Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter offers a review of the theoretical part related to the present study. This theoretical review is in five sections. The first section discusses the aspects of second and foreign language reading as well as the nature and purpose of reading; theories in L2 reading are also discussed in this section. The second section deals with some processing related to L2 reading (bottom up, top-down, and interactive processing). The third section of this chapter discusses some details related to the language learning strategies. Some of these details are characteristics of language learning strategies; Taxonomies of language learning strategies (Rubin, O’Malley, and Oxford); strategies and the reading skill; the effect of strategy instruction on language learning; language learning strategies research in the Arabic context. At the end of this chapter the researcher discussed the relationship between gender and L2 reading as well as offers a review of the related studies to the present study. Some of these studies discuss the type and frequency of language learning strategies used by learners from different parts of the world. While other studies in the same chapter investigate the type and frequency of Language Learning Strategies and the relationship between gender differences and Language Learning Strategies. in addition, studies also revealed the link between strategy use and level of English Comprehension acquired.
2.2 Second / Foreign Language Reading

Bacon (1992) stated that, reading is an important process and reading skills are probably the most important skills required for academic and professional purposes. Quick, efficient, and imaginative reading techniques are essential in order to achieve academic success, because academic performance depends on the quantity and quality of reading. He also stated that reading is a complex communicative process of receiving and interpreting the written words. It involves recognizing what is written and comprehending the matter that, understands the main and subsidiary points as well as links between different parts of the written materials.

William Grabe (2002) figured out that the ability to read in a second language (L2) is one of the most important skills required of people in multilingual and international settings. It is also a skill that is one of the most difficult to develop to a high level of proficiency. For many people, reading is the most important of the four skills in a second language, especially in English as a second and foreign language.

Ernesto Macaro (2003) observed that Reading in a foreign or a second language has received a great deal of attention from researchers over the past twenty years Once the learner has progressed beyond the beginner level, the vast majority of his or her input will be in a written form. This is particularly so in the case of learners of foreign languages where the number of contacts hours with a teacher or a foreign-language assistant are often limited. The
tendency for written texts to gain in importance as input will be even more pronounced in the university phase of education, area studies, or L2 for academic purpose courses- where the expectation is that learners will read extensively in the L2.

Carrell (2006), effective reading in a second language is critical for students in EFL context, at an advanced level of proficiency, or with a need for English for Academic purposes. For a long time, EFL reading was viewed as a rather passive, bottom-up process. In other words we can say, EFL reading was primarily a decoding process of reconstructing the author’s intended meaning through identifying the printed letters and words and building up a meaning for a text from the smallest textual units at the “bottom” (letters and words) to larger units at the “top” (phrases and clauses).

2.3 Nature of Reading

Reading is a receptive language process. It is a psycholinguistic process, it starts with a linguistic surface representation encoded by a writer and ends with a meaning which the reader constructs. There are thus an essential interaction between “language” and “thought in reading”. The writer encodes thought as language and the reader decodes language to thought.

Further, proficient readers are both efficient and effective. They are effective in constructing a meaning that they can assimilate or accommodate and which bears some level of agreement with the original meaning of the
authors. Readers are efficient in using the least amount of effort to achieve effectiveness. To accomplish this efficiency:

(a) Readers maintain constant focus on constructing the meaning throughout the process.

(b) They always seek the most direct path to meaning.

(c) It is also seen that they always use strategies for reducing uncertainty.

(d) They are being selective about the use of the cues available and drawing deeply on prior conceptual and linguistics competence.

(e) Efficient readers minimize dependence on visual detail.

A reader’s proficiency is a variable, depending on the semantic background brought by the reader to any given reading task. Reading can easily be defined simply, as the ability to derive understanding from written text.

McNeil (1992) According to McNeil reading comprehension is making sense out of texts. Although writers structure texts for their given purposes, readers interpret what they read in order to arrive at their own construction of what the text means to them.

Heilman, Blair, and Rubly (1998) defined reading as an active process of constructing meaning from written text in relation to the experiences and knowledge of the reader.
Grabe (1999) whereas L2 reading can best be understood as a combination of skills and abilities that individuals bring to read.

Grabe (2002) explored that different people use the term “Reading” in different ways. However, no one single definition tells the complexity inherent in the ability to read.

Grabe (2002) suggested the following five abilities that should be seen as definitional for reading: a rapid and automatic process, an interacting process, a flexible and strategic process, a purposeful process, and a linguistic process. Grabe (2004) suggested that it "implies processing efficiency, language knowledge, strategic awareness, extensive practice in reading, cognitive resources in working memory to allow critical reflection, and appropriate purposes for reading”.

2.4 Purpose of Reading

Kaplan (2002) stated that people read for a variety of purposes, and many of these purposes require distinct combinations of skills in order to achieve the reader’s purpose. Due to this variation, it is not easy to define L2 reading as a single nation or a unitary ability. It is true that differing purposes draw on many of the same cognitive processes, but they do so to differing extents, and sometimes in different ways.

Grabe (2002) declared that purposes of reading can include the following: (a) reading to find information (scanning, searching), (b) reading to
learn, (c) reading to critique and evaluate, and (d) reading for basic comprehension.

(a) In the case of reading to find information, the crucial skill is to scan for specific word, phrase, form, or number. Meaning in the text is not critical, though a reader may slow down to skim to see if he or she is perhaps in the right neighborhood. This skill is typically carried out at a very fast rate of words per minute processing of the text.

(b) Reading to learn, in contrast, requires reading for the main idea, but, in addition, it requires awareness of many of the details of the text and strong organizing frame in which to relate the various meanings of the text.

(c) Reading to critique and evaluate requires, in addition, reflections and elaborate connections to prior knowledge and integration with prior knowledge, including the reader’s attitudes, emotions, motivations for reading, and level of topic-specific background knowledge. Reading rate is likely to be even slower for this purpose.

(d) The most common, and most basic, reading purpose is reading for general understanding. Reading for general understanding is typically carried out at about 250-300 word per minute by fluent readers. This purpose satisfies most reading expectation for understanding main ideas and a subset of supporting ideas and information. While it is often noted as basic, and general, it is by no means easy to carry out fluently. Reading for general understanding, under normal processing rates, requires a very large recognition vocabulary,
automaticity of word recognition for most of the words in the text, a reasonably rapid overall reading speed for text-information integration, and the ability to build overall text comprehension under some time pressure.

