A Comparative Study of Language Learning Strategies Used by Monolingual and Bilingual Learners

Ahmet Yayla
Assist. Prof. Dr, Yüzüncü Yıl University, Faculty of Education, Van-Turkey
Ishak Kozikoglu
Research Assist. Dr, Yüzüncü Yıl University, Faculty of Education, Van-Turkey
Sehnaz Nigar Celik
Instructor, Yüzüncü Yıl University, Faculty of Education, Van-Turkey

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to analyze monolingual and bilingual university students' language learning strategies (LLS) comparatively and to determine whether students' level of using language learning strategies in foreign language learning process changes in terms of variables such as gender, department and school type. This research was conducted among 524 university students at Yüzüncü Yıl University and Bülent Ecevit University Çaycuma Vocational School. Data of the study was collected by "Strategy Inventory of Language Learning" developed by Oxford (1990) and adapted into Turkish by Cesur and Fer (2007). Data collected was analyzed with descriptive statistics and parametric tests. As a result of the research, it was found that bilingual students use language learning strategies in foreign language learning process more than monolingual students. Furthermore, it was found that university students use language learning strategies at middle level; students mostly use metacognitive strategies and use affective strategies the least; female students use language learning strategies more than male students except cognitive and affective strategies; English language and literature and English language teaching department students use language learning strategies more than department of translation students; 4 years faculty students use language learning strategies more than vocational school students.

Keywords: Language learning strategies, bilingualism, university students

Introduction

As in all developing countries, foreign language learning and teaching in our country has gained importance with **g**lobalization, advances in technology and the increase in international interactions. Although teaching English as a foreign language in our country has a history of nearly half a century; it can be said to fail in achieving the desired success considering spent time, money and effort in foreign language teaching. While there are many reasons of the failure in effectively teaching English in our country such as physical and technical facilities, teacher competences, learning environments, work conditions etc.; methods, techniques and strategies used in foreign language learning and teaching are of great importance. In our country, learner-centered approaches in which the learner is active in language learning are emphasized rather than teacher-centered approaches in foreign language teaching of recent years. As the responsibility to learn is uploaded to the student in an environment having learner-centered approach, thoughts or behaviors of the students in learning process and how they learn have importance. This brings us to the concept of "learning strategies".

Learning Strategies

Learning strategies are defined in different ways by different researchers. Mayer and Weinstein (1983) defined learning strategies as thoughts and behaviors affecting the coding process of the learner; Oxford (1990) defined as strategies applied by learners to facilitate, speed up, organize learning, to make it more effective and transfer it to the new situations; O'Malley and Chamot (1990) defined as specific thoughts or behaviors that are used to help the individual in understanding, learning and keeping the knowledge in mind; Chamot (2004) defined as conscious thoughts and actions used to perform any learning goals; Senemoğlu (2013) defined as strategies including the inner-cognitive and meta-cognitive processes of the individual and used by learners to provide and direct their own learning. As can be seen from these definitions, in the narrowest sense, learning strategies can be defined as thoughts, behaviors and tools used by learners for interpreting, organizing and directing their own learning.

Strategy is not a single action, is a series of creative actions used actively by the learners (Gülleroğlu and Özmen, 2013). Learning strategies not only contribute to the individual be effective when using or learning a language, but also contribute to an individual's self-directed learning (Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006). Strategic learners know what a task requires, have also capabilities to organize strategies that fit themselves and their learning capacities best (Chamot, 2004). Thus, it can be said that the individuals who use learning strategies in the learning process effectively have the skills to manage, regulate and control their own learning. Strategic learners use a

variety of strategies in foreign language learning as is the case in many learning situations.

Language Learning Strategies

It is presumed that there are certain social and cognitive variables that have an impact on language learning. Researchers have been seeking the variables that influence foreign language learning, stressing that learning strategies are another variable that create an impact on language learning. Researchers state that successful students are using a variety of strategies for learning languages and these strategies provide them to take more responsibility in the learning process (Tuncer, 2009).

As in learning strategies, different researchers defined language learning strategies in different ways. Rubin (1981) defined language learning strategies as the strategies that directly and indirectly affect the learning process; Oxford (1990) defined as the steps used to facilitate the usage, calling back, storage and acquisition of the knowledge; Scarcella and Oxford (1992) defined as certain techniques, behavior and actions used by the students to achieve their own learning; Oxford (1996) defined as means used for self-directed active participation that is necessary for improving communication skills; Griffiths (2003) defined as specific actions that are deliberately used by the learner for learning languages; Kashefian-Naeeini, Maarof and Salehi (2011) defined as deliberate thoughts that will accelerate the learning process; Gülleroğlu and Özmen (2013) defined as a factor that helps to determine how and how well the student learned a second language. With reference to these definitions, language learning strategies can be defined as deliberate thoughts, behaviors and means used in order to facilitate the individual's learning in the process of foreign language learning.

