achieve to aid each student's attempts at socialization.

This was supported by Zhou & Instraprasert (2019). There are progressions in learning procedure decisions or recurrence of methodology use among understudies in the trial group in help-seeking and peer learning conduct. Similarly, students favoring agreeable and cooperative language learning over being alone in studying the English language utilized more cognitive, metacognitive, and social LLS. In addition, Thai students are expected to make greater use of social strategies or interactions when learning English, particularly in a classroom setting. This unexpected finding may be attributable to classroom teachers, who may need to be more adept at innovative teaching methods, such as encouraging learner-centeredness and class interactions with peers or naturalistic communication opportunities. Oxford (2017) claims these methods could improve language learning, particularly in language classrooms.

Furthermore, Thai students rarely participate in English-speaking events or activities. English is still used sparingly outside of the classroom and in daily interactions. Activities in social strategies assist students in developing solid skills for activities and conducting business with others (Syafryadin, 2020).

Level of Language Proficiency

Table 2. Level of Language Proficiency among College Students

Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
6.392	1.478	1	10

Table 2 shows the level of language proficiency of the students. The result revealed a mean of 6.392 (SD = 1.478), with one as the minimum score and ten as the maximum. The result was supported by Weeks (2022). This indicates that the level of language proficiency of students was at a *moderate level or the students are independent users*, which means students can appreciate the essential concerns of clear standard commitment to recognizable matters, can oversee most conditions obligated to arise while going in a space where the language is spoken, can convey directly related text on topics. In addition, students with a moderate level of language proficiency can portray experiences and events, examine dreams, assumptions, and goals, and quickly give reasons and explanations for sentiments and plans. According to Al-Khairiy (2013), Saudi EFL students typically perform moderately in English as a foreign language (Alrashidi & Phan, 2015). Students' English proficiency remains fair despite the Saudi government's enormous efforts to improve English education (Rajab, 2013).

Correlation Matrix between Language Learning Strategies and the Level of Proficiency

Table 3. Correlation matrix between language learning strategies and the level of proficiency among College Students

Language Strategies	Learning Proficiency	Pearson's r	p-value
		Memory Strategy	0.02
Affective Strategy	-0.153*	0.014	
Metacognitive Strategy	0.134*	0.031	
Cognitive Strategy	-0.06	0.337	
Compensation Strategy	-0.058	0.354	
Social Strategy	-0.039	0.533	
Overall	-0.045	0.471	

Table 3 shows no significant relationship between strategies and proficiency in language learning when analyzed in the current position $r(258) = -0.045$ ($p\text{-value} = 0.471$). However, two indicators of language learning strategies are significantly related to language proficiency: the *metacognitive* and the *affective strategies*.

However, the overall result revealed no significant relationship between language learning strategies and proficiency. Hence, this result fails to reject the null hypothesis. Contradicting most recent and past studies, there is no significant relationship between LLS execution and language proficiency levels. The overall correlation between strategy and proficiency was low and negative, and the p-values obtained were also relatively low (Rardprakhon, 2016; Phonhan, 2016). This was supported by the study's findings in University Malaysia Sabah's Table 4 displays the correlation coefficient between the entire language learning method and language proficiency. With a high p-value, the association appeared to be unimportant. There is insufficient evidence to conclude that language proficiency and the overall method of learning a language are related (Kiram et al., 2014).

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, this academic inquiry has revealed that the overall level of language learning strategies is high but an average or moderate level of language proficiency. This level is proper to some indicators: metacognitive and affective strategies. On the other hand, the overall result failed to reject the null hypothesis, which means there was no significant relationship between strategies and proficiency in language learning in the new normal.