2.5 Theories in L2 Reading

Considerable advances have been made in understanding the nature of L2 reading, and these changes have influenced how L2 reading has been taught, learned and assessed. Up to now, a lot of theoretical issues related to L2 reading have been discussed. Two of them are discussed in this section.

2.5.1 Process Approach

McNeil (1992) claimed four assumptions underlying the process approach as follows: 1). What students already know affects what they will learn from reading. 2). Both data driven and concept-driven process is a “bottom-up” strategy and calls for activating schemata and applying them when setting expectations for reading, and it calls for filling gaps in one’s schemata with information read in the text. A concept-driven process is a “top-down” strategy in which the reader’s goals and expectations determine what is read. 3). The deeper a person processes text, the more he or she will remember and understand it. The deeper-processing of a text relies on two strategies, which are elaboration and the use of the author’s organizational framework. And 4). The context in which reading occurs influences what will be recalled. The reading context, including the reader’s purpose and perspective, affects the reader’s judgment about the importance of text elements as they are counted.
Heilman et al. (1998) found out that theories of reading comprehension have experienced a change from focusing on product to process. Reading was once taught to be a passive process, where readers’ only purpose was to decode the text in order to figure it out correctly, which supposed to consist of a hierarchal list of word-identification and comprehension skills that would enable one to comprehend what one was reading.

Yang (2002) in contrast with the older emphasis on teaching reading comprehension as a product, process approach regards successful reading comprehension as a complete grasp of meaning in a written text in which a dynamic and growing appreciation of interrelationships in the text is required.

2.5.2 Schema Approach

Anderson et al (1991) Schema theory is based on the belief that “every act of comprehension involves one’s knowledge of the world.

Rumelhart, D.E. (1982) stated that they represent elaborate networks of information that people use to make sense of new stimuli, events, and situations.

Widdowson (1983) observed that an important aspect of cognitive science, schema theory is a theory of how knowledge is acquired, processed, and retrieved. Schema is a technical term used by cognitive scientists to describe how people process, organize, and store information in their heads.
Schema, or schemata, is seen as cognitive constructs by which we organize information in our long-term memory.

Carrell (1983) distinguished three different dimensions of schemata: linguistics (language knowledge), content (knowledge of the topic), and formal (previous knowledge of the rhetorical structures of different types of texts). He contended each of these dimensions plays a role in the interaction among the text and the reader and that when one or all are missing, reading can be problematic.

Carrel (1988) pointed out that “research on the theory of schema had great impact on understanding reading comprehension in first and second language”. It made clear the case that understanding the role of schema in the reading process provides insights into why students may fail to comprehend text material. Most, if not all, research in this area seem to agree that when students are familiar with the topic of the text they are reading, aware of the discourse level and structural make-up of the genre of the text, and skilful in the decoding features needed to organize words and recognize how they fit together in a sentence, they are in a better position to comprehend their assigned reading. Deficiency in any of the above schemata will result in reading comprehension deficit. He again pointed out that, “students’ apparent reading problems may be problems on insufficient background knowledge [content, formal, and linguistic]”. However, as further pointed out by the same author, students might have sufficient schemata, yet unable to comprehend the text is such schemata are not appropriately activated.
Similarly, **McNeil (1992)** recognized three kinds of schemata related to reading comprehension: domain, general world knowledge and knowledge of rhetorical structures. According to him, domain schemata refer to the knowledge of specific topics, concepts, or processes for recoding subject matter. General world knowledge is the schema related to understanding social relationships, causes, and activities common to many situations and domains.

**McNeil (1992)** pointed out that two types of activities are related. One is the teaching of organizational patterns of texts or rhetorical structures. The other is intervention aimed at developing and activating a schema that relates to a particular text.

**Reid (1993)** observed that a central component of this theory is related to the interrelated and independent relationship between text comprehension and the reader’s background knowledge. Schema theory regards reading as an active in which prior knowledge is relevant to what is read. It necessarily includes reader’s prior knowledge to bear upon what is being read. According to this theory, a reader uses his/her prior knowledge to enter into a transaction with the text that leads to an understanding and interpretation unique to him/her. According to schema theory, each individual has different internal representations for the subject matter of a text.

**Harris and Hodges (1995)** defined schema theory as “a view that comprehension depends on integrating new knowledge with a network of prior knowledge”.


Vocca and Vocca (1999) They “reflect the experiences, conceptual understanding, attitudes, values, skills, and strategies...[we] bring to a text situation”. Schemata, therefore, have been called “the building blocks of cognition”.

Finally, schemata about rhetorical structures is the knowledge of the conventions for organizing and signaling the organization of texts, for example, knowledge of expository text may reduce the difficulty in reading texts of this kind. When it comes to being successful in teaching reading.

2.6 L2 Reading Processing

Heilman et al. (1998) defined Reading as a dynamic, requiring active, meaningful communication between the author and the reader. Fluent reading requires efficient cognitive processing by the reader. In the history of research on reading comprehension, there have been three processing recognized: bottom-up, top-down, and interactive processing.

2.6.1 Bottom Up Processing

Gove (1983) stated that in bottom-up reading processing, readers are assumed to decode precisely from letters to words, from words into larger grammatical units and finally to the understanding of the text. Readers recognize letters, words, sentences, and text structure. In this view, reading is initiated by examining the printed symbols and requires little input from the reader. In bottom-up models, reading comprehension is achieved through
accurate and sequential processing of text and comprehension is regarded as text driven and controlled by the text only.

2.6.2 Top-Down Processing

Eskey (2005) affirmed that different from decoding in precise or sequential fashion in bottom-up processing, top-down processing requires readers to attack the text with expectations of meaning developed before and during the processes, making use of the text information when they read to confirm and extend their expectations). In top-down processing, the act of reading begins with the reading generating hypotheses as necessary. According to top-down proponents, prior knowledge plays a vital role in reading.

2.6.3 Interactive Processing

Eskey (1988) indicated, the negligence of learners’ weak linguistic procession skills leads to a “strongly top-down bias” in L2 reading pedagogy. He further explained that L2 readers are fundamentally different from L1 readers in that L2 readers need to master essential knowledge of the language of the text” before they can successfully process the L2 reading schema.

Cohen (1990) concluded from the different reviews seen above about the L2 reading processing that reading is more than active. Reading is a dynamic interaction between the writer and the reader. The reader creates meaning for the text by “retaining newly acquired knowledge, accessing recorded and stored knowledge and attending to the writer’s clues as to the
meaning intended for the text”. In short, reading calls for the reader’s active interaction with the text being read.