Effective use of language learning strategies in language learning process provides more performance and increases learner autonomy (Kashefian-Naeeini, Maarof, & Salehi, 2011). Language learning strategies are directly or indirectly associated with self-direction to a great extent and Oxford (1990) says that they contribute to autonomous learning (Kafipour & Naveh, 2011). Language learners are required to explore, test, evaluate different learning strategies and eventually choose effective strategies for themselves (Chamot, 2004).

One of the challenges to study language learning strategies is that only some of them can be directly observed, in most of them meaning is extracted from behaviors (Griffiths, 2003). One of the most common ways to assess the language learning strategies is the usage of data collection tools such as survey, inventory and scales. Different researchers (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Stern, 1992) classified language learning strategies in different ways. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) classified language learning

strategies as meta-cognitive, cognitive and social-affective strategies; Stern (1992) classified as management and planning strategies, cognitive strategies, communicative-experiential strategies, interpersonal strategies and affective strategies (Hsiao & Oxford, 2002; Cesur, 2008). In the studies concerning the determination of language learning strategies, the most frequently used tool is "Strategy Inventory of Language Learning" developed by Oxford (1990). Because individual strategies are taken in connection with language skills such as reading, writing, listening and speaking skills in this data collection tool (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995).Oxford (1990) classified language learning strategies into two groups, namely direct and indirect strategies, and each group was divided into three sub-categories in itself. Oxford (1990) developed the inventory on the basis of this classification. In this study, ''Strategy Inventory of Language Learning'' developed by Oxford (1990) and adapted into Turkish by Cesur and Fer (2007) was used, because it is known as the most comprehensive classification and the most widely used data collection tool in the literature. Sub-categories of the strategies classified by Oxford (1990) and the techniques that can be employed at the development of these strategies are expressed as follows:

1. Direct Learning Strategies: Strategies discussed in this group are the ones which contribute directly to the learning and are classified into three categories as memory, cognitive and compensation strategies.

Memory strategies: These are the strategies that help in sending the knowledge to the long-term memory in order to keep the knowledge in the memory and recall when needed. Techniques such as creating a map of meaning, establishing mental connections, grouping, binding, using keywords can be used concerning these strategies.

Cognitive strategies: These are used in the creation of mental schemes and interpretation of learning. Techniques such as analyzing, comparing, summarizing and note-taking can be used concerning these strategies.

Compensation strategies: These strategies are used when faced with missing information or communication barriers in using the language. Techniques such as benefiting native language when talking or writing, using facial expressions and body language, making use of tips, overcoming the limitations in various ways can be used concerning these strategies.

2. Indirect Learning Strategies: Strategies discussed in this group are the ones which are not directly related to the learning, but contribute to the individual's regulation of his/her learning process, and are classified into three categories as meta-cognitive, affective and social strategies.

Meta-cognitive strategies: These are the strategies that help the learners to organize, plan and evaluate their own learning. Techniques such as identifying learning goals, making organization, planning learning, doing self-assessment can be used concerning these strategies.

Affective strategies: These are the strategies that help the learners to control the motivation, emotions and attitudes towards learning. Techniques such as developing a positive attitude towards language learning, writing down or sharing feelings experienced in language learning, taking risks, doing relaxation-oriented activities can be used concerning these strategies.

Social strategies: These are strategies that help learners to have oral communication with the ones using the same language. Techniques such as cooperation, developing empathy, asking questions, creating cultural awareness can be used concerning these strategies (Oxford, 1990, p. 18-21).

Language Learning Strategies in Bilingual Learners

When definitions for 'bilingual individuals' are examined in the literature, different views were expressed regarding the condition of being bilingual. But with the simplest definition, bilingual individuals are the ones who know two languages and can keep them apart from each other (Ahslen, 2006). Some classifications are available in the literature concerning bilingualism: These classifications have a wide diversity ranging from being competent in the second language as native language to ability to use any language's feature in the second language. For example, anyone who can read and write but cannot speak in another language apart from native language can be called as bilingual.

Several researchers consider various criteria relating to the state of being bilingual. Language learning age of the individuals who learn a language other than native language (Weber-Fox & Neville, 1996; Wartenburger et al, 2003; Ahslen, 2006); language proficiency level and frequency of use (Bloomfield, 1933; Haugen, 1953; Mackey, 1962; Weinleich, 1968); social factors and the context in which language is learned (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981) emerge as important factors in the classification of bilinguals. The most widely used classification criteria are the ones based on age and language proficiency levels. The classifications that are made according to the age criteria can be grouped as early, late and adult bilingualism; the classifications that are made according to language proficiency levels can be defined as fluent, balanced and dominant (Ahslen, 2006). Apart from these criteria, Ahslen (2006) proposed a comprehensive classification concerning learning age criteria and grouped it under three headings: *Compound bilingualism*: Both two languages are learned simultaneously before 6 years old and generally one of the languages is the one learned by family members; *Coordinated bilingualism:* Second language is learned at home or in another setting before puberty; *Natural bilingualism:* The first language is dominant and the second language is instrumental; the individual thinks in the first language and then translates this into the second language (Ahlsen, 2006). Bilinguals in this study can be considered as compound or coordinated

bilinguals because all of them acquired both languages they know simultaneously before 6 years old.

