



NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

A Comparative Study: EFL English Major Students` Language Learning Beliefs and Language Learning Strategies Use via Non-Specialists

Submitted by:

Dr. Abdul Rahman A. Al Asmari & Nassra M. Ismail

English Language Center, Taif University, KSA

(The National Centre for Educational Research & Development)

(Egypt, Cairo – July 2011)

(A Comparative Study: EFL English Major Students` Language Learning Beliefs and Language
Learning Strategies Use via Non-Specialists)

ABSTRACT

This research aimed to make a comparison between EFL learners` language learning beliefs and using of language learning strategies between English major specialists and non-specialists. 547 students of English specialists Saudis university learners of English, 200 Scientific and 190 Arts students departments were participated in this study. The primary aims of the study were to explore: (1) whether there are any differences between English major specialists and Scientific-Arts non-specialists in their use of language learning strategies, (2) whether there are significant differences in language learning beliefs system and language learning strategies use between non- specialists learner groups (Scientific and Arts students departments), (3) which strategies do EFL English Major students` and non- specialists hold or prefer ? Students were asked to answer questions on the 4-point Likert-scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) through 4 (strongly agree) Belief Questionnaire and 5-point Likert-scale that ranged from 1 (Never) through 5 (Always) Learning Strategies Inventory. The results of one way ANOVAS analysis revealed that there are no differences between Scientific and Arts student departments in language learning beliefs. The results also reported that there are differences between specialists and non – specialists in learning strategies use, but there are no differences between specialists and non specialists in language learning beliefs except in subscale 2 and 4. The results of this study

showed that the most preferred strategy was Metacognitive strategies while the least preferred one was Memory strategies for both English major specialists and non-specialists. In light of these findings, the study provides a number of procedural recommendations that may contribute to raising the degree of language learning strategies use awareness and commitment to an educational innovation by learners.

Keywords: students` language learning beliefs, Language learning strategies, English major students, differences between specialists and non- specialists.

A Comparative Study: EFL English Major Students` Language Learning Beliefs and Language Learning Strategies Use via Non-Specialists

Dr. Abdul Rahman A. Al Asmari & Nassra M. Ismail ()*

Despite applying the scientific method in science class is still a difficult task, and verification. (Ghanem T., 2007)⁸.

This article aimed to make a comparison between EFL learners` language learning beliefs and using of language learning strategies between English major specialists and non-specialists. 547 students of English specialists Saudis university learners of English, 200 Scientific and 190 Arts students departments were participated in this study. The primary aims of the study were to explore: (1) whether there are any differences between English major specialists and Scientific-Arts non-specialists in their use of language learning strategies, (2) whether there are significant differences in language learning beliefs system and language learning strategies use between non- specialists learner groups (Scientific and Arts students departments), (3) which strategies do EFL English Major students` and non- specialists hold or prefer ? Students were asked to answer questions on the 4-point Likert-scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) through 4 (strongly agree) Belief Questionnaire and 5-point Likert-scale that ranged from

(*) English Language Center, Taif University, KSA.

1 (Never) through 5 (Always) Learning Strategies Inventory. The results of one way ANOVAS analysis revealed that there are no differences between Scientific and Arts students departments in language learning beliefs. The results also reported that there are differences between specialists and non – specialists in learning strategies use, but there are no differences between specialists and non specialists in language learning beliefs except in subscale 2 and 4. The results of this study showed that the most preferred strategy was Metacognitive strategies while the least preferred one was Memory strategies for both English major specialists and non-specialists. In light of these findings, the study provides a number of procedural recommendations that may contribute to raising the degree of language learning strategies use awareness and commitment to an educational innovation by learners.

Keywords: students` language learning beliefs, Language learning strategies, English major students, differences between specialists and non- specialists

Introduction:

Research on language learning beliefs (Wenden, 1986; Horwitz, 1988; Cotterall, 1995; Wen and Johnson, 1997; Wenden, 1999; Ellis, 2001), and language learning strategies (Abraham and Vann, 1987; Chamot and Kupper, 1989; Mori,1999; Na, 2007) is increasingly concerned with how they affect learning, and substantial evidence has now accumulated on the roles of language learning beliefs and language learning strategies in learning a second language (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Oxford, Lavine, & Crookall, 1989; Pintrich 2002, 1993; Zimmerman, 2000). Sinclair (2000) suggested that without an explicit and conscious awareness of the process involved in

learning a language, learners will not be in a position to make informed decisions about their own learning and that such awareness involves “a high degree of experienced choice with respect to the initiation and regulation of one’s own behaviour” (p. 9).

Review of the literature :

Language learning beliefs :

In the language acquisition context, beliefs have been defined as 'implicit theories' or 'self-constructed representational systems (Zare-ee, 2010). Understanding learner beliefs in this context is essential, since it has been noted that successful learners develop insightful beliefs about language learning processes, their own abilities, and the use of effective learning strategies, which have a facilitative effect on learning (Horwitz, 1999). Students can have 'mistaken', uniformed or negative beliefs, which may lead to a reliance on less effective strategies, resulting in a negative attitude towards learning (Victori & Lockhart, 1995; Sakalli, 2007). Students' beliefs are sometimes truly detrimental to successful language learning. On the other hand, eliminating erroneous learner beliefs is problematical, Kern (1995) reports that learner beliefs changed very little over one semester and were well entrenched.

Understanding learners’ beliefs about language learning and their use of learning strategies, as well as the factors which influence these beliefs and strategies use, is essential to planning appropriate language instruction (Horwitz, 1999). Ellis (2001) maintains that it is important to identify learners’ beliefs which relate to successful learning and beliefs which have a negative impact on language learning. He suggests that these

beliefs be used to develop self-awareness in learners. Wenden (1999) refers to beliefs as a subset of metacognitive knowledge. Although she acknowledges that the terms metacognitive knowledge and beliefs are used interchangeably, she claims that "...beliefs are distinct from metacognitive knowledge in that they are value-related and tend to be held more tenaciously.

Types of learner beliefs :

In an early attempt to identify the types of beliefs held by language learners, (Horwitz, 1987) administered the BALLI to groups of learners. Five general areas of beliefs emerged from the analysis of the responses relating to (1) the difficulty of language learning, (2) aptitude for language learning, (3) the nature of language learning, (4) learning and communication strategies, and (5) motivation and expectations. Wenden (1986) grouped the beliefs she identified in 25 adults enrolled in a part-time advanced-level class at an American university into three general categories: (1) use of the language (for example, the importance of 'learning in a natural way'), (2) beliefs relating to learning about the language (for example, the importance of learning grammar and vocabulary), and (3) the importance of personal factors (i.e .beliefs about the feelings that facilitate or inhibit learning, self-concept, and aptitude for learning). Both of these early studies, then, identified a very similar set of learner's beliefs. For example, the learners in both Horwitz's and Wenden's studies demonstrated beliefs about the need to study grammar. This dominant belief was also reported by Schulz (2001), who found that both Colombian learners of English in Colombia and American learners of foreign languages in the U.S placed great store on explicit grammar study and error correction .