Language teachers may find the study's conclusions beneficial for encouraging pupils to recognize the significance of different approaches in both situations for direct and indirect learning. They can also be improved upon—instructions for academic scholars who wish to offer techniques for additional research in teaching and learning second languages. Further survey studies using other learning approach taxonomy from earlier studies could be utilized to create a learning strategies questionnaire suitable for the sample situation. This could also be studied using different samples from educational levels, such as high school, college, or graduate students who majored in English instead of science, business, or other disciplines to provide a greater understanding of diversity and other research projects. It is anticipated that the findings of this study will make

some contributions, particularly to the educational setting, given the knowledge that the students had their own beliefs about language learning and utilized their learning strategies, both of which had a positive but weak correlation with the students' English academic achievement. In order to better encourage students to think positively and assist them in approaching and finding solutions to their internal problems related to the negative beliefs in learning a foreign language, such as English teachers, who play a significant role at school, and parents, who play a crucial role at home, need to provide a supportive atmosphere for specific purposes of English language learning. The study suggests important implications for classroom instruction and learning content design. Students, especially those with low proficiency levels, can be assisted to improve their competence in English through strategy instruction.

REFERENCES

Alhawsawi, S. (2013). Investigating student experiences of learning English as a foreign language in a preparatory programme in a Saudi university. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Sussex, Brighton, UK.

Alhaysony, M. (2017). *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 18-28, January 2017 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0701.03>

Ali, A., Ghani, M., Malik, F., Ahmad, A., (2016). *The Use of Language Learning Strategies by Pakistani M.A. English Students in Literature/Linguistics*.
http://www.qurtuba.edu.pk/thedialogue/The%20Dialogue/11_3/Dialogue_July_September2016_324-333.pdf

Alrashidi, O., & Phan, H. (2015). Education Context and English Teaching and Learning in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: An Overview. *English Language Teaching*, 8, 33-44. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n5p33>

Al-Johani, H. M. (2009). Finding a way forward the impact of teacher's strategies, beliefs and knowledge on teaching English as a foreign language in Saudi Arabia. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland, UK

Chamot A. U. (2004). *Issues in language learning strategy research and teaching*. *Electron. J. Foreign Lang. Technol.* 1 14–26.

Charoento, M. (2016). *Individual learner differences and language learning strategies*. *Contemp. Educ. Res. J.* 7, 57–72 Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 261–297.

Charoento, M. (2017). *Individual Learner Differences and Language Learning Strategies*. *Contemporary Educational Researches Journal*, 7(2), 57–72.

Cohen, A. D. (2011). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Routledge.

Creswell JW. (2012). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. 5th Sage Publication, 1-39.

Magnal, Arpa, Oda, Abule

Cross, J., & Vandergrift, L. (2018). *Metacognitive listening strategies*. The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching, Wiley. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0589>

Dawadi, S. (2017). *Language learning strategies profiles of EFL learners in Nepal*. Eur. J. Educ. Soc. Sci. 2, 42–55.

Flavian, H. (2016). *Towards teaching and beyond: Strengthening education by understanding students' self-awareness development*. Power & Education, 8(1) <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1757743815624118>.

Giang, B. (2018). *Language learning strategies of Vietnamese EFL freshmen*. Arab World English Journal, 9(3), 61-83.

Gogokhia, R. (2020). *Memory types in foreign language learning*. West-East, 3(1), 71-77. Available at <https://doi.org/10.33739/2587-5434-2020-3-1-71-7788-100>

Goh, C. and Foong, K. P. (1997). Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics 2 (1), 39-53

Habok, A., & Magyar, A. (2018). *The Effect of Language Learning Strategies on Proficiency, Attitudes, and School Achievement*. Frontiers in Psychology, 8, Article No. 2358. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02358. Retrieved from <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02358/full>

Hamouda, A. (2013). An exploration of causes of Saudi students' reluctance to participate in the English language classroom. International Journal of English Language Education, 1(1), 17-34. Nemat, A. (2009). *Memory Vocabulary Learning Strategies and Long-Term Retention*. International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education, 1, 14-24.