It is considered that a person who is capable of using his/her native language at a certain level will act in a more conscious way with regard to the structure of the language to be learned as part of foreign language learning (Sarıca, 2014). As a result, it is argued that bilingual individuals will learn a foreign language more effectively and use language learning strategies more often, because similarities between the foreign language to be learned by an individual and other languages that he/she speaks are likely to facilitate the process of learning a foreign language.

Studies on language learning strategies that bilinguals use in the acquisition of a new language is often done in countries where English is the official language or spoken language. Studies conducted on the usage of language learning strategies by bilinguals in countries where official language or the native language is not English is quite limited in the literature. In the study conducted by Tuncer (2009) in Turkey, language learning strategies used by monolingual and bilingual individuals who learn English as a foreign language were examined and it was determined that bilingual individuals use more language learning strategies. Undoubtedly, bilingual individuals are more advantageous than monolingual individuals because of their past language experiences in learning a new language and bilingual individuals display better performance in various cognitive skills (Hakuta, 1990; Wharton, 2000). It is important to make a comparison of bilingual and monolingual individuals in terms of language learning strategies that are used in the process of learning a foreign language in Turkey.

Purpose of the study

The present study aimed to make a comparative analysis of language learning strategies used by bilingual and monolingual university students and determine whether students' level of using language learning strategies in the process of learning a foreign language vary or not, depending on "gender," "department," and "school type (faculty/vocational school of higher education)". In accordance with this general purpose, the following questions are tried to be answered in this research:

1-   At what level university students use language learning strategies in learning English?

2-   Is there a significant difference between the levels of monolingual and bilingual university students' using language learning strategies?

3-   Is there a significant difference between the levels of university students' language learning strategies usage in terms of gender?

4-   Is there a significant difference between the levels of university students' language learning strategies usage in terms of department?

5-   Is there a significant difference between the levels of university students' language learning strategies usage in terms of school type (faculty/vocational school in higher education)?

Method
The Research Model
This research is descriptive survey model. As survey models aim to describe a situation in the same way that took place in the past or that still continues (Karasar, 2013, p. 77), it is a proper model for the purpose of this research.

Study Group
This study was conducted with 524 students attending Yüzüncü Yıl University, Faculty of Education/Literature and Bülent Ecevit University, Çaycuma Vocational School of Higher Education. The distribution of the participants in terms of personal variables is presented in Table 1:

Table 1: The distribution of the participants in terms of personal variables

Personal Features	Category	Number (N)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	317	60.5
	Male	207	39.5
Department	English Language Teaching	68	13.0
	English Language and Literature	196	37.4
	Applied English-Turkish	260	49.6
School Type	Translation	264	50.4
	Faculty	260	49.6
	Vocational School in Higher Education	189	36.1
Bilingualism	Bilingual	335	63.9
	Monolingual		

According to Table 1, 317 (%60.5) students are female and 207 (%39.5) students are male. 68 (%13.0) participants are department of English language teaching students, 196 (%37.4) participants are department of English language and literature students, 260 participants (%49.6) are department of applied English-Turkish translation students. 264 participants (%50.4) are 4 years faculty students and 260 (%49.6) participants are vocational school in higher education students. 335 participants (%63.9) are monolinguals, 189 participants (%36.1) are bilinguals.

Data Collection Tool
The survey data was collected by using the 50-item five Likert-type "Strategies Inventory for Language Learning" developed by Oxford (1990) and adapted to Turkish by Cesur and Fer (2007). "Strategies Inventory for

Language Learning" consists of six sub-dimensions that are memory strategies (1-9 items), cognitive strategies (10-23 items), compensation strategies (24-29 items), meta-cognitive strategies (30-38 items), affective strategies (39-44 items) and social strategies (45-50 items). In order to determine the realization level of each item in the data collection tool, the replies concerning scale items were graded as "Always true", "Frequently true", "Sometimes true", "Rarely true" and "Not true at all". According to the validity and reliability analysis done by Cesur and Fer (2007), the KMO value of inventory was calculated as "0.93", the Bartlett Test was calculated as "12937.57" and found to be statistically significant. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the total scale was calculated as 0.92. In this study, the scale's Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was also found as 0.92. This shows that the scale can be used as a valid and reliable measurement tool.

Analysis of Data

Research data collected in this study were analyzed by using SPSS 18.0 statistic program. Frequency and percentage were used in the presentation of descriptive statistics. Evaluation of the students' levels of using language learning strategies was made based on the averages specified by Oxford (1990). The mean scores and standard deviation of each item were calculated in accordance with the scores from the responses to the inventory items in order to determine students' levels of using language learning strategies. If the strategies used by students rate below 2.4, it was considered that their "level of strategy usage is poor"; cases in which the rates ranged between 2.5 and 3.4 were considered to have "strategy usage is of a medium level"; and rates of 3.4 and above meant that "strategy usage is at a high level." Thus, the analyses were interpreted in accordance with these categories.