Hamaedou (1991) claimed, L2 reading comprehension is a complex process that not only entails understanding words, sentences, paragraphs, text, but also entails “building a model within the mind of the comprehender”.

Nuttall (1996) further declared that reading is an interactive process and is more than merely getting the author’s ideas because both the reader and the writer depend on one another. The reader must prepare a text for himself or herself in order to be a thoughtful reader. The cognitive process of reading comprehension involves constructing meaning from a text, and this meaning may or may not be what the author intended.

Nassaji (2003) announced at the same time that the data-driven processing level is doing visual analysis, the syntactic and semantic processing systems are operating to generate hypotheses about the interpretation of the visual information coming from visual analysis. Readers simultaneously decode texts and encode them through their instantiation of interpretive conventions, experiential images, and other conventional and personal knowledge.

Baker and Bookit (2004); Koda (2005) argued that strictly top-down models cannot fully account for the results of much empirical research and, therefore, they propose that reading is an interactive, top-down and bottom-up process.
Roe et al. (2005) confirmed that according to the interactive models, the information-processing system in reading consists of different levels of processing that operate in a barrel manner. It depicts reading as a combination of top-down and bottom-up processing in continues interaction. This view assumes that students are simultaneously processing information from the text being read and information from their background knowledge. The readers from the meaning of the text through interaction of a variety of their mental processes to work at different levels such as using the bottom-up process to identify the meaning and grammatical category of words, sentence syntax, and text details (Aebersold & Field, 1997).

2.7 Language Learning Strategies

O’Mally, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Kuper, and Russo, (1985) observed that research has proved that language learning strategies are extremely effective in second or foreign language learning; they have the potential to be “an extremely powerful learning tool”. In (1985) O’Mally et al. all defined learning strategies as being “operations or steps used by a learner that will facilitate the acquisition storage, retrieval or use of information”.

Weinsten and Mayer (1986) stated that learning strategies have learning facilitation as a goal and are intentional on the part of the learner. In fact, more proficient students tend to consciously use more strategies to learn the language.
2.7.1 Characteristics of Language Learning Strategies

When analyzing the learning strategies it can be seen that different writers use different terminology to refer to the strategies. For example, Wenden and Rubin (1987) used the term “Learner Strategies”. O’Malley and Chamot (1990) used the term “Learning Strategies” and Oxford (1990) used the term “Language Learning Strategies”.

Even though the terminology used for language learning strategies is not uniform among scholars in the field, there are a number of basic characteristics accepted by them.

2.7.2 Taxonomies of Language Learning Strategies

Rubin (1987), O’Malley and Chamot (1990), had classified language learning strategies. However, most of these attempts to classify LLS reflect more or less the same categorization without any drastic changes. Below Rubin’s (1987), O’Malley and Chamot (1990), and Oxford’s (1990) taxonomies of LLS will be handled.

2.7.2.1 Rubin’s Taxonomy:

Rubin (1987), who is the pioneer in the field of LLS, drew a distinction between strategies directly contributing to learning and those contributing indirectly. According to Rubin (1987), there were three types of strategies used by learners that contribute directly or indirectly to language learning.
The first category, learning strategies, consists of two main types Cognitive and Meta-cognitive Learning Strategies. They are thought to be strategies directly contributing to language system constructed by the learner. Cognitive Learning Strategies (CLS) refer to the steps or processes used in learning or problem-solving tasks that require direct analysis, transformation, or synthesis of learning materials. Rubin (1987) identified six main CLS directly contributing to language learning: Clarification/ Verification, Guessing/ Inductive, Inferring, Deductive, Reasoning, Practice, Memorization, and Monitoring.

Meta-cognitive Learning Strategies (MLS) are used to supervise, control or self-directed language learning. They involve a variety of processes as planning, prioritizing, setting goals, and self-management.

The second category consists of Communication Strategies, which are less directly related to language learning because they focus on the process of participating in a conversation and getting meaning across or clarifying what speaker interred. These strategies are used by a co-speaker. Social Strategies comprise the last category, which are manipulating when the learners are engaged in tasks that afford them opportunities to be exposed to and practice their knowledge.

Rubin and Weden (1987) declared that even though these strategies provide exposure to the target language, they contribute indirectly to the obtaining, storing, retrieving, and using of language.
2.7.2.2 O’Malley’s Classification of Language Learning Strategies

O’Malley et al (1985) divided language-learning strategies into two main subcategories: (1) Meta-Cognitive Strategies, And (2) Socio Affective Strategies. It can be stated that Meta-cognitive Strategies is a term which refers to the excusive skills, strategies which require planning for learning, thinking about the learning processes that is taking place, monitoring of one’s production or comprehension, and evaluating learning after an activity is complete. Strategies such as self-monitoring, self-evaluation, advance organizers, self-management, and selective attention can be placed among the main meta-cognitive.

When compared to Meta-cognitive Strategies, it can be stated that Cognitive Strategies are not only more limited to specific learning tasks but they also involve more direct manipulation of the learning material itself. Among the most important Cognitive Strategies are repetition, elaboration, contextualization, auditory repetition and transfer.

Regarding the Socio Affective Strategies, it can be stated that they involve interaction with another person. They are generally considered to be applicable to various tasks. Questioning for clarification, cooperation with others to solve a problem, rephrasing, and self-talk are some examples of socio affective strategies.
2.7.2.3 Oxford’ Classification of Language Learning Strategies

Among all the existing Learning Strategies taxonomies Oxford (1990) provided the most extensive classification of LLS developed so far. However, when analyzed her classification is not something completely different from the previous discussed ones. On the contrary, Oxford’s taxonomy overlaps with O’Malley’s (1985) taxonomy to a great extent. For instance, the Cognitive Strategies category in O’Malley’s classification seems to cover both the Cognitive and Memory Strategies in Oxford’s taxonomy. Moreover, while O’Malley puts socio affective strategies in one category. Yet, a significant difference in Oxford’s classification is the addition of compensation strategies, which have not been treated in any of the major classification system earlier.

