

THE EFFECT OF LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES TRAINING TOWARD STUDENTS' READING ACHIEVEMENT OF SMA NEGERI 8 BULUKUMBA

Mutmainnah Marzuki

Graduate Student of State University of Makassar
English Education Department

innamuthe88@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The objectives of the research were to find out (1) the language learning strategies are dominantly used by the students, (2) the significant difference of the students' reading improvement between the students who were given language learning strategies training and who were not given language learning strategies training, and (3) whether or not there is any effect of dominant language learning strategies used by the students toward their reading achievement. The results of this research showed that (1) the social strategies were marked as the highest usage or the dominant strategies used by the students and followed by metacognitive strategies, (2) there was significant difference of the students' reading improvement between the students who were given the language learning strategies training and who were not given the language learning strategies training, and (3) there was not an effect of dominant of language learning strategies training (metacognitive and social strategies) simultaneously toward the students' reading achievement. Meanwhile, in detail analysis or partial analysis showed that only social strategies had an effect toward the students' reading achievement, but for metacognitive strategies had not an effect toward the students' reading achievement.

Keyword: *Language Learning Strategies, Reading, Students' Achievement*

INTRODUCTION

Reading is the one of important skills that is developed by everyone. Many scientific books written in English makes people have to be able to read. In addition, reading is a way of getting information either from text or from mass media. Besides that, reading is an activity to improve the students thinking ability. They have to read the compulsory books or other materials related to the lesson. Therefore, reading is considered as the one of important skills.

When dealing with a reading lesson, students often get the lack of reading strategies which are essential for them to solve the problems in the classroom. Many students can read English, but they can catch the whole point of the passage (Taylor, 1998). Misunderstanding and misinterpreting the text is hoped to be avoided.

Besides improving students' reading achievement, the better understanding of language learning strategies can help students become more independent language learners. Therefore, it is very important for the teacher to introduce and give training of language learning strategies for the students, especially the strategies that are related to reading skill.

Considering the better understanding of language learning strategies, the students can find the effective way in learning English and also help them to increase their English ability, especially reading skill. Research into reading has found that effective readers are aware of the strategies they use and that they use strategies flexibly and efficiently (Brown, 1990). Researchers believed that these strategies could be taught to ineffective language learners so that they can become more successful in language learning. As Oxford (1990:1) states that language learning strategies "... are especially important for language learning because they are tools for active, self-directed movement, which is essential for developing communicative competence." Therefore, teachers should consider teaching students effective reading strategies, especially showing them how to use the skills and knowledge from their first language in order to cope with reading in the foreign language.

Students are helped to understand good language learning strategies and also training them to develop and to use such good language learning strategies that can be considered to be the appropriated characteristics of a good language teacher.

Those problems can influence the students' achievement in learning reading. To anticipate this, the teacher should use strategies in teaching reading. For example, the teachers facilitate the students with the activities that related to language learning strategies, particularly the strategies in reading and also these strategies can help students to figure out the meaning of word, comprehend the reading text, acquire vocabulary, and understand the structure of text.

Furthermore, Oxford (1990: 17) categorized learning strategies into six groups and covered four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). Nevertheless, results of several studies, particularly in Indonesian context indicate that the students at senior secondary level dominantly used metacognitive and social strategies in learning English, such as studies were conducted by Weda (2005) and Hamsinah (2014).

Language Learning Strategies

The Definition of Language Learning Strategies

According to Richards et al. in Jihad (2013:32) learning strategy is the way in which learners attempt to work out the meanings and uses of words, grammatical rules, and other aspects of the language they are learning. Oxford (1990) puts forward that learning strategies are one specific action taken by the learners to make learning more enjoyable, faster, easier, more self directed, more effective, and more translatable to new situation.

In other way, Rubin in O'Malley & Chamot (1990:3) learning strategies as strategies which contribute to the development of the language system which the learners construct and affect learning directly.

Types of Learning Strategies

Oxford (1990) classified learning strategies into two major language learning strategies (LLS) categories, the Direct and Indirect Strategies. The strategies used directly in dealing with a new language are called direct strategies. The three groups that belong to the direct strategies are memory, cognitive and compensation. The indirect strategies are used for general management of learning. The three groups belonging to its category are metacognitive, affective and social strategies.