Learners' beliefs are an important individual difference in second language (L2) learning (Li, 2009). Beliefs are both outcomes of formal and informal learning experiences and determinants of subsequent learning (Ryan, 1984). Beliefs influence both the process and product of learning. Also, like a number of other individual difference variables, they are dynamic and situated (in Ellis, 2008). The study of Kienhe (2008) indicates the possibility of changing domain-specific epistemological beliefs through a short-term intervention. However, it questions the stability and elaboration of domain-specific epistemological beliefs, particularly when the domain knowledge is shallow. Most language learning belief studies examine the effects of student beliefs on learning in general, but not specially on language learning strategies.

The sources of learners' beliefs :

Little and Singleton (1990) surveyed random samples of undergraduate and postgraduate students of foreign languages at Trinity College, Dublin. Little & Singleton (1990) found that 'past experience, both of education in general and of language learning in particular, played a major role in shaping attitudes to language learning'. The results of Li (2005) also suggest that there is significant difference between the learners who hold positive beliefs and those hold negative beliefs about the role of Rote Learning in vocabulary learning strategies. Ellis (2008) concludes by noting that teachers cannot ignore learners' beliefs or their own to help their students become aware of and to evaluate their own beliefs and to address any mismatch in their and their students' belief systems. And that they must work toward understanding and reconciling any differences in belief systems between teachers and learners. Oz (2007)

demonstrated that Turkish EFL learners have a broad range of conceptions both similar to and different from those reported in the current literature. Large numbers of EFL learners have misconceptions about learning English language. Some students overcome these misconceptions, but others do not.

The importance of beliefs

The importance of taking students` belief systems and learning strategies into account has recently been stressed by researchers (Wenden, 1986; Horwitz, 1988; Cotterall, 1995; Wen and Johnson, 1997). Pace , Marshall, Horowitz,, Lipson, & Lucido, (1989, p.214) have argued that if misconceptions students are associated with their beliefs, the misconceptions are more resistant to change. The nature and importance of beliefs about learning language educators have long recognized that learners bring to the language-learning task a complex set of attitudes, experiences, expectations, and learning strategies (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Benson, 1991; Stone, 1989). Within this complex web of variables are beliefs: beliefs about the nature of language, about the language-learning task, about likely outcomes, about learners' personal language learning strengths and limitations.

Beliefs are a central construct in every discipline which deals with human behavior and learning. In the psychological literature, there is a rich body of theoretical and empirical work on beliefs. Different, theoretical orientations and concerns have produced somewhat different views of the nature of beliefs (Dole & Sinatra, 1994). Beliefs are defined as "psychologically held understandings, premises, or propositions about the world that are felt to be true" (Richardson, 1996). While in cognitive

psychology, beliefs about learning are viewed as a component of metacognitive knowledge (Wenden, 1998). Flavell, (1979), (1985), (1987), for example, views beliefs as a part of self-knowledge, which includes all that individuals understand about themselves as learners and thinkers, including their learning goals and needs.

A related view comes from Alexander et al., (1991), who place beliefs and attitudes within the domain of sociocultural knowledge, on the basis of which new experiences and information are interpreted. In social psychology, Bandura's social cognitive theory (1986) indicates that people's previous experiences and personal beliefs will influence students' behaviors and a prominent view of beliefs is that they are understandings which arise from an individual's life history and educational experiences and which are the basis for value judgments (cited in; Dole & Sinatra, 1994). Also among these perspectives, are learners' beliefs about language learning, which are a result of a number of factors that shape one's thinking and belief formation, including past experiences, culture, context, and numerous personal factors (Bernat & Gvozdenko, 2005). However, Bernart (2006) stated that in her study it is rather the individuals' complex metacognitive structure, as affected by a number of social, cultural, contextual, cognitive, affective, and personal factors that is responsible for the shaping nature and strength of these beliefs.

Learning strategies

Learning strategies (or approaches) are the ways that individuals consciously intend to learn in order to achieve a set outcome. Many students of all ages have misconceptions about

how they can best learn and remember information; in other words, they metacognitively naive. In addition to teaching academic content, we should concurrently teach our students effective strategies for studying that content (e.g. elaborating, summarizing, monitoring comprehension) and give them sufficient practice and scaffolding to ensure their success in applying such strategies. Ultimately, we should help our students discover that school is more than just a place for learning isolated facts at a rote level (Gaber, 2005). Wenden (1986) also assured that what learners know about themselves and about their own learning process can affect their use of language learning strategies. Chamot and Kupper, (1989) discovered that effective learners reported a greater frequency and range of strategy use. Learners' level of strategy awareness also influences strategy use. Through teaching to our students, the researchers found that learners used only a narrow range of strategies and were generally unaware of the strategies they used. Therefore, in order to improve students' language learning, EFL teachers need to understand what language learning strategies students use and encourage lower proficiency EFL students to use language learning strategies in their learning process.

The research on language learning strategies shows that effective second language learners use a variety of strategies, while less effective learners not only use strategies less frequently but also often do not choose appropriate strategies for the task. Rubin (1975) states that a good language learner uses a more variety of learning strategies than does a less successful language learner (cited in Oxford, 1989). Graham and Harris (1990) report the need for explicit strategy

instruction in which students know what they are doing, why they are doing it, and how and when to apply the strategy to different situations. The obligation of the teacher is to teach strategies and encourage their use. While Pressley (1990) presents specific guidelines for teachers wishing to get started in teaching strategies. These guidelines include: (1) select a few strategies to teach; (2) use powerful methods of teaching; (3) motivate students to use the strategies they are taught; (4) encourage students to believe that they can become good information strategies processors; and (5) follow the initial success in teaching strategies, extend the approach in the curriculum.

There are three strategies that are mostly used in our universities; lecturing, questioning and problem solving (Al Kharashy, 2005). While the results of Liao (2006) hope to sensitize EFL teachers to various learning strategies involving translation and to the possible benefits of using translation for English learning reported by the students. Jinghui, et al., (2009) show that metacognitive strategies are essential for learners who wish to assume responsibility for their language learning and these strategies are positively associated with students' Chinese` FL achievement results. Reporting on language learning strategies used by students at different proficiency Levels, Wu (2008) finds that students of higher proficiency are more likely to employ learning strategies and identifies cognitive strategies as central to the relationship between language learning strategy and proficiency. Ellis (2008) concludes that if beliefs do impact on learning, it is likely that they do so indirectly by influencing the kinds of learning strategies learners employ.