The t-test was used in order to compare language learning strategies used by bilingual and monolingual students and also to determine if the language learning strategies used by students varied depending on gender or not; ANOVA was used to determine if the language learning strategies used by students differed in accordance to departments that they attend. In analysis of data, significance level is accepted as .05.

Results
Results Concerning First Sub-problem

Table 2 reports the arithmetic means and standard deviations calculated on the basis of university students' answers to the scale and its sub-dimensions, concerning the first sub-problem of the study: "At what level university students use language learning strategies in learning English?"

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics on the Scale of LLS

Language Learning Strategies	$\overline{X}$	Sd
Memory Strategies	3.14	0.63
Cognitive Strategies	3.22	0.61
Compensation Strategies	3.36	0.73
Metacognitive Strategies	3.63	0.75
Affective Strategies	3.06	0.74
Social Strategies	3.33	0.74
Total	3.29	0.52

The findings reported in Table 2 show that the students generally use language learning strategies at medium levels ($\overline{X}$ =3.29). In other words, they make moderate use of language learning strategies. The most commonly used language learning strategies are the metacognitive ones, ($\overline{X}$ =3.63), followed by compensation ($\overline{X}$ =3.36), social ($\overline{X}$ =3.33), cognitive ($\overline{X}$ =3.22), memory ($\overline{X}$ =3.14), and finally affective ($\overline{X}$ =3.06) strategies. The arithmetic mean scores received by the students for language learning strategies show that students use metacognitive strategies at high levels, and the other strategies at medium levels. The most commonly used language learning strategies among students are the metacognitive ones, while the least preferred are the affective ones.

Results Concerning the Second Sub-Problem

Table 3 reports the t-test results for language learning strategies used by bilingual and monolingual students, which allow the second sub-problem of the study to be examined: "Is there a significant difference between the levels of monolingual and bilingual university students' using language learning strategies?"

Table 3: T-test results for language learning strategies used by bilingual and monolingual students

L.L. Strategies	Bilingualism	N	$\overline{X}$	S	sd	t	p
Memory strategies	Bilingual	189	3.16	0.61	522	0.71	.48
	Monolingual	335	3.12	0.64			
Cognitive strategies	Bilingual	189	3.36	0.53	522	4.00	.000
	Monolingual	335	3.14	0.64			
Compensation strategies	Bilingual	189	3.55	0.65	522	4.69	.000
	Monolingual	335	3.24	0.75			
Metacognitive strategies	Bilingual	189	3.84	0.64	522	4.91	.000
	Monolingual	335	3.52	0.77			
Affective strategies	Bilingual	189	3.14	0.67	522	2.10	.04
	Monolingual	335	3.00	0.77			
Social strategies	Bilingual	189	3.45	0.59	522	2.83	.005

	Monolingual	335	3.26	0.80			
Total	Bilingual	189	3.42	0.43	522	4.26	.000
	Monolingual	335	3.21	0.57			

The findings of Table 3 show that bilingual students received higher scores for using language learning strategies, both in total scale and in its sub-dimensions, compared with monolingual students. In other words, bilingual students make more use of language learning strategies than monolingual students. In addition, bilingual students make more use of metacognitive and compensation strategies compared with monolingual students. According to the results of the t-test conducted to see whether there were significant differences between bilingual and monolingual students' use of language learning strategies, there are significant differences between the monolingual and bilingual students' levels of use of the language learning strategies (p<.05), in favor of bilingual students, both in total scale and in the sub-dimensions, except for the memory strategies dimension (cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social).

Results Concerning the Third Sub-Problem

Table 4 reports the t-test results for language learning strategies used by male and female students in order to examine the third sub-problem of the study: Is there a significant difference between the levels of university students' language learning strategies usage in terms of gender?

Table 4: T-test results for use of language learning strategies among students by gender

L. L. Strategies	Gender	N	$\overline{X}$	S	sd	t	p
Memory strategies	Female	317	3.21	0.65	522	3.42	.001
	Male	207	3.02	0.57			
Cognitive strategies	Female	317	3.25	0.62	522	1.72	.08
	Male	207	3.16	0.59			
Compensation strategies	Female	317	3.41	0.73	522	2.14	.03
	Male	207	3.27	0.73			
Metacognitive strategies	Female	317	3.70	0.74	522	2.73	.01
	Male	207	3.52	0.74			
Affective strategies	Female	317	3.10	0.77	522	1.56	.11
	Male	207	2.99	0.69			
Social strategies	Female	317	3.38	0.74	522	2.01	.04
	Male	207	3.25	0.73			
Total	Female	317	3.34	0.54	522	2.91	.004
	Male	207	3.21	0.51			

Table 4 shows that the female student's total mean scores and sub-dimension scores are higher than those received by the male students. This indicates that female students make more use of language learning strategies than male students. According to the results of the t-test, conducted to see

whether there were significant differences between male and female students' use of language learning strategies, there exist significant differences between male and female students' levels of use of the language learning strategies (p<.05), in favor of female students, both in total scale and in the sub-dimensions except for the affective and cognitive dimensions (memory, compensation, metacognitive, and social).