Direct Strategies

Direct strategies are those behaviors that directly involve the use of the target language, which directly facilitates language learning. Direct strategies are divided into three subcategories: Memory, Cognitive and Compensation Strategies (Oxford: 1990).

1. Memory strategy

Memory is used by students to reinforce their memory and to keep their memory in a long period. For example, grouping, imagery, sound, movement, structured reviewing.

2. Cognitive strategy

Cognitive is a strategy involves the learner self-ability to process the language that they have learnt in their mind, analyze, and transform the language by using their rhetoric. So the language is the input and the analysis is the process and the output is the result of the thinking process. For example, practicing, receiving and sending messages, analyzing and reasoning, and creating structure for input and output.

3. Compensation strategy

Compensation allows the learners to use a language in accordance with their own comprehension. Although they have limitation in knowledge, they can use the most appropriate language if they don't know the vocabulary in the simple language but understandable. For example, guessing intelligently, and overcoming limitations in speaking and writing.

Indirect Strategies

The second group of strategies, that is indirect strategies, consists of three subcategories as well: Metacognitive, Affective, and Social Strategies.

1. Metacognitive strategy

Metacognitive strategies are steps that learners take to manage or regulate their learning. It allows learners to identify, organize, arrange, monitor, and evaluate the result of the learning process.

2. Affective strategy

A strategy which is expected to change the learner emotions, attitudes, and motivations to the language learning to better and positive condition in order they can control their feeling and reduce negative feeling. For example, asking questions, cooperating with others, and empathizing with others.

3. Social strategy

The nature of the language strategy is to make the learners communicate well and have good relationship with other people and environments. It deals with cooperating and empathizing with other and how to use a good language.

Based on the classification system described above, Oxford (1989) developed and inventory called the *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning* (SILL). Thus, this research used Oxfords' theory about language learning strategies to investigate students learning strategies.

Reading

Definition of Reading

People do their activity by reading because there is a curiosity about information in the text. Hence, the researcher describes the definition of reading from some experts.

Hornby (2000:1097) defines reading as an activity of person who reads. The activity includes reading books, articles, magazines, or newspaper that are intended to obtain information.

According to Urquhart and Weir cited in Grabe (2009:14) reading is “the process of receiving and interpreting information encoded in language form via the medium of print”. It means that reader obtain information through written language then understand information based on their knowledge.

Reading Comprehension

Cooper cited in Muchtar (2008:12) defines comprehension in reading as the process of constructing meaning by taking the suitable ideas from the text and relating them to the idea that readers already have. He adds that to comprehend the written word the reader must be able to:

1. Understand how an author has organized the ideas and information presented in the text.
2. Relate information from text to his or her mind.

Factor Influencing Reading

In order to learn how to read more effectively, it is essential to know not only what reading is, but also the factors that influence reading. Scarcella and Oxford cited in Ling (2011), propose four dimensions of competence that effect reading, namely; grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence. Grammatical competence refers to the readers’ grammar knowledge which has an impact on getting meaning. Discourse competence refers to the knowledge of acceptable patterns in written and spoken language which can help interpret the text. Sociolinguistic competence refers to the readers’ ability to use language appropriately in various social contexts. And the strategic competence refers to the readers’ ability to use a variety of language strategies while reading.

The Goal of Reading

According to Nababan (1993:164), the goal of reading is to understand or to comprehend the content or the message of the reading text efficiently. Different from what is stated by Nababan, Harmer (1991:20) stated that people read something because of three reasons:

- 1) Interest, that including reading for enjoyment, pleasure
- 2) Intellectual stimulation
- 3) Usefulness. Reading something (books, newspaper, etc) because we want or need to know a certain thing useful example: How is economic today.

Related to the goal of reading, Said (1982:14) puts forward the specific aim of reading as follows:

- 1) The reader is able to comprehend the words she is reading about.
- 2) The reader is able to find out the main idea from the general ideas excited is a passage.

- 3) The reader is able to find out the details: the relationship between sentence to sentence and paragraph to paragraph.
- 4) The reader is able to comprehend the content of passage, both the concrete and the abstract one.