Oxford (1990) stated that “learning strategies are specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations”. To sum up, according to Oxford (1990) language learning strategies:

- Allow learners to become more self-directed.
- Expand the role of language teachers.
- Are problem-oriented.
- Involve many aspects, not just the cognitive.
- Can be taught
- Are flexible.
- Are influenced by a variety of factors.
Oxford classified learning strategies into six groups: Memory-Related, Cognitive, Compensation, Meta-Cognitive, Affective, And Social Strategies. The classification framework of learning strategies came into being from some researchers’ efforts for determining the characteristics of the “good language learner” (Naiman et al. 1978; Kupin 1975; Stern, 1975).

Ellis (1994) declared that Oxford’s taxonomy is “perhaps the most comprehensive classification of learning strategies to date”.

In Oxford’s language learning strategies taxonomy, language-learning strategies are divided into two big categories: direct and indirect strategies. (See figure (2:1)).

Oxford (1990), the direct language learning strategies is “directly involve the subject matter”. In that sense, “all direct strategies require mental processing of the language. As for the indirect language learning strategies, they “do not directly involve the subject matter itself, but are essential to language learning nonetheless”.
Figure 2:1 Oxford’s classification of Language Learning Strategies

The category of Direct Strategies is further divided into three subcategories, including (a) Memory-Strategies, (b) Cognitive Strategies, and (c) Compensation Strategies. Similar to direct strategies, the category of indirect strategies is also divided into three categories, including (a) Meta-Cognitive Strategies, (b) Affective Strategies, and (c) Social Strategies.
Here are, below, the definitions Oxford provided in 1998, 2001 (pp. 363-365), and 2003 for each set of strategies:

**Memory-Related Strategies**

They help the learner link one L2 item or concept with another but do not necessarily involve deep understanding. Various memory-related strategies enable the learner to retrieve information in an orderly string (e.g., acronyms), while other techniques create learning and retrieval via sounds (e.g., rhyming), images (e.g., a mental picture of the word itself or the meaning of the word), a combination of sounds and images (e.g., the keyword method), body movement (e.g., total physical response), mechanical means (e.g., flashcards), or location (e.g., on a page or blackboard).

Memory-Related Strategies would be used by creating mental linkages, such as grouping and placing words in context; applying images and sounds to represent things in memory; structured reviewing; using mechanical techniques such as physical response, etc.

**Cognitive Strategies**

According to Oxford (1998), Cognitive Strategies enables the learner to manipulate the language material in direct ways, e.g., through reasoning, analysis, note-taking, summarizing, synthesizing, outlining, recognizing information to develop stronger schemas (knowledge structures), practicing in naturalistic settings, and practicing structures and sounds formally.

Cognitive Strategies would be used by practicing and repeating new words, deductive reasoning, translation, analyzing; taking-notes, highlighting,
summarizing, imitating native speakers, starting conversations in the target language, practicing sounds, using words in different ways, watching TV shows or going to movies spoken in the target language, reading for pleasure in the TL, skimming passages first then going back and reading them carefully, looking for words in native language that are similar to new words being studied, trying to find patterns, finding the meaning of a word by chunking, and trying to avoid literal translation.

**Compensation Strategies**

They help the learner make up for missing knowledge. Those strategies involve guessing from the context in listening and reading, using synonyms and “talking around” the missing word to aid speaking and writing, selecting a topic for discussion based on one’s knowledge of the language and shaping the discussion to avoid unknown vocabulary, guessing at words based on context, using gestures, and coining words to communicate.

Compensation Strategies would be used by making wise guesses in listening and reading, making up new words, reading without looking up every word, trying to guess what people will say next, replacing words one cannot find with synonyms or descriptions, and, strictly for speaking, using gestures or pause words.

**Meta-cognitive Strategies**

They are employed for managing the learning process overall. Several studies of EFL learners reached the conclusion that meta-cognitive strategies
are often strong predictors of L2 proficiency (Oxford, 1998). These strategies are used to oversee, regulate or self-directed language learning. They involve various processes such as planning, prioritizing, and self-management.

Meta-Cognitive Strategies would be used by identifying one’s learning style preferences and needs, planning for an L2 task, gathering and organizing materials, arranging a study space and a schedule, looking for people to talk to in the TL, monitoring mistakes, evaluating task success, evaluating the success of any type of learning strategy, paying attention, setting goals and objectives, looking for opportunities to read, and evaluating one’s own performance and progress.

Affective Strategies

They are strategies such are identifying one’s mood and anxiety level and trying to control them, talking about feelings, rewarding oneself for good performance, and using deep breathing or positive self-talk.

Affective Strategies would be used by using music or laughter as part of the learning process, making positive statements about one’s own progress, discussing feelings, trying to relax whenever one feels afraid of using the TL, encouraging oneself to speak the TL even when one is afraid of making mistakes, writing down feelings in a language learning dairy, and talking to someone else about how one feels when learning the TL.

Social Strategies

They help the learner work with others and understand the target culture as well as the language. Social strategies are those activities learners engage in
which afford them opportunities to be exposed to and practice their knowledge. Although these strategies provide exposure to the target language, they contribute indirectly to learning since they do not lead to directly to the obtaining, storing, retrieving, and using of language.

Social Strategies would be used by seeking correction, asking for clarification, working/practicing with peers, talking with a native-speaking conversation partner, exploring cultural and social norms, and developing cultural understanding.

2.7.3 Strategies and Reading Skill:

According to Oxford (1990), all memory strategies can be applied and used to improve the reading skill. In Oxford’s view, strategies are applied to the reading skill in order to improve the overall language proficiency by benefiting the most from what is being read. Cognitive Strategies in reading include practicing by reading authentic material in and out of the class, repeating the reading of a passage to fully understand it, get the main idea, predict, and take notes, summarizing and highlighting. To help aid the comprehension process students are introduced to strategies such as skimming for main ideas and scanning for specific details, analyzing, reasoning, translating, transferring known information, guessing and using clues.

Ediger (2006) introduces the concept of good strategies users “strategic” reader. Pointing out that in order to use strategies effectively in reading readers
have to be “… primarily focused on the drive to obtain meaning from a text, not on using strategies”.

In addition to being “… aware of their purpose for reading…” and “know and utilize multiple strategies, including Cognitive, Meta-Cognitive, Affective, and other types, integrating and orchestrating their use in relation to each other, and then evaluating their effectiveness in achieving the purpose”.

The NCLRC suggests an activity that points out the usefulness of strategies in reading comprehension, by dividing students into two groups, and one reading passage. Except, one group has a title to the passage and illustrating pictures and the other one doesn’t. Students should be guided to understanding why the title and picture should make a difference. The strategies to be pointed out are activating background knowledge, making predictions about what to expect, and inference.