Results Concerning the Fourth Sub-Problem

Table 5 reports ANOVA results for the language learning strategies used by students according to their departments, which serves to examine the fourth sub-problem of the study: Is there a significant difference between the levels of university students' language learning strategies usage in terms of department?

Table 5: ANOVA results for use of language learning strategies among students by department

Descriptive Statistics					ANOVA Results						LSD Test
Dimensions	Department attended	N	$\overline{X}$	Ss	Source of variation	Mean square	sd	Sum of squares	F	P	Significant difference
Memory strategies	English lang. & literature	196	3.18	0.67	Between groups	2.55	2	1.273	3.253	.04	2>3
	English teaching	68	3.25	0.52		203.94	521				
	Translation	260	3.07	0.62	Within groups	206.49	523	0.39			
					Total						
Cognitive strategies	English lang. & literature	196	3.33	0.60	Between groups	6.41	2	3.206	8.822	.000	1>3
	English teaching	68	3.31	0.52		189.37	521				2>3
	Translation	260	3.11	0.63	Within groups	195.78	523	0.36			
					Total						
Compensation strategies	English lang. & literature	196	3.55	0.68	Between groups	21.02	2	10.512	21.215	.000	1>3
	English teaching	68	3.57	0.62		258.16	521				2>3
	Translation	260	3.15	0.74	Within groups	279.18	523	0.50			

					Translation	Total					
Metacognitive strategies	English lang. & literature	196	3.82	0.71	Between groups	14.24	2	7.12	13.437	.000	1>3 2>3
						276.12	521				
	English teaching	68	3.73	0.62	Within groups			0.53			
	Translation	260	3.47	0.76	Total	290.36	523				
Affective strategies	English lang. & literature	196	3.15	0.79	Between groups	3.93	2	1.964	3.650	.03	1>3 2>3
						280.31	521				
	English teaching	68	3.11	0.58	Within groups			0.54			
	Translation	260	2.97	0.72	Total	284.24	523				
Social strategies	English lang. & literature	196	3.49	0.70	Between groups	11.95	2	5.973	11.433	.000	1>3 2>3
						272.21	521				
	English teaching	68	3.44	0.71	Within groups			0.52			
	Translation	260	3.18	0.74	Total	284.16	523				
Total	English lang. & literature	196	3.42	0.51	Between groups	8.12	2	4.060	14.985	.000	1>3 2>3
						141.17	521				
	English teaching	68	3.40	0.44	Within groups			0.27			
	Translation	260	3.16	0.55	Total	149.29	523				

Note: 1- English language and literature 2- English teaching 3- Translation
$p<.05$

The findings reported in Table 5 show that students majoring in English language and literature received the highest overall scores for the scale ($\overline{X}$ =3.42), followed by those majoring in the teaching of English ($\overline{X}$ =3.40) and Applied English and translation ($\overline{X}$ =3.16). Students attending the departments of English language and literature and English teaching, which are administratively part of a faculty, had similar levels of using language learning strategies, whereas students attending the department of Translation, which is part of a vocational school, had relatively lower levels of use. The

same also applies to all the individual sub-dimensions. According to the results of the ANOVA analysis, conducted to see whether there were significant differences between language learning strategies of students from different departments, there were significant differences between both the overall scores and the sub-dimension scores (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social) received by students pursuing different majors (p<.05). An LSD test, one of the multiple comparison tests, was conducted to examine the source of these significant differences and it was found that students majoring in the teaching of English received higher scores for using memory strategies compared with students majoring in Translation; and both English language and literature and teaching of English majors received higher scores for the whole of the scale and for its sub-dimensions compared with the Translation majors.

Results Concerning the Fifth Sub-Problem

Table 6 reports the t-test results for the use of language learning strategies among students according to the school type (faculty/vocational school in higher education), to examine the fifth sub-problem of the study: "Is there a significant difference between the levels of university students' language learning strategies usage in terms of school type?"

Table 6: T-test results for use of language learning strategies among students by school type

L. L. Strategies	Type of school	N	$\overline{X}$	S	sd	t	p
Memory strategies	Faculty	264	3.20	0.63	522	2.41	.02
	Voc. Sc.	260	3.07	0.62			
Cognitive strategies	Faculty	264	3.33	0.58	522	4.19	.000
	Voc. Sc.	260	3.11	0.63			
Compensation strategies	Faculty	264	3.55	0.67	522	6.52	.000
	Voc. Sc.	260	3.15	0.74			
Metacognitive strategies	Faculty	264	3.79	0.69	522	5.11	.000
	Voc. Sc.	260	3.47	0.76			
Affective strategies	Faculty	264	3.14	0.74	522	2.68	.008
	Voc. Sc.	260	2.97	0.72			
Social strategies	Faculty	264	3.48	0.70	522	4.76	.000
	Voc. Sc.	260	3.18	0.74			
Total	Faculty	264	3.41	0.49	522	5.47	.000
	Voc. Sc.	260	3.16	0.55			

Table 6 shows that the students attending four-year faculties received higher overall and sub-dimension scores for language learning strategies, compared with students attending two-year vocational schools. In other words, students pursuing a bachelor's degree make more use of language learning strategies compared with students pursuing associate degrees. According to

the results of the t-test conducted to see whether there were significant differences between faculty students and vocational school students in terms of their levels of using language- learning strategies, faculty students received higher scores for the whole of the test and for its sub-dimensions (cognitive, memory, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social) compared to vocational school students (p<.05).