Na (2007) concludes that the learners have different learning strategies, learning behaviours, learning aims and expectations one class. As a consequence, it is crucial for ESL teacher to use the appropriate strategies to teach English. Griffiths (2003) asserts that the effective use of language learning strategies contribute to successful language learning. Chen (2006) found significant relationships between grade level and language learning strategies. Mori (1999) found that the strategies students use for a language learning task more reflect their beliefs in related areas than their beliefs in general.

The relationship between beliefs and language learning strategies

Influenced by previous experiences as language learners, or shaped by their own cultural backgrounds, second language learners often hold different beliefs or notions about language learning (Horwitz, 1987). Many researchers have suggested that learners' preconceived beliefs about language learning would likely affect the way they use their learning strategies and learn a second language (Abraham & Vann, 1987; Horwitz, 1987, 1988; Wenden, 1986, 1987; Muis & Franco, 2009).

Aim and scope of the study

According to Rubin (1975), learners' use of learning strategies might be affected by the type of task, the age of the learner, the learning stage (beginning, intermediate, advanced), the learning environment, learning style, and cultural background. Many researchers have also studied the beliefs (e.g., Ryan, 1984; Dole & Sinatra, 1994; Ellis, 2008), and others have studied the language learning strategies (e.g.,

Chamot & Küpper, 1989; O'Malley, Chamot, & Küpper, 1989; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Oxford, 1993; Griffiths, 2003; Na, 2007) in different countries that learn English as a second / foreign language. Despite the fact that there are many studies conducted on the field of language learning strategies use and language learning beliefs, and to the best of the researchers' knowledge studying these variables across different specializations seem to highly underresearched, especially in EFL-major context and within Arabic contexts. As a result, the differences in language learning beliefs and language learning use between English major specialists and non-specialists are far from clear or conclusive in the Arab area at the university level.

And also as teachers for English as a foreign language for many years, we noticed that some students in English Dept. have low motivation and different beliefs. However, these beliefs are unlimited; positive or negative. In addition to, there is a kind of contradiction among the previous studies; some studies mentioned Asian students have strong preferences for memory strategies rather than communicative strategies such as working with others, asking for help, and cooperating with peers (Al-Otaibi, 2004; Bremner, 1998; Politzer and McGroarty, 1985; Wharton, 2000; Yang, 1999), while others argue that Asian students have strong preferences for metacognitive strategies and cognitive strategies (e.g. Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006). These thoughts on the students' beliefs and their learning strategies have inspired us this research to see to what extent there are differences in language learning beliefs and use of language learning strategies between English major students and non-specialists. So, this study investigates the

differences between specialists and non-specialist in beliefs and use of language learning strategies across different specializations; namely English major students, Scientific and Arts student departments. Thus, the present study has addressed the three following research questions:

1. Are there any differences between EFL specialists' and non- specialists' in language learning beliefs and their reported use of language learning strategies?
2. Are there any differences between Scientific and Arts student departments in language learning beliefs and their reported use of language learning strategies?
3. Which strategies do EFL English Major students' and non-specialists hold or prefer?

Purpose of the Study

The present study was to compare between students` language learning beliefs and language learning strategies use to learn English between specialists and non-specialists (i.e. beliefs about contemporary beliefs about a traditional orientation to learning English, beliefs about the quality and sufficiency of classroom instruction for learning English and beliefs about foreign-language aptitude and difficulty). (i.e. language learning strategies include memory, cognitive, compensation, meta cognitive, affective, and social strategies The investigation was based on language learning strategies (Oxford, 1990) and a modified model of language learning beliefs (Sakui & Gaies, 1999).

Significance of the study :

This research makes a worthwhile contribution to the present state of knowledge about language learning beliefs and use of language learning strategies in learning English as a foreign language using quantitative measures such as scales and inventories.

Sample of thw study:

Three different departments participated in this study (English, Science and Arts departments). The participants in this study included 547 undergraduate English major students (184 males and 363 females). Participants ranged in age from 19-29 years with a mean of ($M= 20.116$, $SD = 1.596$). 200 Science undergraduate students (103 males and 97 females) ranged in age from 19-23 years with a mean of ($M= 19.070$, $SD = 0.449$), and 190 Arts students (93 males and 97 females) ranged in age from 19-21 years with a mean of ($M= 19.053$, $SD = 0.267$) also participated in this study.

Instruments: Students` beliefs Questionnaire :

The researchers modified the beliefs Questionnaire that was used in Sakui & Gaies` (1999) study on assessing Japanese students` beliefs. Participants will complete 25 item Questionnaire that assesses the beliefs of the students that related to their learning of English. Principal components analysis, followed by varimax rotation, yielded a four-factor solution. These four factors together included 25 of the 45 items. Items (1-11) concern the beliefs about a contemporary communicative orientation to learning English; items (12-17) represent the beliefs about a traditional orientation to learning

English; items (18-22) represent the beliefs about the quality and sufficiency of classroom instruction for learning English; items (23-25) deal with the beliefs about foreign-language aptitude and difficulty. Students answered each item statement using a 4-point Likert-scale that ranged from 1 (Strongly disagree) through 4 (Strongly agree). The internal consistency reliability Cronbach's alpha is .96 for a 1200-person university sample and .95 for a 483-person military sample. Content validity is .95 (Oxford, 1990).

Item validity and internal consistency for beliefs Questionnaire in the current study:

The corrected item-total correlations ranged from 0.380 to 0.726 ($p < 0.01$), suggesting adequate item validity. While for the corrected item-Subscale 1 correlation ranged from 0.583 to 0.738 ($p < 0.01$), for the Subscale 2 correlation ranged from 0.488 to 0.746 ($p < 0.01$), for the Subscale 3 correlation ranged from 0.617 to 0.777 ($p < 0.01$), but for the Subscale 4 correlation ranged from 0.661 to 0.671 ($p < 0.01$), suggesting adequate item validity. The internal consistency was high for the total scale ($\alpha = 0.865$), as well as for Subscale 1 ($\alpha = 0.863$) and Subscale 2 ($\alpha = 0.751$), Subscale 3 ($\alpha = 0.732$), and Subscale 4 ($\alpha = 0.367$). The mean Total score was 73.580 (S.D. = 11.417). The means for Subscale 1 (M= 35.195, S.D. = 6.228) and for Subscale 2 (M= 17.755, S.D. = 3.757), for Subscale 3 (M= 12.965, S.D. = 3.537) and for Subscale 4 (M= 7.665, S.D. = 2.086).