2.7.4 The Effect of Strategy Instruction on Language Proficiency:

Chamot (2005) stated that “although the majority of language Learning Strategies investigations have been simply descriptive, a number of researchers have conducted studies in which language learning strategies have been taught to students”. Indeed, this area of research is relatively new and researchers worldwide have just begun to tackle this issue and test strategy instruction in classroom experiments.
When O’Malley et al. (1985) conducted a strategy training study they found a negative result of strategy training. They started by randomly assigning 75 students to one of three instructional groups. The first group reviewed training in meta-cognitive, cognitive, and socio-affective strategies, the second group received instruction in cognitive and socio-affective strategies only, and the third control group received no special instruction in language learning strategies. The strategy instruction was administered for listening, speaking and vocabulary acquisition skills. It was discovered that the control group for vocabulary actually scored slightly higher than the treatment groups. The researchers explaining this unexpected finding as being due to the persistence of familiar strategies among certain students, who continued to use note repetitive strategies and were unwilling to adopt the strategies presented in training, especially when they knew they would be tested within only a few minutes. Therefore, general guidelines and limitations of previously conducted research in strategy instruction should be followed to refine researches in this field. Caution is also needed in interpreting strategy instruction results and the effect of many other factors.

Chamot (2005) stated a number of limitations of O’Malley et al.’s (1985) study that were avoided in following researches, “... the study’s short duration and absence of follow-up; the lack of measure of student’s use of learning strategies prior and subsequent to instruction; and the fact that researchers rather than the normal classroom teachers provided the instruction.”
Indeed, later on, many researchers found a positive effect of strategy instruction, but most of them focused on training students in a number of strategies that affect a specific skill. The effect of strategy instruction was investigated on listening skills (Carrier, 2003; Ozeki, 200; Vandergrift, 2003) and oral communication (Cohen, et al., 1989).

Furthermore, Strategy Instruction was conducted to test the effect on reading comprehension (Chamot & Keatly, 2003; Ikeda & Takeuchi, 2003), on vocabulary acquisition (Fan, 2003; Greenfell & Harris, 1999), and on writing (Cohen & Brook-Carson, 2001; Macaro, 2001). However, it is to find an intervention study that investigates the effect of comprehension strategy instruction on the overall language proficiency and motivation of students.

2.7.5 Language Learning Strategies Research in the Arabic Context:

The recent interest in strategy instruction research worldwide came as a second step after many descriptive researches defying the concept of language learning strategies and relating them to improve language proficiency levels. In the Arabic context, the issue of language learning strategies itself is relatively new. Therefore, strategy instruction is still rare and studies in this field are mainly descriptive in nature, relating strategy use to factors such as proficiency, gender, and attitude. Such researches were conducted in Jordan (Kaylani, 1996; Darubie, 2000) in Sudan (Ahmed, 1988), in Palestine (Shmais, 2003), and in Kwait (El-Dib, 2004).
However, a few studies were found on actual strategy training such as a study by Aliweh (1989) who conducted a strategy instruction study on 30 Egyptian English major students and used videotaped observations to investigate communication strategies. He reported that students showed the use of a slightly wider variety of strategies after strategy training. Dadour & Robbins (1996) also conducted a university level study of strategy instruction for speaking abilities for Egyptian EFL learners. The study used the Clear Oral Proficiency Exam (COPE). The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (Oxford, 1990), and the Style Analysis Survey (Oxford, 1993). The researcher designed a strategy instruction course which consists of 15 weekly three hour sessions. The results showed that the strategy instruction course significantly affected the speaking performance of the subjects in the experimental group. Moreover, the experimental group showed greater strategy use than the control group.

In the Saudi context, for example, strategies were investigated as early the late eighties as in the study by Al-Braik (1986). He found that learning strategies were one of four attributes associated with successful learning among 176 Saudi students. However, a more detailed research on language learning strategies was conducted by AL-Abdan (1993) as he used many instruments to investigate strategy use, such as language learner’s daily journals, “a think aloud task”, “observation by the researcher”, and “the SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) questionnaire” adopted by translated
from Oxford (1990). He found that cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies are the most employed strategies and explains that this might be attributed to their relation to the educational system in which the Saudi students are learning the English language in classrooms. Moreover, low averages were found in the use of memory and affective strategies compared to other strategies. In the case of memory strategies Al-Abdan states that “this might be the result of neglecting the study of vocabulary, and he relates the cultural background of Saudi students with low rates of affective strategies”.

In addition, Al-Abdan (1993) concluded that one of the few researches found on learning strategies of 66 learners of Arabic as a Second Language in two Saudi universities. His findings indicated a high to moderate use of strategy like the current study’s findings among those subjects. The study related strategy that is used to the advanced level of learners and their strong motivation to learn the language. More descriptive studies were conducted in the Saudi context in the late nineties such as Almandil’s (1999) study which investigate “the relationship between the learning strategies used by Saudi female EFL learners coming from various educational backgrounds and proficient levels”. Using interviews and questionnaires, the researcher found “correlation between the use of learning strategies, the level of proficiency and individual variables such as motivation, age, attendance of private schools or
public schools, and extracurricular exposure to English”. All variables were found to be affected by the current provision of language teaching in Saudi Arabia which the study shed light on its weaknesses. The study reviewed the deficiencies in the current system and advocated a more flexible, communicative style of teaching, highly recommending strategy instruction to be integrated in the EFL curriculum.

In another study by Alwahibee (2000) focused on “the relationship between oral proficiency and language learning strategies among Saudi students was investigated”. As in all researches on this subject in the Saudi context, suggestions for teaching directly to policy makers in the ministry of education and English departments in Saudi Arabia were concluded. Alwahibee added tips for teacher who integrates strategy instruction into the curriculum whether in public schools or in at the college level. More research in this field was highly recommended, using different methods to investigate the effect of strategies on Saudi learners. Moreover, Al-Alkoby (2001) explored the vocabulary situation at the secondary school level in Saudi Arabian public schools in an effort to illuminate the strengths and weaknesses of the teaching and learning of English vocabulary. The results show that the lexical syllabus embodied in the official world list and textbook was insufficient and presentation of vocabulary aspects was limited to pronunciation and meaning. There was an inefficient use of vocabulary learning strategies which was considered a potential source of vocabulary learning failure.
Al–Otaibi (2004) examined “the language learning strategies of Saudi EFL male and female students in an intensive English language program”. Findings indicated that the participants generally used language learning strategies at a moderate level.