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions:
This study aimed to examine differences in bilingual and monolingual university students' use of language learning strategies using a number of variables. The findings of the study showed that university students generally make use of language learning strategies at a medium level. This finding intersects with the findings of Demirel's (2012) study. The strategies most commonly used by bilingual and monolingual students are similar. This study found that both bilingual and monolingual students used metacognitive strategies most frequently, which intersects with the findings of Quasimnejad and Hemmati (2014). Similarly, other studies in the literature (O'Malley et al., 1985; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006; Hamamcı, 2012; Uztosun, 2014), report that students use multiple language learning strategies and that metacognitive strategies are the most commonly used.

However, the current study found that monolingual students make moderate use of metacognitive strategies, whereas bilingual students make frequent use of them. Metacognitive strategies are high-level management skills and comprise skills such as planning, organization, monitoring, and assessment. The bilingual students' more frequent use of metacognitive strategies, which allow the learner to question his or her learning process based on past linguistic experience, was an expected finding, and its overall frequent use among students is encouraging, as it shows that students are able to plan, organize and assess their own learning. However, other studies came up with different findings regarding the most commonly used strategies.

In a study on bilingual students, Wharton (2000), found that this type of students most frequently used social strategies, contrary to the findings of the current study. Social strategies mostly involve interactive learning situations such as asking questions and cooperating in learning. A commonly held view about the Turkish education system is that, especially in foreign language teaching, productive skills are not taught at a sufficient level, which might explain why students are reluctant to actually speak English and make insufficient use of social strategies. In addition, this study found that both among bilingual and monolingual students, the least frequently used strategies were the affective ones. Parallel to this finding, Hamamcı (2012) reported that students make frequent use of all language learning strategies, except for affective strategies, which are used at moderate levels. It could be argued that

these results from the strong emphasis put on cognitive strategies in the Turkish education system, and the lack of emphasis on affective ones.

This study found that bilingual students make more use of language learning strategies compared with monolingual students, and this finding is in line with the findings of a number of other studies (Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2007; Tuncer, 2009; Quasimnejad & Hemmati, 2014). People who have a certain level of skill in using their native language are more successful in grasping the structure of the foreign languages they learn (Sarıca, 2014). Considering that bilingual individuals have the skill to use both languages as their native language, it is only natural that they should be more effective in their efforts to learn another language, use better strategies, and achieve more efficient and effective learning by drawing parallel lines between the languages they already know and the new language they are studying. All these probably explain why bilingual students make more frequent use of language learning strategies compared with monolingual students.

Differences in foreign language learning strategies between students from different cultures might be explained with reference to different foreign language policies in the countries concerned and different teaching methods used in practice, or with reference to individual differences, in terms of learning styles, attitudes, motivation, age and gender (Ehrman, Leaver and Oxford, 2003; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994). Thus, this study examined whether there were differences in the use of language learning strategies among students by gender, department attended, and the type of school attended. As a result, it was found that, except for cognitive and affective strategies, female students made more frequent use of language learning strategies compared with male students. Parallel to this finding, many studies in the literature (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Green & Oxford, 1995; Kaylani, 1996; Sheorey, 1999; Bekleyen, 2005; Algan, 2006; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006; Yalçın, 2006; Cesur, 2008; Al Shabou, Asassfeh, & Alsbouh, 2010; Ghee, Ismai, & Kabilan, 2010; Demirel, 2012; Onursal-Ayırır, Arıoğul and Ünal, 2012) report that women make more use of language learning strategies than men. This finding indicates that women are more efficient and organized in their process of foreign language-learning. There are also studies that suggest men make more use of language learning strategies than women (Wharton, 2000; Özyılmaz, 2012), and studies that fail to find any significant differences between the two genders in this respect (Aydın, 2003; Kondo & Ying-Ling, 2004; Rahimi, Riazi, & Saif, 2008; Tuncer, 2009; Gömleksiz, 2013). Differences in the language learning strategies used by men and women can be explained with reference to the different learning styles adopted by the two genders, differences in socialization, or physiological factors (Wharton, 2000).