Table (1) item-total correlations between items and total score for each factor for belief questionnaire

Item-total Correlations	Correlations	Items	Factors	Item-total Correlations	Item-dimension Correlations	Items	Factors
0.538**	0.626**	12	A traditional orientation to learning English	0.508**	0.583**	1	A contemporary communicative orientation to learning English
0.540**	0.724**	13		0.596**	0.738**	2	
0.538**	0.703**	14		0.478**	0.668**	3	
0.520**	0.746**	15		0.561**	0.732**	4	
0.543**	0.733**	16		0.497**	0.608**	5	
0.365**	0.488**	17		0.543**	0.631**	6	
0.411**	0.617**	18	The quality and sufficiency of classroom	0.540**	0.660**	7	
0.508**	0.699**	19		0.604**	0.641**	8	
0.404**	0.765**	20		0.464**	0.619**	9	
0.471**	0.777**	21		0.595**	0.729**	10	
0.395**	0.617**	22		0.545**	0.572**	11	
0.398**	0.661**	23	Foreign-language aptitude and difficulty				
0.437**	0.671**	24					
0.307**	0.662**	25					

Table (1) shows that all the values of item correlations with the total score for each sub factor is $p < 0.01$ or $p < 0.05$ and this indicates that items of the questionnaire have high internal consistency in measuring the students' beliefs.

Table (2) internal consistency for beliefs questionnaire sub factors

<i>Factor4</i>	<i>Factor3</i>	<i>Factor2</i>	<i>Factor1</i>	<i>Sub factors</i>
			1	Factor 1
		1	0.489**	Factor2
	1	0.344**	0.228**	Factor3
1	0.452**	0.299**	0.275**	Factor4
0.572**	0.630**	0.757**	0.827**	Total

P < 0.01

SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning)

In order to collect information on strategy use, Oxford (1990) 50-item Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL, version 7.0) was adapted for the study. The instrument consists of 50 statements. The 50 items in the SILL comprise 6 categories: Memory, Cognitive, Compensation, Metacognitive, Affective, and Social strategies. Items (1-9) concern the effectiveness of memory (memory strategies); items (10-23) represent the use of mental processes (cognitive strategies); items (24-29) are the compensation for missing knowledge (compensation strategies); item (30-38) deal with the organization and evaluation of learning (metacognitive strategies); items (39-44) concern emotion management (affective strategies); items (45-50) concern learning with others (social strategies). Students answered each item statement using a 5-point Likert-scale that ranged from 1 (Never or almost never true of me) through 5 (Always or almost always true of me). The questionnaires . were given out during

students' regular English classes in the winter semester, 2010. In this study the SILL questionnaire had an alpha reliability coefficient of 0.96.

<i>Item-total Correlations</i>	<i>Correlations</i>	<i>Items</i>	<i>Factors</i>	<i>Item-total Correlations</i>	<i>Item-dimension Correlations</i>	<i>Items</i>	<i>Factors</i>
0.598**	0.649**	30	Metacognitive strategies	0.557**	0.613**	1	The effectiveness of memory (memory strategies)
0.486**	0.655**	31		0.541**	0.632**	2	
0.450**	0.581**	32		0.414**	0.648**	3	
0.504**	0.604**	33		0.433**	0.608**	4	
0.571**	0.691**	34		0.370**	0.633**	5	
0.634**	0.681**	35		0.400**	0.636**	6	
0.627**	0.716**	36		0.455**	0.567**	7	
0.595**	0.715**	37		0.285**	0.431**	8	
0.552**	0.701**	38		0.358**	0.447**	9	
0.468**	0.629**	39	Affective strategies	0.548**	0.626**	10	Cognitive strategies
0.620**	0.620**	40		0.599**	0.638**	11	
0.505**	0.674**	41		0.565**	0.663**	12	
0.278**	0.531**	42		0.518**	0.553**	13	
0.328**	0.605**	43		0.594**	0.602**	14	
0.416**	0.604**	44		0.294**	0.374**	15	
0.319**	0.486**	45		0.487**	0.609**	16	
0.566**	0.739**	46		0.450**	0.536**	17	

<i>Item -total Correlations</i>	<i>Correlations</i>	<i>Items</i>	<i>Factors</i>	<i>Item -total Correlations</i>	<i>Item-dimension- Correlations</i>	<i>Items</i>	<i>Factors</i>
0.641**	0.744**	47	Social strategies	0.419**	0.513**	18	Cognitive strategies
0.513**	0.671**	48		0.478**	0.535**	19	
0.545**	0.708**	49		0.439**	0.506**	20	
0.584**	0.670**	50		0.440**	0.426**	21	
				0.240**	0.334**	22	
0.451**	0.659**	24	compensation strategies	0.451**	0.659**	24	compensation strategies
0.318**	0.584**	25		0.318**	0.584**	25	
0.418**	0.668**	26		0.418**	0.668**	26	
0.201**	0.492**	27		0.201**	0.492**	27	
0.539**	0.664**	28		0.539**	0.664**	28	
0.513**	0.582**	29		0.513**	0.582**	29	

Item validity and internal consistency for Strategy Inventory for Language Learning in the current study:

The corrected item-total correlation ranged from 0.380 to 0.726 ($p < 0.01$), suggesting adequate item validity. While for the corrected item-Subscale 1 correlation ranged from 0.431 to 0.648 ($p < 0.01$), for the Subscale 2 correlation ranged from 0.334 to 0.663 ($p < 0.01$), for the Subscale 3 correlation ranged

from 0.492 to 0.668 ($p < 0.01$), but for the Subscale 4 correlation ranged from 0.581 to 0.716 ($p < 0.01$), suggesting adequate item validity. The Subscale 5 correlation ranged from 0.531 to 0.674 ($p < 0.01$), but the Subscale 6 correlation ranged from 0.486 to 0.744 ($p < 0.01$). The internal consistency was high for the total scale ($\alpha = 0.928$), as well as for Subscale 1 ($\alpha = 0.753$), for Subscale 2 ($\alpha = 0.800$), for Subscale 3 ($\alpha = 0.658$), for Subscale 4 ($\alpha = 0.852$), for Subscale 5 ($\alpha = 0.663$) and for Subscale 6 ($\alpha = 0.754$). The mean Total score was 155.275 (S.D. = 32.510). The means for Subscale 1 (M=25.795 S.D. = 6.904), for Subscale 2 (M= 42.270, S.D. = 10.206), for Subscale 3 (M= 18.450, S.D. = 5.027), for Subscale 4 (M= 32.660, S.D. = 8.089), for Subscale 5 (M= 17.975, S.D. = 5.353), for Subscale 6 (M= 18.125, S.D. = 5.793).

Table (3) item-total correlations between items and total score for each factor for Language Learning Strategies Inventory

Table (3) shows that all the values of item correlations with the total score for each sub factor is $p < 0.05$ or $p < 0.01$ and this indicates that items of the inventory of language learning strategies have high internal consistency in measuring the students' language learning strategies.

Table (4) Internal consistency of language learning strategies inventory and its sub factors

<i>total</i>	<i>Soc</i>	<i>Aff</i>	<i>Meta</i>	<i>Com</i>	<i>Cog</i>	<i>Mem</i>	<i>Sub factors</i>
						1	Mem
					1	0.623**	Cog
				1	0.476**	0.369**	com
			1	0.499**	0.682**	0.443**	Meta
		1	0.557**	0.396**	0.540**	0.383**	Aff
	1	0.555**	0.578**	0.519**	0.583**	0.533**	Soc
1	0.790**	0.714**	0.829**	0.664**	0.882**	0.733**	Total
Mem (Memory strategies), Cog (Cognitive strategies), Com (Compensation strategies), Met (Metacognitive strategies), Aff (Affective strategies), Soc (Social strategies).							