Good Reader

Good reader is selectively attentive when their reading. They sometimes make notes, predict, paraphrase, and back up when confused. They try to make inferences to fill in the gaps in text and in their understanding of what they have read. Good readers intentionally attempt to integrate across the text. They do not settle for literal meanings but rather interpret what they have read, sometimes constructing images, and other times identifying categories of information in text, and on still other occasions engaging in arguments with themselves about what a reading might mean. After making their way through text, they have a variety of ways of firming up their understanding and memory of the messages in the text, from explicitly attempting to summarize to self-questioning about the text to rereading and reflecting.

METHODOLOGY

The researcher applied quasi-experimental design which involves two groups; an experimental and control group. The population of this research was the third grade students of SMA Negeri 8 Bulukumba, namely IPA 1, IPA2, IPA 3, IPS 1, IPS 2 and IPS 3. The total number of the population was 190 students. The sample was taken by using cluster random sampling technique. Therefore, the sample consisted of two classes that were IPA 1 for control group and IPA 2 for experimental group. The data of this research were collected through questionnaire and reading text. The data were analyzed by using descriptive and inferential statistics through SPSS program version 20.

FINDINGS

1. The Students' Language Learning Strategies that are Dominantly Used

As it was mentioned by Oxford (1990) classifies the six language learning strategies (LLSs), namely memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. First, memory strategies are techniques which entail the mental processes for storing new information in the memory and for retrieving them when needed. Second, cognitive strategies entail conscious ways of handling the target language, for example, through reasoning or this category relies heavily on the involvement of human brain. Third, compensation strategies enable the students to use new language for either comprehension or production despite limitations in knowledge. Fourth, metacognitive strategies are essential for successful language learning. These strategies enable the students to control their own cognition. Fifth, affective strategies are strategies that help the students gain control over their emotions, attitudes, and motivations related to language learning. The last, social strategies are actions/strategies that facilitate language learning through interactions with others.

The result of questionnaire reveals that the language learning strategies used by the students at SMAN 8 Bulukumba, as measured by SILL questionnaire, ranges from high (3.73) to medium (2.74), with social strategies employed more dominant than the other strategies categories. Then, it followed by metacognitive strategies (3.57). Social strategies

facilitate the language learning through interactions with others. These strategies cover three sets of strategies, they are asking questions, cooperating with others and empathizing with others. Meanwhile, compensation strategies which ranked the lowest (2.74) involve filling any gaps in the knowledge of language through guessing, using gestures, repeating and taking notes.

Beside that, the order of use of language learning strategies employed by the third grade of students at SMAN 8 Bulukumba in learning English from most frequent to the least frequent is: 1) Social strategies, 2) Metacognitive strategies, 3) Cognitive strategies, 4) Affective strategies, 5) Memory strategies, and 6) Compensation strategies.

The purpose of distributing the post-questionnaire is comparing the result of pre-questionnaire and it is shown that the result has the same frequently or dominantly learning strategies used by the students.

Beside that, the order of use of language learning strategies employed by the third grade of students at SMAN 8 Bulukumba in learning English from most frequent to the least frequent is: 1) Social strategies, 2) Metacognitive strategies, 3) Affective strategies, 4) Memory strategies, 5) Cognitive strategies, and 6) Compensation strategies.

Furthermore, the result of this research reveals that the social and metacognitive strategies are the dominant/frequent strategies that were used by the students. Then, compensation strategies are the least frequent strategies that were used by the students. This result is congruent with the general results of previous related finding of the language learning studies, especially in Indonesian context which was conducted by Weda (2005) who found that social strategies marked the highest usage or the most frequently used strategies followed by metacognitive strategies, and compensation strategies was the least frequent. Beside that, the research results were found by Shmais (2003) and Abbasian et al. (2012) which indicated that metacognitive strategies were the most frequently strategies used, meanwhile compensation and affective strategies were the least frequently strategies used.

Furthermore, the result of this current research is inconsistent with the research results were found by Zare (2010), Yilmaz (2010), Min (2012) and Fatemeh Zarei (2013). These results showed that compensation strategies were mostly frequently strategies used. Meanwhile, the least frequently strategies used were affective and social strategies. Therefore, it can be concluded that these results showed the contradictive results with this current research.