This study found that students attending the English language and literature and English teaching departments, which are four-year programs offering bachelor's degrees, made more frequent use of language learning strategies compared with students attending the Applied English and Translation department, which is a two-year program offering an associate degree. Based upon this finding, it could be argued that students attending four-year university programs are more organized and effective in their approach to learning a second language, compared with those attending two-year vocational schools. This is an expected finding, given that the departments of English language and literature and English teaching attract students with higher standardized test scores compared with Translation programs in the vocational schools. Differences in language learning strategies between the four-year and the two-year programs might therefore be due to differences in overall academic achievement, as well as to different preferences of translation majors, as opposed to literature and teaching majors. According to Oxford (1990), students who are able to effectively combine and manage different language learning strategies are more successful in learning a second language (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). Many studies in the literature report a positive relationship between the frequency of strategy use and level of proficiency in a foreign language (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1993; Green & Oxford, 1995; Cohen, 1998; Chamot, Kupper & Impink-Hernandez, 1988; Khaldieh, 2000; Wharton, 2000; Bruen, 2001; Griffiths, 2003; Shmais, 2003; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006; Magogwe & Oliver, 2007; Cesur, 2008; Rahimi, Riazi, & Saif, 2008; Lai, 2009; Al-Shabou, Asassfeh, & Alsbouh, 2010; Ghee, Ismail, & Kabilan, 2010; Gerami & Baighlou, 2011; Gülleroğlu and Özmen, 2013). Therefore, regular university students are expected to be more successful in learning a foreign language compared to vocational school students due to their more frequent use of language learning strategies.

Creating a more effective education program requires understanding the different variables that affect learning and creating learning environments that incorporate these variables. Considering the significant impact language learning strategies have on the success of language-learning, they are certainly an important factor to be taken into account when educational activities are being designed. In multi-cultural countries such as Turkey, bilingualism is an important variable in language teaching. It is therefore crucial to understand its role in language learning and teaching, and incorporate these insights into the development of education policies. This study did not look into the direct relationship between the language learning strategies used by bilingual and monolingual students and their success in language-learning, which could be an area of future research.

References:

Ahlsén, E. (2006). *Introduction to Neurolinguistics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Algan, N. (2006). *University Preparatory Class Students' Use of Language Learning Strategies and Perceptions of Their Instructors on Their Use.* (*Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*). İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi.

Al-Shabou Y. M., Asassfeh, S. M., & Alsboul, S. S. (2010). Jordanian students learning English: Strategy development. *The Buckingham Journal of Language and Linguistics*, *3*, 101-120.

Aydın, T. (2003). *Language learning strategies used by Turkish high school students learning English (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi).* İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi.

Bekleyen, N. (2005). Öğretmen adayları tarafından kullanılan dil öğrenme stratejileri. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 14* (2), 28-37.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: University of Chicago Press.

Bruen, J. (2001). Strategies for success: Profiling the effective learner of German. *Foreign Language Annals,* 34 (3), 216-225.

Cesur, M. O., ve Fer, S. (2007). Dil öğrenme stratejileri envanterinin geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması nedir?. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4 (2), 49-74.

Cesur, M. O. (2008). *Üniversite Hazırlık Sınıfı Öğrencilerinin Yabancı Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri, Öğrenme Stili Tercihleri ve Yabancı Dil Akademik Başarısı Arasındaki Açıklayıcı ve Yordayıcı İlişkiler Örüntüsü.* (*Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi*). İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi.

Chamot, A., Kupper, L. & Impink-Hernandez, M. (1988). *A Study of Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Instruction: Findings of the Longitudinal Study*. McLean Va.: Interstate Research Associates.

Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in language learning strategy research and teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 1 (1), 14-26.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language*. UK: Longman, Essex.

Demirel, M. (2012). Üniversite öğrencilerinin kullandıkları dil öğrenme stratejileri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 43, 141-153.

Ehrman, M. E., & Oxford, R. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73 (1), 1–13.

Ehrman, M., Leaver, B., & Oxford, R., (2003). A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning. *System*, 31(3), 313-330.

Gerami, M. H., & Baighlou, S. M. G. (2011). Language learning strategies used by successful and unsuccessful Iranian EFL students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1567-1576.

Ghee, T. T., İsmail, H. N., & Kabilan M. K. (2010). Language learning strategies used by MFL students based on genders and achievement groups. *US-China Foreign Language,* 8 (1), 50-58.

Gömleksiz, M. N.(2013). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının İngilizce dil öğrenme stratejilerine ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi (Fırat üniversitesi örneği). *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi Türkçenin Eğitimi Öğretimi Özel Sayısı*, 6 (11).

Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency and gender. *Tesol Quarterly*, 29 (2), 261–297.

Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language learning strategy use. *System*, 31, 367-383.

Gülleroğlu, H. D., ve Özmen, D. T. (2013). Determining language learning strategies used by the students at faculty of educational sciences based on some variables. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 38 (169).

Hakuta, K. (1990). Bilingualism and bilingual education: a research perspective. *NCBE Focus 1*.

Hamamcı, Z. (2012). Üniversite hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin dil öğrenme strateji tercihleri. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1 (3).

Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian Langauge in America: A Study in Bilingual Behaviour*. Philadelphia: UP of Pennsylvania.

Hong-Nam, K., & Leavell, A.G. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System 34*, 399-415.

Hsiao, T., & Oxford, R. (2002). Comparing theories of language learning strategies: a confirmatory factor analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86 (3), 368–383.