Table (5) the differences between Science and Arts students in language learning strategies use and language learning beliefs

<i>sig</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Department</i>	<i>Subscales</i>	<i>Language learning strategies Subscales</i>
.063	388	-1.866	6.5731	25.0750	200	Science	(1) Mem	
			7.2231	26.3789	190	Literary		
.006	388	-2.785	10.7275	39.9750	200	Science	(2)Cog	
			10.4463	42.9632	190	Literary		
.349	388	-.937	4.9504	17.9200	200	Science	(3) Com	
			5.0497	18.3947	190	Literary		

Table (5)

<i>sig</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Department</i>	<i>Subscales</i>		
.077	388	-1.775	7.8597	31.7900	200	Science	(4) Met	Language learning strategies Subscales	
			7.9987	33.2158	190	Literary			
.005	388	-2.810	4.9456	16.7700	200	Science	(5) Aff		
			5.2160	18.2158	190	Literary			
.379	388	-.880	5.6266	17.8000	200	Science	(6) Soc		
			5.7101	18.3053	190	Literary			
.014	388	-2.469	32.0278	149.3300	200	Science	Total		
			33.1095	157.4737	190	Literary			
.503	388	.671	5.7791	35.8300	200	Science	Subscale(1)		Beliefs questionnaire subscales
			6.1077	35.4263	190	Literary			
.151	388	1.438	3.4202	18.2750	200	Science	Subscale(2)		
			3.7525	17.7526	190	Literary			
.087	388	-1.716	3.6282	12.1650	200	Science	Subscale(3)		
			3.6792	12.8000	190	Literary			
.984	388	.020	2.1095	7.8200	200	Science	Subscale(4)		
			2.1089	7.8158	190	Literary			
.782	388	.277	10.0081	74.0900	200	Science	Total		
			11.0638	73.7947	190	Literary			
Mem (Memory strategies), Cog (Cognitive strategies), Com (Compensation strategies), Met (Metacognitive strategies), Aff (Affective strategies), Soc (Social strategies).									

Table (5) shows that there are no differences between science students dept. and Arts students dept. in language

learning beliefs. While there are differences between science and Arts students in the use of learning strategies but in subscales 2 (cognitive) ($p < 0.01$, t ($df = 388$) = -2.785), for subscale 5 (affective) ($p < 0.01$, t ($df = 388$) = -2.810) and total scores ($p < 0.01$, t ($df = 388$) = -2.469) for the sake of Arts dept. the reasons behind that it might refer to that Arts students dep. have a good awareness of the importance of languages because this is a part of their study.

Table (6) the differences between specialists (English major) and non specialists (Scientific and Arts dept.) in using of language learning strategies and language learning beliefs and their sub scales

η^2	Sig	df	t	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	LEV	Subscales		
0.015	.000	935	-3.806	6.9193	25.7103	390	Non Specialists	(1) Mem	Language learning strategies	
				6.1665	27.3473	547	Specialists			
0.055	.000	935	-7.395	10.6831	41.4308	390	Non Specialists	(2) Cog		
				10.6466	46.6563	547	Specialists			
0.032	.000	935	-5.572	4.9982	18.1513	390	Non Specialists	(3) Com		
				4.7469	19.9433	547	Specialists			
	.054	935	-1.930	7.9496	32.4846	390	Non Specialists	(4) Met		
				7.1446	33.4424	547	Specialists			
0.027	.000	935	-5.098	5.1240	17.4744	390	Non Specialists	(5) Aff		Beliefs questionnaire subscales
				4.7820	19.1389	547	Specialists			

Table (6)

η^2	Sig	df	t	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	LEV	Subscales	
0.029	.000	935	-5.281	5.6657	18.0462	390	Non Specialists	(6) Soc	Beliefs questionnaire subscales
				5.4096	19.9771	547	Specialists		
0.0403	.000	935	-6.270	32.7718	153.2974	390	Non Specialists	Total	
				9.7975	72.9384	547	Specialists		
Mem (Memory strategies), Cog (Cognitive strategies), Com (Compensation strategies), Met (Metacognitive strategies), Aff (Affective strategies), Soc (Social strategies).									

Table (6) indicates that there are differences between specialists and non –specialists in learning strategies use for the sake of specialists; this indicates that English major students have a clear good awareness of English language learning strategies; this means that learning strategies were a part of their language learning process. Therefore, their choice of Foreign Language dept. from the beginning is a good manifestation and evidence for why they are good language learning strategies users than non – specialists.

However, there are differences between them in their beliefs towards learning English language but only in subscale 2 (beliefs about a traditional orientation to learning English) for the sake of non – specialists and in subscale 4 (beliefs about foreign-language aptitude and difficulty) for the sake of specialists. Gao (2006) asserted the influences of learning environment on strategy use over time.

Language learning strategies across the students` across different specializations

Table (7) which strategies do EFL English Major Students` and non- specialists hold or prefer?

Sig.	F	Rank	Maximum	Minimum	SD	Mean	Variable	
0.000	95.103	6	5.00	1.00	0.683	3.043	Mem.	Specialists
0.000		2	5.00	1.00	0.759	3.335	Cog.	
		4	5.00	1.00	0.788	3.328	Com.	
		1	5.00	1.00	0.789	3.721	Met	
		5	5.00	1.00	0.797	3.194	Aff.	
		3	5.00	1.00	0.902	3.334	Soc.	
			5.00	1.00	0.619	3.334	Total	
0.000	86.084	6	5.00	1.00	0.771	2.851	Mem.	Non specialists
		4	5.00	1.00	0.764	2.956	Cog.	
		2	5.00	1.00	0.834	3.019	Com.	
		1	5.00	1.00	0.887	3.603	Met	
		5	5.00	1.00	0.852	2.907	Aff.	
		3	5.00	1.00	0.941	3.002	Soc.	
			5	1.12	0.657	3.061	Total	

A one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) revealed statistically significant differences ($F = 95.103, p = 0.05$) in the overall use of strategies by English major participants (see Table 7). Specifically, the results LSD test revealed a

statistically significant difference in the use of memory and affective strategies compared to metacognitive, cognitive, social, or compensation strategies. These four categories ranked high in use ($M = 3.5-5.0$). The least preferred strategies were memory ($M = 3.043$) and affective ($M = 3.194$). The most preferred group of the six strategy categories for English major participants was metacognitive strategies ($M = 3.721$) followed by cognitive strategies ($M = 3.335$), social strategies, ($M = 3.334$), and compensation strategies ($M = 3.44$).