https://academicjournals.org/article/article1379328836_Nemati.pdf

<https://doi.org/10.4314/marang.v20i1.56821>

Khan, I. (2011). Learning difficulties in English: Diagnosis and pedagogy in Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House

Oxford, R. (2017). *Teaching and Researching Language Learning Strategies: Self-Regulation in Context* (2nd edition). Routledge

Oz, H. (2005). *Metacognition in foreign/second language learning and teaching*. H. U. Journal of Education, 29, 147-156. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/87735>

Peñuela, D. C. (2018). *Using metacognitive strategies to raise awareness of stress and intonation in EFL*. Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 20(1) 91-104. <https://doi.org/10.14483/22487085.12383>

Pilipović, V., & Tatjana Glušac. (2016). *Age-related decline in the use of affective learning*

strategies. British and American Studies (BAS),22, 233-242.
https://litere.uvt.ro/publicatii/BAS/pdf/no/bas_2016_articles/233-242-age-related-decline-in-the-use-of-affective-learning-strategies-Content%20File-PDF.pdf

Phonhan, P. (2016). *Language learning strategies of EFL education students: A case study of Thai undergraduate students*. Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts, 16(2), 115-135.

Rajab, H. (2013). Developing speaking and writing skills of L1 Arabic EFL learners through teaching of IPA phonetic codes. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3, 653-659. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/tpsls.3.4.653-659>

Rao, Z. (2016). *Language learning strategies and English proficiency: interpretations from information-processing theory*. *Lang. Learn. J.* 44, 90–106. Retrieved from: doi: 10.1080/09571736.2012.733886

Raofi, S., Chan, S. H., Mukundan, J., & Md Rashid, S. (2014). *Metacognition and Second/foreign language learning*. *English Language Teaching*, 7(1), 36-49. Available at <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n1p36>

Sandoval Zúñiga, M. G., Gómez Álvarez, L., & Sáez Carrillo, K. (2010). *Estrategias metacognitivas en la comprensión auditiva del inglés como segunda lengua [Metacognitive strategies for listening comprehension in English as a second language]*. *Lenguas Modernas*, 1(36), 25-44. Retrieved from <https://revistas.uchile.cl/index.php/LM/article/view/30679/32435>

Syafryadin, S. F Martina, Salniwati, S, (2020). *Compensation strategies in speaking activities for non-English department students: poor and competent speakers - JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*

Shawer S. F. (2016). *Four language skills performance, academic achievement, and learning strategy use in pre-service teacher training programs*. *TESOL J.* 7 262–303. 10.1002/tesj.202

Sarala A/P Subramanyam. (2012). *English Language Teaching*. The Malaysia International Conference on English Language Teaching MICELT 2012 (pp. 110–114). UPM, Serdang, Malaysia: Department of Language & Humanities Education.

Thomas, N., & Rose, H. (2019). *Do language learning strategies need to be self-directed? Disentangling strategies from self-regulated learning*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(1), 248-257

Viriya & Sapsirin (2014). *Gender differences in language learning style and language learning strategies*. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 3(2) Retrieved from: DOI:10.17509/ijal.v3i2.270

Waluyo, B. (2019). *Examining Thai first-year university students' English proficiency on CEFR Levels*. *The New English Teacher*, 13(2), 51-71.

Magnal, Arpa, Oda, Abule

Wischgoll, A. (2016) *Combined training of one cognitive and one metacognitive Strategy Improves academic writing skills*. *Frontiers in Psychology*. Available at: <https://doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00187>

Yamane, T. (1973). *Statistics: an introductory analysis*. 3rd edition. New York, USA: Harper and Row.

Yustitiasari, H., Junining, E., & Sahiruddin, S. (2020). *The relationship between Language Learning Strategies used by vocational students and level of proficiency*. *eJournal of Linguistics*, 14(1), 128-136. Available at <https://doi.org/10.24843/e-jl.2020.v14.i01.p013>