In addition, they revealed significant differences in strategy used based on language proficiency level and motivation. However, the questionnaire results did not show significant differences between male and female participants unlike the findings of the interviews which showed greater female strategy use, especially out of class-strategy. In addition, female participants utilized a more active approach to language learning, and were more inclined to communicate the English speakers. Finally, the findings revealed that teachers and teaching practices affect students’ motivation and strategy use. Taking one step further, a task-based study was conducted by Alhammadi (2004) examining “the relationship between Saudi female EFL learners’ strategies of organizing the mental lexicon and the quality of listening and reading comprehension”. The results showed that the proficiency level of students determines the strategies they employ. The study recommended that teachers should work hard to enhance the lexical, reading and listening strategies of individual learners, and provide instruction that cater for the individual needs.

Recently, an experimental strategy training research on Saudi female EFL students was conducted by Madkhali (2005). The aim of the study was “to train students on using four reading strategies and test the effect of such
training on their reading comprehension performance after the training course”. However, this additional training had no significant impact on their reading comprehension scores and students showed a decrease in their perception of strategy use too. The results of such studies encouraged the researcher to focus on conducting a general strategy training course rather than teach specific strategies in isolation, such a strategy training course would be more beneficial because it would give students general guidelines and training on how to call on all their resources in their language learning process as a whole when faced by a given language task. The aim would be to raise awareness of the thought and learning processes of the human mind.

2.8 Gender and L2 Reading

Existing research shows that motivation (Kaylani, 1996), cultural background (Oxford, 1996b), attitude and believes (Oxford et al. 1990), and gender (Kaylani, 1996) are some of the factors which influence the choice of strategies used among students learning a foreign language.

It must be pointed out; however, of all the international studies dealing with Language Learning Strategies probably the most often tested variable is that of gender and how it affects strategy use. In fact, gender was tested as a second independent variable in a majority of the studies and has been the focus of much attention in the field of strategy research ever since the publication of “Vive le Difference? Reflections on sex differences in Use of Language Learning Strategies” (Oxford et al., 1988). Since Oxford’s call for more
research in the area of gender and Language Learning Strategies has been reached, a number of studies have been conducted worldwide, mostly reporting higher strategy use among females. Studies reporting greater strategy use by female participants include observations from the US (Ehrman and Oxford, 1989; Oxford and Nyikos, 1989; Zuobir Shaw and Oxford, 1995), from Japan (Watanabe, 1990), from Taiwan (Wang, 2002), from China (Sy, 1994), and from Puerto Rico (Green and Oxford, 1995).

In recent years, a number of SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) - based studies have also surprisingly revealed no significant gender differences in strategy use. For example, a study conducted in Malaysia (Hashmi and Sahil, 1994) showed no significant differences between male and female students in overall strategy use, although it did indicate a slightly higher use of affective strategies by females. Similarly, no significant gender differences were found in overall strategy use in a study coming out of Lebanon. However, the females there did score higher in certain individual strategy categories (Salem, 2006). Likewise, no significant gender differences were found in a strategy study in Palestine (Shmais, 2003) or in what was probably the first strategy study conducted in Saudi Arabia (Al-Otaibi, 2004). Similar studies from Taiwan, (Luo, 1989; Peng, 2001) have also reported no significant gender differences, but were later disputed by Wang’s (2002) study.
In another Thai study (Phakiti, 2003), no differences were found between male and female respondents in the use of cognitive studies.

Interesting enough, a study published in Turkey has reported higher use among males in overall strategy use. However, the researcher in that study cites cultural reasons which might explain over-reporting on the part of male subjects and under-reporting by females. According to the researcher, a possible explanation for higher male scores could have less to do with actual strategy use and more to do with low female self-esteem and over-confidence of the men in a “male-dominated Turkish society” (Tercanlioglu, 2004, p8).

2.9 Studies on Language Learning Strategies:

Chia – Ti Tseng (1997) in his research paper “How do Good Language Learners Learn English in Taiwan?” investigated the Language Learning strategies employed by advanced EFL learners in Taiwan. The study attends to find out their overall use of the Language Learning Strategies, and examines how they apply Language Learning Strategies in a variety of tasks and with different English sub skills. This study also examines gender differences in the use of Language Learning Strategies among these advanced EFL learners. The results indicated that these advanced EFL learners have employed a variety of Language Learning Strategies in learning English. Particularly, their high use of meta-cognitive strategies has made them efficiently plan, monitor, and orchestrate different strategies for different language tasks. The most frequently strategies used revealed in this study were meta-cognitive strategies.
and the least were affective strategies. In order to examine gender differences in relation to the use of Language Learning Strategies, independent T-test was performed and the result of analysis showed no significant differences between male and female participants in their overall Language Learning strategy use. Overall mean differences indicated that male participants used more Language Learning Strategies than female participants.

Kate Tzuching Chen (1997) presented this study “Understanding Taiwanese College Students’ Strategies for English Language Learning” showing that different students have different degrees of success in learning English as a foreign language. Since students may not accomplish the study goals probably without an understanding of learning strategies, Kate concluded that Taiwanese college students use language learning strategies included in the English Learning Strategy questionnaire with moderate to low frequency. Students’ gender, grade level, and high school background significantly influence some of the strategies they use. Therefore, Kate suggested that Taiwanese students tend to favor translation strategies that would help them to better understand the language and meta-cognitive strategies that help them to reflect upon their English learning process.

Nae-Dong Yang (1999) presented his study “The Relationship between EFL Learners’ Beliefs and Learning Strategy Use” by investigating the relationship between college EFL students’ beliefs about language learning and their use of learning strategies. This study found that language learners’ self-efficacy beliefs about learning English were strongly related to their use of all
types of learning strategies, especially functional practice strategies. Also, learners’ beliefs about the value and nature of learning spoken English were closely linked to their use of formal oral practice strategies. The results of this study suggested cyclical relationships between learners’ beliefs and strategy use.

**Chen, I., (2002)** stated a study “Language Learning Strategies used by High and Low English Proficiency Students in a Technology College” and investigated the language learning strategies used by 276 high and low English proficiency students at the Technology college level, and found that both high and low English proficiency students used compensatory strategies most frequently; high English proficiency seldom used memory strategies; low English proficiency students employed cognitive strategies the least frequently.