While for non-specialists, a one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) revealed statistically significant differences ($F = 86.084, p = 0.05$) in the overall use of strategies by English major participants (see Table 7). Specifically, the results LSD test revealed a statistically significant difference in the use of memory and affective strategies compared to metacognitive, cognitive, social, or compensation strategies. These four categories ranked high in use ($M = 3.5-5.0$). The least preferred strategies were memory ($M = 2.851$) and affective ($M = 2.907$). The most preferred group of the six strategy categories for English major participants was metacognitive strategies ($M = 3.603$) followed by cognitive strategies ($M = 3.019$), social strategies, ($M = 3.002$), and compensation strategies ($M = 3.019$).

Table 8
Preference of Language learning strategies by EFL English major students

<i>Mean</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Strategy statements</i>	<i>Strategy No.</i>	<i>Strategy category</i>
4.1499	1	I pay attention to someone speaking English.	32	Met
4.0841	2	I use my mistakes to help me do better.	31	Met
4.0823	3	I try to find how to be a better learner.	33	Met
3.8208	4	I try to find many ways to use English.	30	Met
3.7916	5	I watch TV or movies in English.	15	Cog
3.7477	6	I think about my progress in learning English.	38	Met
3.7130	8	I guess the meaning of unfamiliar words.	24	Com
3.7130	7	If I cannot think of a word I use a synonym	29	Com
3.6143	9	I use location to remember new words	9	Mem
3.6124	10	I divide words into parts I understand	21	Com
3.6088	11	I have clear goals for improving my English	37	Met
3.5576	12	I try to learn the culture of English speakers.	50	Soc
3.4973	13	I look for people I can talk to in English	35	Com
3.4808	14	I try to talk like native speakers	11	Cog
3.4680	15	I ask questions in English	49	Soc
3.4662	17	I use words I know in different ways	13	Cog

Table 8

<i>Mean</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Strategy statements</i>	<i>Strategy No.</i>	<i>Strategy category</i>
3.4662	16	I encourage myself to speak even when afraid	40	Aff
3.4625	18	I try to relax when afraid of using English.	39	Aff
3.4388	19	I say or write new words several times	10	Cog
3.4241	20	I ask for help from English speakers.	48	Soc
3.4077	21	I look for similar words in my own language	19	Cog
3.3693	22	I create images to remember new words	3	Mem
3.3601	23	I read for pleasure in English	16	Cog
3.3437	24	I start conversations in English	14	Cog
3.3400	25	When I can't think of a word I use gestures	25	Com
3.3391	26	I ask for correction when I talk	46	Soc
3.3309	27	I think of relationships	1	Mem
3.3144	28	I look for opportunities to read in English	36	Met
3.3108	29	I practice the sounds of English	12	Cog
3.3071	30	I use new words in a sentence	2	Mem
3.2815	31	I give myself a reward for doing well	41	Aff
3.2523	32	I make up words if I don't know the right ones	26	Com
3.2285	33	I skim, read, then read carefully	18	Cog

Table 8

<i>Mean</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Strategy statements</i>	<i>Strategy No.</i>	<i>Strategy category</i>
3.1993	34	I talk to someone else about how I feel.	44	Aff
3.1974	35	I make summaries	23	Cog
3.1792	36	I plan my schedule to have time to study.	34	Met
3.1792	37	I make mental pictures	4	Mem
3.1170	38	I review English lessons often.	8	Mem
3.1152	39	I practise English with other students	47	Soc
3.0987	41	I guess what the other person will say next	28	Com
3.0987	40	I ask others to speak slowly or repeat.	45	Soc
3.0622	42	I notice if I am tense or nervous	42	Aff
3.0329	43	I write notes, messages, letters, and reports	17	Cog
3.0091	44	I try to find patterns in English	20	Cog
3.0073	45	I try not to translate word for word	22	Cog
2.8519	46	I read without looking up every new word	27	Com
2.7093	47	I physically act out new words.	7	Mem
2.6910	48	I write my feelings in a diary.	43	Aff
2.3784	49	I use flashcards to remember new words	6	Mem
2.3766	50	I use rhymes to remember new words	5	Mem

For English major students ranks reported strategy use by individual item mean scores on the SILL for the entire sample;

results are presented in descending order from most to least used. The most used strategy by participants was a Metacognitive strategy, “I pay attention to someone speaking English” (M = 4.15). The least used item for the participants was memory, “I use rhymes to remember new words” (M = 2.38).

Table 9
Preference of Language learning strategies by Scientific and Arts student departments.

<i>Mean</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Strategy statements</i>	<i>Strategy No.</i>	<i>Strategy category</i>
4.2282	1	I pay attention to someone speaking English.	32	Met
4.2205	2	I try to find how to be a better learner.	33	Met
4.0231	3	I think about my progress in learning English	38	Met
3.8795	4	I use my mistakes to help me do better	31	Met
3.6051	5	I encourage myself to speak even when afraid	40	Aff
3.5974	6	I divide words into parts I understand	21	Cog
3.5923	7	I use location to remember new words	9	Mem
3.5282	8	I watch TV or movies in English	15	Cog
3.5205	9	I try to find many ways to use English	30	Met
3.4256	10	If I cannot think of a word I use a synonym	29	Com

Table 9

<i>Mean</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Strategy statements</i>	<i>Strategy No.</i>	<i>Strategy category</i>
3.4179	11	I have clear goals for improving my English	37	Met
3.3769	12	I try to talk like native speakers.	11	Cog
3.3256	13	I create images to remember new words	3	Mem
3.3077	14	I ask for help from English speakers	48	Soc
3.2821	15	I think of relationships	1	Mem
3.2744	16	I guess the meaning of unfamiliar words	24	Com
3.2615	17	I say or write new words several times	10	Cog
3.1641	18	I skim, read, then read carefully	18	Cog
3.1487	19	I try to relax when afraid of using English	39	Aff
3.1462	20	I look for opportunities to read in English	36	Met
3.0846	21	I try to learn the culture of English speakers	50	Soc
3.0769	22	I ask for correction when I talk	46	Soc
3.0513	23	I read for pleasure in English	16	Cog
3.0487	24	I give myself a reward for doing well	41	Aff
3.0462	25	I ask questions in English	49	Soc
3.0462	26	I look for people I can talk to in English	35	Met
3.0436	27	I look for similar words in my own language	19	Cog

Table 9

<i>Mean</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Strategy statements</i>	<i>Strategy No.</i>	<i>Strategy category</i>
3.0410	28	I use words I know in different ways	13	Cog
3.0026	29	I make mental pictures	4	Mem
2.9872	30	I notice if I am tense or nervous	42	Aff
2.9692	31	I make up words if I don't know the right ones	26	Com
2.9487	32	When I can't think of a word I use gestures	25	Com
2.9436	33	I plan my schedule to have time to study	34	Met
2.9359	34	I practice the sounds of English	12	Cog
2.9154	35	I use new words in a sentence	2	Mem
2.9026	36	I review English lessons often.	8	Mem
2.8872	37	I ask others to speak slowly or repeat	45	Soc
2.7769	38	I guess what the other person will say next	28	Com
2.7436	39	I start conversations in English	14	Cog
2.7205	40	I read without looking up every new word.	27	Com
2.6436	41	I physically act out new words.	7	Mem
2.6077	42	I practise English with other students.	47	Soc
2.6000	43	I talk to someone else about how I feel	44	Aff
2.5769	44	I try not to translate word for word .	22	Cog
2.5744	45	I make summaries.	23	Cog

Table 9

<i>Mean</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Strategy statements</i>	<i>Strategy No.</i>	<i>Strategy category</i>
2.3846	46	I try to find patterns in English.	20	Cog
2.1077	47	I write notes, messages, letters, and reports	17	Cog
2.0513	48	I write my feelings in a diary	43	Aff
2.0513	49	I use rhymes to remember new words	5	Mem
1.9462	50	I use flashcards to remember new words.	6	Mem

For Science and Arts major students ranks reported strategy use by individual item mean scores on the SILL for the entire sample; results are presented in descending order from most to least used. The most used strategy by participants was a Metacognitive strategy, “I pay attention to someone speaking English” (M = 4.23). The least used item for the was memory, “I use flashcards to remember new words” (M = 1.95).

Discussion

The differences between Science students` and Arts students` departments

This study tended to highlight the language learning beliefs and use of language learning strategies differences within participants of the same cultural background rather than their similarities. It would seem that a number of group differences exist and that the differences identified in the various Saudi groups (English major students, Scientific and

Arts students departments). One of the main purposes of this study was to compare between Science and Arts students` in language learning beliefs and use of language learning strategies. The findings showed that there are differences between them in the use of language learning strategies in subscales two (cognitive strategies) and five (affective strategies) and in the total scores also in favour of the Arts students. But this result was surprising, because assumed that the differences will be for the sake of Science students dept. because sciences require more use of professional English than a discipline like Arts where most research is conducted in Arabic. Similarly, thesis track students often publish in English, attend international conferences, and correspond with colleagues abroad, all which necessitate professional English, as opposed to non-thesis track students, who do so much less. This result does not fit with the results of (Elisha-Primo, Sandler, Goldfrad, Ferenz & Perpignan, 2010).

Whereas there are no differences between scientific dept. students and Arts dept. students in language learning beliefs; this might be explained in the light of the students sharing the same good perspectives for learning English Language and also because both have good English Language teachers staff (English native speakers) that give them sufficient instruction, try to improve their attitudes towards learning English Language and try to improve their communication in English. Moreover, Parks & Raymond (2004) mentioned that from the benefits of working with native English speakers such as opportunities for language developing and sharing of cultural knowledge.

The differences between English major specialists and non specialists (science and Arts dept.) in language learning beliefs and use of language learning strategies and their subscales

Specialization has effect on students` language learning beliefs and language learning strategies use. Thus, it is a determining factor in language learning. There are significant differences between specialists and non –specialists in learning strategies use in favour of English major students, but there are no differences between specialists and non specialists in language learning beliefs except in subscale 2 and 4. An explanation can be offered for some differences: that English language learners were clearly aware that learning strategies were a part of their language learning process that they may affect their performance. Strategy use reported by these learners indicated a high preference for metacognitive strategies. These results fit well with Hong-Nam and Leavell’s (2006) study that demonstrated the ESL students in an intensive English learning context preferred to use metacognitive strategies most, whereas they showed the least use of affective and memory strategies.

Language learning strategies across the students` different specializations

This study showed also that all the three departments participated in this study ; namely English language learners enrolled in the Foreign languages department, Scientific and Arts departments were clearly aware that learning strategies were part of their language learning process. Unlike other studies (e.g., Politzer, 1983; Reid, 1987) that were conducted in many Asian countries, strategy use reported by these learners

indicated a high preference for metacognitive strategies which helped them in directing, organizing, and planning their language learning (metacognitive strategies). This result fits well with the result of Hong-Nam and Leavell's (2006). On the other hand, the least favored strategies by English major specialists and non-specialists in this study were memory strategies and affective strategies.

Low use of memory strategies was initially surprising in that these are largely in keeping with instructional delivery systems typically employed in many Asian countries which are frequently didactic and emphasize rote memorization. However, further examination of the literature revealed that other studies have also had contradictory findings to this perhaps too common assumption that Asian students have strong preferences for memory strategies rather than communicative strategies such as working with others, asking for help, and cooperating with peers (Al-Otaibi, 2004; Bremner, 1998; Politzer and McGroarty, 1985; Wharton, 2000; Yang, 1999).

Conclusion :

This study provided a greater understanding of the language learning beliefs and language learning strategies use between English major specialists and non-specialists. Three main conclusions can be made based on the findings. First, there are no differences between Scientific and Arts students dept. in language learning beliefs. However, there are differences between Scientific and Arts students in the use of learning strategies in subscales two and five for the sake of the Arts students department. Moreover, significant differences in the Saudi students' use of learning strategies were found related

to specialization, namely English major specialists and Science, Arts specialists in favour of English major students. Third, all learners indicated a high preference for metacognitive strategies which helped them in directing, organizing, and planning their language learning (metacognitive strategies). Consequently, the teacher of these students can facilitate learning by addressing both content and process. For example, instead of handing out a simple list of 40 vocabulary words, the teacher can organize the terms in groups based on a unifying concept for each group. The teacher should also take a few minutes to tell students how and why the terms are organized as they are and how the graphic organization of the terms can have a positive impact on their understanding. This explicit attention to building strategic awareness in learners has been shown to be quite successful in enhancing their skills as learners (Keene and Zimmermann, 1997).

Finally, the present study was the first research attempt to compare learner beliefs and language learning strategies use across different specializations, namely English majors, Scientific and Arts students' dept in the Arab area at the university level.

Benefits from the research

For teachers, by investigating learners' language learning beliefs and language learning strategies about language learning can lead to more effective instructional planning and implementation. For learners, the process of exploring beliefs and language learning strategies can in the best of circumstances lead to more effective in- and out- of-class language-learning behaviors as well as greater self-knowledge

and autonomy (Horwitz, 1987, 1988; Victori & Lockhart, 1995; Matsumoto, 1996; Oxford & Green, 1996; Wenden, 1998).

Further research

Other questions that need further research are: when and how ESL/ EFL teachers acquire their beliefs? What is the association between ESL teacher beliefs and classroom practices? Do language learning beliefs have any effects on the learners` use of language learning strategies?

References

1. Abraham, R.G., & Vann, R.J., (1987). Strategies of two language learners: a case study. In: Wenden, A.L., Rubin, J. (Eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, pp. 85-102.
2. Al-Otaibi, G.N. (2004). *Language learning strategy use among Saudi EFL students and its relationship to language proficiency level, gender and motivation*. Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA.
3. Bremner, S. (1998). Language learning strategies and language proficiency: Investigating the relationship in Hong Kong. *Asian Pacific Journal of Language in Education* 1 (2), 490–514
4. Chamot, A., & Küpper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22, 13-24.
5. Cotterall, S. (1995). Readiness for autonomy: investigating learners' beliefs. In: Dickinson, L., Wenden, A. (Eds.), *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics: Special Issue on Learner Autonomy*, 23, pp. 195-206.
6. Dole, J.A., & Sinatra, G.M. (1994). Social psychology research on beliefs and attitudes: implications for research on learning from text. In: Garner, A., Alexander, P.A.

-
-
- (Eds.), Beliefs About Text and Instruction with Text. Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey, 245-264.
7. Elisha-Primo, I., Sandler, S., Goldfrad, K., Ferenz, O., & Perpignan, H. (2010). Listening to students' voices: A curriculum renewal project for an EFL graduate academic program. *System*, 38, 457-466.
 8. Ellis, R. (2001). Individual differences in second language learning. Retrieved February 12, 2004 from <http://english.nccu.edu.tw/academic/rodellis/lect3.doc>
 9. Ellis, R. (2008). Learner Beliefs and Language Learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 10 (4), 1-27.
 10. Gao, X. (2006). Understanding changes in Chinese students' uses of learning strategies in China and Britain: A socio-cultural re-interpretation. *System* 34, 55-67.
 11. Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language Learning strategy use. *System*, 31, 367-383.
 12. Hong-Nam, K. & Leavell, A. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System* 34, 399-415.
 13. Horwitz, E.K. (1987). Surveying student beliefs about language learning. In: Wenden, A.L., Rubin, J. (Eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, pp. 119-129.
 14. Horwitz, E.K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *Modern Language Journal* 72, 283-294.
 15. Horwitz, E. K. (1999). Cultural and situational influences on foreign language learners' beliefs about language learning: a review of BALLI studies. *System*, 27, 557-576.

16. Keene, E.O., & Zimmermann, S. (1997). *Mosaic of Thought*. Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH.
17. Kern, R.G. (1995). Learner beliefs of language learning revisited. *Foreign Language Teaching*, 3 (3), 62-75.
18. Li, L. S. (2009). Second Language Learners` Beliefs about Grammar Instruction and Error. *Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 91- 104.
19. Matsumoto, K. (1996). Helping L2 learners reflect on classroom learning. *ELT Journal* 50, 143-149.
20. Mori, Y. (1999). Epistemological beliefs and language learning beliefs: What do language learners believe about their learning. *Language Learning*, 49, 377-415.
21. Muis, K.R. & Franco, G.M. (2009). Epistemic beliefs: Setting the standards for self-regulated learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 34, 306-318.
22. Na, P. P.Q. (2007). Some Strategies for Teaching English to Multi-level Adult ESL Learners: A Challenging Experience in Australia, *Asian EFL Journal*, 9 (4), 306 – 322.
23. O`Malley, J., Chamot, A., & Küpper, L. (1989). Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 10, 418-437.
24. Oxford, R. (1993). Research on second language learning strategies. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 175-187.
25. Oxford, R., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 291-300.
26. Oxford, R., Lavine, R., & Crookall, D. (1989). language learning strategies, the communicative approach, and

-
-
- their classroom implication. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22, 29-39.
27. Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Heinle and Heinle, Boston, MA.
28. Oxford, R.L., & Green, J.M. (1996). Language learning histories: learners and teachers helping each other understand learning styles and strategies. *TESOL Journal* 6 (1), 20-23.
29. Pace, A. J., Marshall, N., Horowitz, R., Lipson, M., & Lucido, P. (1989). When Prior knowledge doesn't facilitate text comprehension: An examination of some of the issues. In McCormick, S., Zutell, J., Scharer, P. L., O'Keefe, P. R. (Eds.), *Cognitive and social perspectives for literacy research and instruction*. Chicago, IL: The National Reading Conference, Inc, pp. 213-224.
30. Parks, S. & Raymond, P.M. (2004). Strategy use by non-native –English-Speaking students in an MBA program: Not business usual! *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, 374-389.
31. Pintrich, P. R. (2002). Future challenges and directions for theory and research on personal epistemology. In B. K. Hofer & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Personal epistemology: The psychology of beliefs about knowledge and knowing* (pp. 389–414). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
32. Politzer, R. (1983). An exploratory study of self-reported language learning behaviors and their relation to achievement. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 6, 54–65.

33. Politzer, R., & McGroarty, M. (1985). An exploratory study of learning behaviors and their relationship to gains in linguistic and communicative competence. *TESOL Quarterly* 19, 103–124.
34. Reid, J.M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly* 21, 87–111.
35. Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9, 41-51.
36. Ryan, M.P. (1984). Monitoring text comprehension: individual differences in epistemological standards. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 248-258.
37. Sakalli, M. (2007). The Frequent Use of Teaching Strategies/Methods Among Teachers According to the Teacher Candidates Observation, *Cypriot Journal of Educational*, 2(1), 33-48
38. Sakui, K. & Gaies, S.J. (1999). Investigating Japanese learners' beliefs about language learning. *System* 27, 473-492.
39. Schulz, R. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 244–58.
40. Sinclair, B. (2000). Learner autonomy: the next phase? In: Sinclair, B., McGrath, I., Lamb, T. (Eds.), *Learner Autonomy, Teacher Autonomy: Future Directions*. Longman, pp. 4–14.
41. Victori, M., & Lockheart W. (1995). Enhancing meta-cognition in self-directed language learning. *System*, 23 (2), 223 – 234.
42. Wen, Q., & Johnson, R. K. (1997). L2 learner variables and English achievement: a study of tertiary-level English majors in China. *Applied Linguistics*, 18, 27-48.

-
-
43. Wenden, A.L. (1986). Helping language learners think about learning. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 40, 3-12.
 44. Wenden, A.L. (1987). How to be a successful language learner: insights and prescriptions from L2 learners. In: Wenden, A.L., Rubin, J. (Eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, pp. 103-118.
 45. Wenden, A.L. (1998). *Learner Training in Foreign/Second Language Learning: a Curricular Perspective for the 21st Century* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 416 673).
 46. Wenden, A.L. (1999). An introduction to metacognitive knowledge and beliefs in language learning beyond the basics. *System*, 27, 435-441.
 47. Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning* 50 (2), 203-243.
 48. Yang, N.D. (1999). The relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategy use. *System* 27, 515-535.
 49. Zare-ee, A. (2010). Associations between university students' beliefs and their learning strategy use. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 882-886.
 50. Zimmerman, B.J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: a social cognitive perspective. In: Boekaerts, M., Pintrich, P.R., Zeidner, M. (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 13-39.