The distinction of this research and the previous related research findings is the respondents and learning context. In this research, the respondent of this research was senior secondary school students, while the previous studies are mostly tertiary level students.

2. The Students' Improvement in Reading Comprehension

The data that presented in the findings were collected and analyzed with SPSS 20. The data obtained from the pretest and posttest given to the experimental and control group, as well as the subsequent the mean score and standard deviation. Prior to conducting the treatments, an independent sample t-test analysis was used to determine if there was significant difference of the students' reading comprehension that are gave metacognitive and social strategies treatments and the students' reading comprehension that are not gave metacognitive and social strategies treatments or taught by using conventional method. Based on the previous section of the findings, it shows that metacognitive and social

strategies in teaching reading comprehension significantly improve the students' reading achievement. It was proved by the result of the students' score of pretest and posttest for each group. In this case, the mean score and standard deviation were analyzed.

Comparing the students' pretest and posttest, the differences between the two groups can be seen from the mean score of pretest and posttest. Gay et al (2006:124) state that the difference between close score is essentially the same to the students means score between experimental and control group is relatively the same when the variables have equal interval. Furthermore, in the experimental group, the mean score of the students' pretest was 56.02 and posttest was 85.17. Meanwhile, in control group, the students' pretest was 55.42 and posttest was 67.50. It means that the students' posttest score for both groups are statistically different. However, after the treatments, there was a significant difference. The posttest result of experimental was higher than control group, where the result is $85.17 > 67.5$. In this case, both of groups improved their achievement after giving the treatments. Therefore, the improvement of experimental group was higher than control group. It means that metacognitive and social strategies treatments significantly improve the students' reading comprehension.

Besides, the comparison of the students' improvement of reading achievement for experimental and control group can be proved by analyzing the posttest result. The result reveals that the mean score of the students' posttest both of the groups increased after giving the treatments. The score between pretest and posttest of experimental group was 63.67 and 85.17. In fact, the students' reading achievement increased about 21.5 from pretest to posttest. Therefore, it indicates that there is a significant progress before and after giving the treatments by using metacognitive and social strategies treatments. Meanwhile, the pretest and posttest score of control group was 55.42 and 67.5. It reveals that the students' reading achievement increased about 12.08. Furthermore, it could be stated that the score of the two groups got progress, but the improvement or progress of experimental group was higher than control group.

By seeing the result of the students' pretest, the researcher assumed that the prior knowledge of the students seemed lack, because the students did not have any knowledge about the test or they are not given the treatment yet by applying metacognitive and social strategies. According to Padly (2013: 78), there are some problems in reading activities, such as the students cannot identify the purpose of the text, some students are difficult in understanding the familiar English vocabulary that used in the text, some students are difficult to get the meaning in explicit information, and some students have low motivation in learning reading.

In line with Weda (2005:127), the improvement of the students' score in posttest was not all from the effect of treatment. There were also factors or components affected the students' English proficiency i.e., the teachers' competence, classroom interaction, the use of Indonesian and English as a medium of instruction in the classroom, the teaching media/aids, and the teaching materials. Therefore, pretest was given to find out prior knowledge of the students, so the researcher should treat the students by applying metacognitive and social strategies as one of facilitating methods to overcome the students' problem in studying reading comprehension.

After calculating the result of data analysis for t-test, the result revealed that the p-value was lower than $\alpha = 0.05$ (or $0.000 < 0.05$), where the p-value (0.000) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom 58. It indicated that the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected. It revealed that metacognitive

and social strategies significantly affect the students' reading achievement. Therefore, it can be concluded that metacognitive and social strategies were able to give greater contribution in teaching and learning process, especially in teaching reading. The significant improvement can be described from the pretest and posttest data as final result of this research.

1. The Effect of Dominant Language Learning Strategies (Metacognitive and Social Strategies) toward the Students' Reading Achievement

This subsection deals with the analysis of the effect of dominant language learning strategies toward the students' reading achievement. To know whether the dominant language learning strategies (metacognitive and social strategies) have an effect toward the students' reading achievement, the researcher used SPSS 20 version for windows which applied *linear regression* analysis. This analysis includes partial and simultaneous analysis. Partial analysis involved the analysis of the effect of the dominant language learning strategies separately toward the students' reading achievement. Meanwhile, simultaneous analysis involved the analysis of the effect of the dominant language learning strategies simultaneously toward the students' reading achievement.

After analyzing the effect of each strategy toward students' reading achievement by linear regression test, anova analysis, the results showed that metacognitive strategies revealed the value was -0.03 and the significant was 0.98. Besides that, F_{count} (0.001) was lower than F_{table} (3.37) and p value (0.98) was greater than α (0.05). This result indicated that there was no an effect of metacognitive strategies toward the students' reading achievement of SMA Negeri 8 Bulukumba. This result also revealed that in testing hypothesis, the null hypothesis (H_0) was accepted. Meanwhile, anova analysis of social strategies revealed that value was 2.18 and significant was 0.038 and F_{count} (4.74) was greater than F_{table} (3.37). This result revealed that p-value (0.038) was smaller than α (0.05). This result indicated that there was an effect between social and students reading achievement of SMA Negeri 8 Bulukumba. This result also revealed that in testing hypothesis, the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected.

In addition, the researcher also calculated the analysis both strategies toward the students' reading achieve. Anova analysis of both strategies revealed that there was no an effect between both strategies toward the students' reading achievement. It was proven by the result of F_{count} (2.28) was lower than F_{table} (3.37) and p value (0.12) was greater than α (0.05). It indicated that alternative hypothesis (H_1) was rejected. It means that there is not an effect of dominant language learning strategies training toward the students' reading achievement.

Referring to these results, the researcher concluded that there was not an effect of dominant language learning strategies (metacognitive and social strategies) simultaneously toward the students' reading achievement. Meanwhile, in detail analysis or partial analysis showed that only social strategies had an effect toward the students' reading achievement, but for metacognitive strategies had not an effect toward the students' reading achievement.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the research findings and discussion in the previous chapter, this research then comes up with the following conclusions:

1. The results of this research showed that the students at SMA 8 Bulukumba were high to medium users of strategies. Furthermore, social strategies were marked as the highest or the dominant language learning strategies used by the students and it was followed by metacognitive strategies.
2. There was significant difference of the students' reading improvement between the students who were given the language learning strategies training and who were not given the language learning strategies training. It was proved by the students' mean score of posttest was 85.17 for experimental group, while in control group was 67.50. It means that the mean score of experimental group in posttest was higher than the mean score of control group ($85.17 > 67.50$). Besides that, P-value (*Sig.*) in reading comprehension was smaller than alpha ($0.000 < 0.05$). In other words, H_1 was accepted and H_0 was rejected.
3. There was not an effect of dominant language learning strategies training (metacognitive and social strategies) simultaneously toward the students' reading achievement. Meanwhile, in detail analysis or partial analysis showed that only social strategies had an effect toward the students' reading achievement, but for metacognitive strategies had not an effect toward the students' reading achievement.

SUGGESTION

In regarding to improve of the teaching reading by language learning strategies in order to improve the teaching English to the students in school, the researcher would like to give suggestion as follows:

1. One of the methods in teaching English especially reading text that can be recommended to all of the English teachers; especially in SMA Negeri 8 Bulukumba is implementing language learning strategies as these strategies can attract the students to learn reading.
2. In applying language learning strategies in teaching learning process, the teacher should focus on the ways to communicate and to motivate the students to learn English whether consciously or unconsciously and implement all of its components in order these strategies can be more effective in its implementation.
3. Since the findings of this research reveal that metacognitive and social strategies were dominant language learning strategies used by the students, it is suggested to the students to use the wide variety of language learning strategies, particularly in learning reading. Therefore, they are expected to achieve the better improvement of reading achievement and reading comprehension.
4. Regarding to the results of the effect of language learning strategies training toward the students' reading achievement. It is suggested to the further researchers who are interested to conduct the same related of this research are recommended to conduct more comprehensive investigation on wide range of the factors or variables affecting language learning strategies used by EFL students toward their reading achievement.
5. For the next further researchers, it is suggested that they need to provide the better understanding of the interconnection between the language learning strategies training and the reading achievement. Beside that, they need to conduct the comprehensive test which will find the accuracy of the results of their interconnection.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbasian, R., et al. 2012. Language Learning Strategies of Iranian EFL Learners: Are Gender and Educational Level Important. *Journal of SAVAP International*, Vol. 3, No.2, 350-356.
- Brown. 1990. Strategies for Developing Reading Skills. Retrieved October 20, 2014. <http://www.nclrc.org/essentials/reading/stratread.htm>
- Fatemeh Zarei. 2013. Exploring Gender Effects on Language Learning Strategies. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, Vol. 4 (3), 757-767. Available online at www.irjabs.com.
- Gay. R. L, Mills. E. G, & Airasian. P. 2006. Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications (Eighth Edition). *New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall*.
- Grabe, W. 2005. Reading in a Second Language: Moving from Theory to Practice. *United States of America (USA): Cambridge University Press*.
- Hamsinah. 2014. The Relationship and Differences in Gender between Language Learning Strategies and Students English Achievement in Senior Secondary School in Gowa. Makassar: Unpublished thesis PPs UNM.
- Harmer, J. 1991. The practice of English Language Teaching. *London: Longman*.
- Hornby, A.S. 2000. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (6th Edition). *Oxford: Oxford University Press*.
- Jihad Suryani. 2013. The Language Strategies in Learning Speaking English of the Midwifery at Universitas Indonesia Timur. *Thesis, Makassar; PPS UNM*.
- Ling. S. 2011. Investigating Chinese English Majors' Use of Reading Strategies: A Study on the Relationship between Reading Strategies and Reading Achievement. *School of Teacher Education. Kristianstad University. Publish Journal. EN 2460 (Pp 1-41)*.
- Min, L. 2012. Gender and Language Learning Strategy Use – in the Case of Chinese High School Students. *Journal of Studies in Literature and Language, CSCanada*, Vol. 5, No. 3, 2012, 90-94.
- Muchtar, N. 2008. The Correlation between Reading Attitude and Comprehension of 2nd Semester Students of English Department at State University of Makassar.
- Nababan, P.W.J. 1983. Communicative Language Teaching Communicative Approach: Question Arising From Materials Writing In a Tefl Situation. *Singapore: Singapore University*.
- O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U. 1990. Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition. *USA: Cambridge University Press*.
- Oxford. R. L. 1989. Strategies Inventory of Language Learning (SILL). Version for Speakers of Other Languages Learning English Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL).

- Oxford, R. 1990. *Language Learning Strategies*. New York. Newbury House Publisher.
- Oxford, R.L. 1990a. Language learning Strategies and Beyond: A Look at Strategies in the Context of Styles. In S.S. Magnan (Ed.). *Shifting the Instructional Focus to the Learner (Pp. 35-55)*. Middlebury, VT: *Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages*.
- Oxford. R. L. 1990b. *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Boston: *Heinle & Heinle*.
- Oxford. R. L. 2003. Language Learning Styles and Strategies: An Overview. *Learning Styles & Strategies: Oxford, GALA*. (Pp 1-25).
- Padly, 2013. The Efficacy of workshop model in teaching reading comprehension. Unpublished thesis graduated program. *Makassar: state University of Makassar*.
- Shang, H-F. 2011. Exploring the Relationship between EFL Proficiency Level and Reading Strategies Use. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 1/3, (Pp. 18-26).
- Shmais, W. A. 2003. Language Learning Strategy Use in Palestine. *TESL-EJ*, Vol. 7, No. 2. (Online, accessed on August 28, 2013. Retrieved from www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume7/ej26/ej26a3).
- Taylor, B. 1998. *Reading Difficulties: instruction and assessment*. New York. *Random House, Inc*.
- Weda. S. 2007. *English Learning Strategies*. Lembaga Pusat Pengembangan Masyarakat Marginal (LPPMM).
- Yilmaz, C. 2010. The Relationship between Language Learning Strategies, Gender, Proficiency and Self-Efficacy Beliefs: A Study of ELT Learners in Turkey. *Journal of Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2 (2010), 682-687. Available online at www.sciencedirect.com.
- Zare, P. 2010. An Investigation into Language Learning Strategy Use and Gender among Iranian Undergraduate Language Learners. *Journal of World applied Sciences Journal*, 11 (10), 1238-1247.