**Lee Kyung Ok (2002)** in his study “The Relationship of School Year, Sex and Proficiency on the Use of Learning Strategies in Learning English of Korean Junior High School students”, investigated the use of Language Learning Strategies of Korean Secondary School Students of EFL with a consideration of variables such as sex, school year, and proficiency. The major findings of this study were that the reported frequency of strategy use by students was moderate overall, with the students reporting most frequent use of compensation strategies and least of affective strategies. Females showed more frequent use of all six strategy categories than males.
Al-Nujaidi (2003) stated a study titled “The Relationship between Vocabulary Size, Reading Strategies, And Reading Comprehension Of EFL Learners in Saudi Arabia” and investigated the relationship between Reading Strategies, vocabulary size, and reading comprehension of EFL Saudi learners, he concluded that the perceived use of Reading Strategies shown by EFL learners in Saudi Arabia should be subjected to additional investigations. He added that the awareness of reading strategies may not necessarily mean that Saudi EFL learners know how and when to use these strategies. Thus, he recommended replications of his study, using think aloud protocols and interviews in examining the reading strategies of EFL learners, which, according to him, would provide important and more accurate details about the different aspects of EFL reading on Saudi Arabia.

Rahimi Mohammad, Raizi Abdolmehdi & Siaf Shahrazad (2004) in their study “An Investigation into the Factors Affecting the Use of Language Learning Strategies by Persian EFL Learners” and investigated the use of language learning strategies by post-secondary level Persian EFL learners. Their main concern in this study is paid to the variables affecting learners’ choice of strategies, and the relationship, if any, between these variables and learners’ patterns of strategy use. The results of the study point to proficiency level and motivation as major predictors of the use of language learning strategies among this group of learners. Gender, on the other hand, is found to have any effect, while years of language study appear to negatively predict strategy use. The different between learners’ use of the six major strategy
categories is found to be significant and indicates learners’ preference for meta-cognitive strategies. The results of this study highlight the fact that strategy use is a complex phenomenon that interacts with a number of variables. On the other hand, the present study shows that the context of the language learning plays an important role in determining the nature and extent of this effect. For example, certain aspects of the learners’ strategic behavior such as their perceived use of meta-cognitive and social strategies appear to have been influenced by the teaching approach adopted in the Iranian EFL classrooms.

Aziz Khalil (2005) in his study “Assessment of Language Learning Strategies” assessed the language learning strategies used by 184 university English as a Foreign Language learners in Palestine. His study also explored the effect of language proficiency and gender on frequency of strategy use. The findings of this study show that proficiency level and gender have a main effect on overall strategy use, but their effects on the use of each of six categories of strategies and individual strategies are variable. The finding as for gender differences means for females and males were completely different. These results show that female students reported significantly higher frequency of strategy use than did male students. The findings also showed that the mean for each of the six categories fell within the medium range of use by school students. This also shows that students reported a high frequency of use of meta-cognitive strategies. With regard to the effect of gender on the use of the six categories, the (ANOVA) indicated significant variation in the use of only
two categories, namely memory and meta-cognitive, favoring female over male students.

Chang, Ching-Yi & LIU, SHU-Chen & Lee, Yi-Nian (2007) designed a study titled “A Study of Language Learning Strategies used by College EFL Learners in Taiwan” in order to investigate the influence of gender and major on college EFL learning strategy use in Taiwan. The findings of this study were generalized by the researchers as follows: firstly, there was not a great difference among the frequency of each strategy that Taiwanese college EFL learners report using, all in medium-use level. Secondly, statistically significant differences were found in the use of cognitive strategies, meta-cognitive strategies, social strategies and overall strategies with regard to gender. Thirdly, statistically significant differences were found in the use of six sub-categories of language learning strategies and overall strategies with regard to major. According to the findings of this work, Chang, Liu, and Lee reported that teachers should help students cultivate and raise their awareness of language learning strategies. Once students are aware of advantages of using strategies in their language learning process, they will be willing to and appropriately employ these strategies to facilitate their English learning.

Abbas Zare-ee (2007) states a study titled “The Relationship between Cognitive and Meta-cognitive Use of EFL Reading Achievement” and examined the relationship between the use of cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies on one hand and EFL reading achievement on the other hand. The findings of this study suggest that the use of meta-cognitive strategies can
account for variation in EFL reading achievement and needs to be promoted by EFL teachers. Gender did not have a determining role in the use of either cognitive or meta-cognitive strategies in this study. The results of this study showed that the test takers use met-cognitive strategies more than cognitive strategies.

Aslan Oktay (2009) in her study “The Role of Gender and Language Learning strategies in Learning English” investigated the language learning strategies used by learners of English as a Foreign Language, aiming to find the amount of strategies and the domain differences of the strategies used; to reveal the link between strategy use and success levels; and to find out the differences in strategy use between genders and its influence on their achievement in English. The findings of the study mentioned revealed that the use of language learning strategies are positively effective in success in English, that females were significantly more successful than males in terms of achievement tests, and that they used more language learning strategies in learning English. Depending on the statistical results, it is discovered that there is a significant connection between gender, language learning strategies and achievement in English.

Feng Fang Li (2010) presented a study titled “A Study of English Reading Strategies used by Senior Middle School Students” and investigated the students’ awareness of reading strategies. Therefore, his study was based on the assumption that there is a moderate awareness of all the strategies; the students hold preference for Problem Solving Reading Strategies, followed by
Global and Support Reading in the combined sub-categories. Also, females show higher use of reading strategies than males in each individual category, as well as in the combined sub-categories. Furthermore, the females are more careful and considerate while males are more adventurous and bolder. Finally, the learners’ meta-cognitive awareness of reading strategies is closely linked to their language proficiency. Li’s study shows that learners show medium strategy use while reading. In this respect, females show greater awareness of reading strategies in all categories. Moreover, the high proficiency learners show more frequent use in all the three sub-categories and also in the individual reading strategies than low-proficiency students. Li declared from the findings of the study that several suggestions can be made to help teachers understand more about their learners and also to take actions to help learners improve their reading. First, Cultivating Cooperative Awareness, second, Using Different Methods to Treat Different Students, and finally, Reorienting Teachers’ Roles.

**Haifa Al-Buainain (2010)** in her study “Language Learning Strategies Employed by English Majors at Qatar University: Questions and Queries” held in Qatar University and published by Asiatic, Volume 4, No.2, discussed the type and frequency of Language Learning Strategies used by Qatar University English majors students. The results showed that the students used learning strategies with high to medium frequency. They preferred to use meta-cognitive strategies most, whereas they showed the least use of affective strategies.
Kamarul Shukri, Mohamed Amin, Nik Mohd Rahimi, and Zamri Mahmod (2009) in their study “A closer Look at Gender and Arabic Language Learning Strategies Use” investigated whether or not differences exist between female and male Arabic students in the use of language learning strategies. The findings of the study showed that there were significant gender differences in the use of language learning strategies as a whole. Female students also tend to use overall language learning strategies more than males. For categories of language learning strategies, there was significant differences between genders in the use of affective and metaphysic strategies with females using them more often.

Juan Zhoa (2009) in his study “Language Learning Strategies and English Proficiency” investigated the use of language learning strategies by undergraduate students in Taiwan: the extent of use of language learning strategy categories in the Oxford Taxonomy, and the relationship between the use of language learning strategies and English proficiency. He found that the students were medium users of overall strategies, Compensation strategy was the most frequently used, and Memory strategy category was the least used. A positive correlation was found between the use of language learning strategies and English proficiency.

Shr-Chang Huang & I – Chen Chen (2009) conducted a study titled “A Study of Language Learning Strategies used by Applied English Major Students” aimed to understand applied English major students’ language learning use and to investigate how factors such as academic level and gender
were associated with their language learning strategy use. The results indicated students in this study used learning strategies in the medium range. While the most frequently used strategies were social strategies followed by meta-cognitive, compensation, cognitive, affective, and memory strategies. As far as the effects of gender made no significant differences in overall strategy use and in any of the six strategies categories whereas academic level made significant differences in overall strategy use, cognitive strategy use, memory strategy use and compensation strategy use.

Mohammed Ashour Jhaish (2010) in his study “The Relationship among Learning styles, Language Learning Strategies, and the Academic Achievement” aimed to identify the learning styles and learning strategies of students at Al-Aqsa University students, to check whether there are significant differences in the learning style and strategy preferences between female and male learners, and to investigate whether there is a relationship between students’ learning style, strategy preferences, and the academic achievement among the English majors. Moreover, he aimed to identify whether there are gender differences in the preferences of learning style and Language Learning strategies. He found out that there are statistically significant between male and female in using language learning strategies and those meta-cognitive strategies were favored the most. When the students’ achievement test results were correlated with their learning strategies, it was shown that there are statistically significant correlation coefficient between achievement test and all strategies except compensation strategies.
Pezhman Zara (2010) focused in his study, “An Investigation into Language Learning Strategies Use and Gender among Iranian undergraduate Language Learners”, on determining the language learning strategies use of Undergraduate Iranian language learners in learning English as a Foreign Language. Moreover, this study resolves how the use of learning strategies varies according to gender. Pezhman found out in his study that Iranian Undergraduate EFL learners can be categorized as medium strategy users. Also, this study shows that the overall use of learning strategies significantly prevailed over males in the use of learning strategies. Female EFL significantly prevailed over males in the use of learning strategies.

LIU Jing (2010) presented a paper titled “A Study on Language Learning Strategies among the Instructed EFL Learners”. He presented this study to explore the language learning strategies use of instructed EFL learners. The implication of the findings is that language strategies training is necessary and EFL instructors may facilitate their students to become more effective learners by encouraging them to employ a variety of language learning strategies. LIU concluded in his study that the non-English major undergraduate students were able to describe their use of a wide range of learning strategies. Consequently, the most frequently used strategies were compensation strategies, while the least frequently employed strategies were memory strategies. Cognitive strategies, meta-cognitive strategies, memory strategies, affective and social strategies were the entire important impact factor on the EFL learning and demonstrated significant correlation with the
learners’ English proficiency. Moreover, meta-cognitive, memory, and cognitive strategies were the top strongest positive factors of language proficiency. LIU Jing recommended that the EFL instructors may facilitate their students to become more effective learners by encouraging them to employ a variety of language learning strategies, such as effectively planning, monitoring and evaluation; creating mental linkage and review well; practicing, analyzing and reasoning; guessing intelligently, asking questions, self-encouraging and cooperation. This kind of language learning instruction can be embedded into daily lessons so that it becomes an integral part of the regular class routine, rather than a supplementary activity so as to enhance the EFL learners’ learning effect and efficiency.

Adel Abu Radwan (2011), “Effects of L2 Proficiency and Gender on Choice of Language strategies” in his study examined the relationship between the use of language learning strategies, gender, and English proficiency by Omani university students. The findings of the study showed that Omani students used Meta-cognitive Strategies significantly more than any other category of strategies. Results of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) did not reveal any significant differences in the overall strategy use between male and female students.

Masoud Hashemi (2011) in his study “The Impact of Gender on Language Learning Strategies of Iranian EFL Learners” declared that there are many factors that has been found to influence students’ learning style and learning strategies. Gender is among a number of factors that influences the
learner’s learning styles and learning strategies. During this, Masoud, has tried, to show the language learning strategies among Iranian EFL learners and the important role that gender plays in the process of language learning. Despite the limited scope of the study, the results shows that male and female learners differ in the language learning strategies use. Masoud reveals in his study that Iranian EFL learners use social and cognitive strategies more than other language learning strategies. Memory and compensation strategies, on the other hand, which ranked the lowest, were mainly used by female learners. Regarding the role that gender plays in strategy use, the results of this study indicated that female learners use compensation and affective strategies more than male learners. Masoud’s recommendations, according to the results of this study, are to provide students with further opportunities to use language learning strategies more frequently. Furthermore, it is an obliged for a language teacher today to familiarize the learners with the most common language learning strategies.

Salim Razi (2012) conducted a study titled “Turkish EFL Learners’ Language Learning Strategy Employment at University Level” (published by Journal of Theory and Practice in Education, 2012, 8 (1): 94-119). This study mainly aimed to investigate the preferences of Language Learning Strategies by English Language Teaching Department Students. Moreover, to identify the impact of gender, class, and period of English study the use of strategies. Descriptive statistics indicated that the participants are highly users of Language Learning Strategies and mostly preferred compensation and meta-
cognitive strategies. However, T-test and post hoc test did not indicate significant differences among the participants in terms of their gender, age, and period of English study.