Kafipour, R., & Naveh, M. H. (2011). Vocabulary learning strategies and their contribution to reading comprehension of Efl undergraduate students in kerman province. *European Journal of Social Sciences,* 23 (4).

Karasar, N. (2013). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi (25. Baskı).* Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

Kashefian-Naeeini, S.,   Maarof, N., & Salehi, H. (2011). Malaysian Esl learners' use of language learning strategies. *International Conference on Humanities, Society and Culture,* 20.

Kaylani, C. (1996). The influence of gender and motivation on EFL learning strategy use in Jordan. In R.L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp.75-88). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Khaldieh, S. A. (2000). Learning strategies and writing processes of proficient vs. less-proficient learners of Arabic. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33 (5), 522–533.

Kondo, D.S., & Ying-Ling, Y. (2004) Strategies for coping with language anxiety: The case of students of English in Japan. *ELT Journal*, 58 (3), 258-265.

Lai, Y. (2009). Language learning strategy use and English proficiency of university freshmen in Taiwan. *Tesol Quarterly, 43* (2), 255- 80.

Mackey, W. 1962. "*The description of bilingualism*" in L. Wei. (Ed.) Bilingualism Reader. UK: Routledge

Magogwe, J., & Oliver, R. (2007). The relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age and self-efficacy beliefs: A study of language learners in Botswana. *System 35*, 338-352.

Mayer, R. E. & Weinstein, C. E. (1983). The teaching of learning strategies. *Innovation Abstracts,* 5 (32), 1-4.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The effects of induced anxiety on cognitive processing in second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 17, 117.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-M anzanares, G., Kupper, L., & Russo, R. P. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. *Language Learning,* 35 (1), 21–46.

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

Onursal-Ayırır, İ., Arıoğul, S., ve Ünal, D.Ç. (2012). Cinsiyetin ve öğrenim alanlarının hazırlık öğrencilerinin yabancı dil öğrenme stratejisi kullanımına etkisi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 42, 60-71.

Oxford, R. L., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73 (3), 291–300.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know.* New York: Newbury House.

Oxford, R. L. (1993). Instructional implications of gender differences in language learning styles and strategies. *Applied Language Learning*, *4*, 65-94.

Oxford, R., & Burry-Stock, J. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL). *System,* 23 (1), 1-23.

Oxford, R.L. (1996). *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii Press, USA.

Özyılmaz, Ö. (2012). *An Investigation into ELT Students' Academic Achievement and Their Use of Language Learning Strategies Across Gender Groups (Yüksek Lisans Tezi)*. Kuzey Kıbrıs: Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi.

Qasimnejad, A., & Hemmati, F. (2014). Investigating the language learning strategies used by Iranian monolingual (Persian) and bilingual (Persian

Turkish) speakers as Efl learners. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, (136), 26-30.

Rahimi, M., Riazi, A. & Saif S. (2008). An investigation into the factors affecting the use of language learning strategies by Persian EFL learners. *CJAL, 11* (2), 31-60.

Rubin, J. (1981). Study of cognitive processes in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11 (2), 118-131.

Sarıca, N. (2014). Idiosyncrasy in native language acquisition and linguistic transfers in second language acquisition. *International Journal of Language Academy, 2 (4), 554-563.*

Scarcella, R. & Oxford, R., (1992). *The Tapestry of Language Learning: The Individual in the Communicative Classroom*. Heinle & Heinle, USA.

Senemoğlu, N. (2013). *Gelişim, Öğrenme Ve Öğretim: Kuramdan Uygulamaya* (*23.baskı*). Ankara: Yargı Yayınevi.

Sheorey, R. (1999). An examination of language learning strategy use in the setting of an indigenized variety of English. *System,* 27, 173-190

Shmais, W. A. (2003). Language learning strategy use in Palestine. *TESL-EJ,* 7 (2), 1–17.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1981). Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities. *Multilungual Matters*, Clevedon.

Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues And Options In Language Teaching*. London: Oxford University Press.

Tuncer, U. (2009). How do monolingual and bilingual language learners differ in use of learning strategies while learning a foreign language? Evidences from Mersin University. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1, 852–856.

Uztosun, M.S. (2014). The impact of language learning experience on language learner strategy use in Turkish Efl context. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications, 5 (1).*

Wartenburger, I, Heckeren, H.R., Abutalebi, J., Cappa, F.S., Villinger, A., & Perani, D. (2003). Early setting of grammatical processing in the bilingual brain. *Neuron*, (37), 159–170.

Weber-Fox, C. M., & Neville, H. J.(1996). Maturational constraints on functional specializations for language processing: ERP and behavioral evidence in bilingual speakers. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 8 (3), 231–256.

Weinleich, U. (1968), *Language in Contact*. Mouton: The Hague Press.

Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning,* 50 (2), 203–243.

Yalçın, M. (2006). *Differences In Perceptions On Language Learning Strategies Of English Preparatory Class Students Studying at Gazi University* (*Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*). Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi.