International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science (IJLRHSS)
Volume 09 - Issue 06, 2026
www.ijlrhss.com || PP. 123-133

# Language Learning Strategies of Prospective Teachers*

*This article was produced from a master's thesis completed at the Institute of Educational Sciences, Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Türkiye

Derya Kiliç[1], Kenan Demir[2]
[1]*Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Curriculum and Instruction, Burdur 15100, Türkiye*
[2]*Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Curriculum and Instruction, Burdur 15100, Türkiye*

**Abstract:** The purpose of this study is to determine whether there is a significant difference between the language learning strategies used by prospective teachers who have just started at the Faculty of Education. The study was conducted with 417 first-year students studying in the Classroom, Mathematics, English, Preschool, Science, Computer and Turkish Language Teaching departments of the Faculty of Education at Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University in the 2017-2018 academic year. The study sample was created on the basis of easy accessibility and volunteering. The descriptive survey method, a quantitative research design, was used in the study, and data were obtained by using the " Strategy Inventory of Language Learning" (SILL). The inventory consists of 50 items including direct (memory, cognitive, compensation) and indirect (metacognitive, affective, social) strategies. The data obtained in the study were analyzed using parametric tests, independent (unrelated) samples t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), as they showed normal distribution and their variances were homogeneous. The study data were compared according to the students' university departments. As a result of these comparisons, it was determined that first-year English language teaching students preferred language learning strategies more than those in other departments. It was found that those studying in the classroom teaching department used these strategies more than those studying in the Science teaching department, and there was no significant difference at the 0.05 level between the scores of those studying in other departments.

**Keywords:** Language learning strategies, foreign language learning, strategy inventory for language learning

## 1. Introduction

Scientific and technological developments occurring in every field of human life have made it easier for individuals to transcend their physical and virtual boundaries; this situation has turned the world into a global village and made communication and interaction among people imperative (Batumlu-Uslu, 2006, p. 1). Thus, the necessity for nations to communicate with one another has required the use of a common language. With the advantage brought by the Industrial Revolution, English has filled the gap for a common language and has become a language used all over the world. Since learning English has become almost mandatory among virtually all nations, the importance of foreign language teaching has increased, and various theories, methods, approaches, and techniques have emerged to realize an effective and permanent language learning-teaching process. Particularly, the current developments and the searches that have arisen in parallel with these developments have caused the education-training process to be shaped within the framework of learner-centered and individual-specific approaches. This resulting situation has led to the prominence of the understanding that the educational process should be planned, executed, and evaluated according to the characteristics of the individuals (Davis, Christodoulou, Seider, and Gardner, 2009). Along with this learner-centered approach, it is stated that in foreign language teaching, the individual should be responsible for their own learning process, and emphasis should be placed on experiential learning and active participation for permanent learning. Furthermore, in this learner-centered educational process, learning-teaching processes in which the individual discovers and uses learning paths, strategies, and methods suitable for themselves have come to the fore. Weinstein and Mayer (1986) define learning strategies as thoughts and behaviors that explain how information processing operations are shaped by exploring the processes of selecting, organizing, and integrating the new information that students aim to acquire.

These thoughts and behaviors used in the learning process are strategies that play a fundamental role in achieving learning (Demirel and Kaya, 2006, p. 77). Learning strategies, which are an important factor in today's learner-centered teaching-learning approaches, are defined as thoughts and behaviors consciously used by an individual to achieve a specific learning goal (Chamot, 2005). Language learning strategies, on the other hand, refer to the methods and practices that individuals mostly use consciously in the foreign language learning process, making learning faster, easier, and more enjoyable (Oxford, 1990).

In the foreign language teaching-learning process, knowing what language learning strategies are suitable for the individual provides a positive contribution to both the individual as a learner and the teachers. It is clear that when individuals know their own language learning strategies, they will easily regulate their own learning process, planning, implementation, and evaluation processes, and achieve permanent learning. Similarly, teachers' awareness and even knowledge of how students learn and what learning strategies they use will be a driving force in enabling them to plan, implement, and evaluate the teaching-learning process centered around the learner. It is evident that language will be learned more easily and permanently in teaching-learning environments organized according to students' language learning strategies. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) also stated that students using language learning strategies by mastering their own learning processes is an important factor in foreign language learning. Individuals learning through methods most suitable for themselves and using the correct language learning strategies contribute to their more effective and permanent learning (Ehrman, Leaver & Oxford, 2003).

Although these strategies employed by individuals in the language learning-teaching process are fundamentally similar, they have been grouped by different researchers. O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Kupper, and Russo (1985) alongside O'Malley and Chamot (1990) examined these strategies under three groups as metacognitive, cognitive, and social/affective strategies. Oxford (1990) classified these strategies under two main headings and three subheadings to create the SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) as direct and indirect ones. Language learning strategies consist of two main headings, direct and indirect, and three subheadings that constitute them. Direct strategies encompass the mental processes related to the language planned to be learned and are directly employed in the language learning process. These strategies consist of three subfields as memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies. Indirect strategies, which are another field of the language learning process, are mostly expressed as strategies that facilitate the learning process without directly employing the foreign language to be learned, and they consist of metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. In this research, based on the classification of language learning strategies developed by Oxford, the language learning strategies used by those studying at the faculty of education were determined.

Although foreign language teaching in our country continues from the second grade of primary school until university, the failure to obtain results with the desired proficiency is a situation that also emerged in the studies conducted by Coşkun in 2015. However, there are many studies in the literature regarding how to achieve good results in foreign language learning, and the language learning strategies used by individuals are also of great importance within this scope. As Chamot and Kupper (1989) stated, this can be explained by the reality that while individuals who are successful in foreign language learning use different strategies suitable for themselves, those with lower success levels use fewer strategies or fail to choose strategies appropriate for their learning situation. Therefore, the results obtained from this research can offer suggestions that will enable the preparation of different teaching processes suitable for university students' language learning strategies and help students become aware of their own learning processes.

**Purpose of the Study**

In this study, it was aimed to determine whether the language learning strategies used by pre-service teachers newly starting the Faculty of Education differ according to the departments they study. In line with this general purpose, answers to the following questions were sought:

a. Is there a significant difference among the language learning strategies of students newly starting the Faculty of Education according to the departments they study?
b. Is there a significant difference among the direct language learning strategies—namely memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies—of students newly starting the Faculty of Education according to the departments they study?
c. Is there a significant difference among the indirect language learning strategies—namely metacognitive, affective, and social strategies—of students newly starting the Faculty of Education according to the departments they study?

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1 Research Model

In this study, the descriptive survey research model was used to determine the language learning strategies of students newly starting the Faculty of Education, to find out the rates and frequencies of using these strategies, and to answer questions such as whether the frequency of using strategies shows a significant difference according to the departments they study. The descriptive survey model used in the study refers to research conducted to reveal the existing situation by answering questions like "how much" and "how often" without affecting/being affected by variables such as location, person, and time involved in the research (Karasar, 2005).

### 2.2 Universe and Sample

The universe of the study was determined as students newly starting all faculties of education in Türkiye; its sample, on the other hand, consisted of students newly starting the Faculty of Education at Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University in line with the criteria of voluntariness and convenience. The study was conducted with a total of 417 voluntarily participating students, consisting of 300 females (72%) and 117 males (28%). The distribution of these students regarding the departments they study in is presented in Table 2.

Table1: Margin specifications

| *Departments* | *n* | *%* |
|---|---|---|
| rimary School Education | 83 | 19,9 |
| lathematics Education | 46 | 11,0 |
| nglish Language Education | 53 | 12,7 |
| reschool Education | 61 | 14,6 |
| cience Education | 60 | 14,4 |
| omputer Education | 42 | 10,1 |
| urkish Language Education | 72 | 17,3 |
| Total | 417 | 100,0 |

### 2.3 Figures and Tables

As indicated in Table 1, a total of 417 first-year students took part in the sample of the study, consisting of 83 from Primary School Education (19.9%), 46 from Mathematics Education (11%), 53 from English Language Education (12.7%), 61 from Preschool Education (14.6%), 60 from Science Education (14.4%), 42 from Computer Education (10.1%), and 72 from Turkish Language Education (17.3%).

### 2.4 Data Collection Tools

In the study, quantitative data were collected using the "Strategy Inventory for Language Learning" (SILL), which was developed by Oxford (1990:293) and adapted into Turkish by Cesur (2008:145). The SILL is a fifty-item inventory with five options. This inventory basically consists of two main domains, direct and indirect, and three subdomains constituting them. In this inventory, the extent to which participants use which language learning strategies is calculated through the scores obtained on an inventory basis, and it includes score values on a 5-point Likert scale ranging between 4.5–5.0 (always true) and 1.0–1.4 (never true) (Oxford, 1990, p. 300). The validity and reliability study of the inventory was conducted by Cesur (2008), and the internal consistency reliability coefficient was determined as .92. It was determined that the correlation values of the subscales constituting the inventory ranged between .67 and .82. The internal consistency reliability coefficient of the data obtained from the 417 students included in this study was found to be .953.

### 2.5 Data Analysis

In this study where the quantitative method was used, the descriptive statistics of the obtained data were determined by calculating the mean, standard deviation, frequency, and percentages. As a result of the normality and homogeneity tests performed on the quantitative data, parametric statistics, including the independent samples t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), were utilized.

## 3. Findings

### 3.1 Findings Regarding the First Sub-Problem

In the first sub-problem of the study, an answer was sought to the question, "Is there a significant difference among the language learning strategies of students newly starting the Faculty of Education according to the departments they study?" and the descriptive statistics regarding this question are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Mean scores obtained from the strategy inventory for language learning

| Language Learning Strategies | Teacher Training Departments | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1. *Classroom Teaching* (n=83) | | 2. *Mathematics Teaching* (n=46) | | 3. *English Teaching* (n=53) | | 4. *Preschool Teaching* (n=61) | | 5. *Science Teaching* (n=60) | | 6. *Computer Teaching* (n=42) | | 7. *Turkish Teaching* (72) | |
| | $\overline{x}$ | SD | $\overline{x}$ | SD | $\overline{x}$ | SD | $\overline{x}$ | SD | $\overline{x}$ | SD | $\overline{x}$ | SD | $\overline{x}$ | SD |
| 1. Direct | 2,81 | ,70 | 3,00 | ,81 | 3,56 | ,48 | 2,52 | ,74 | 2,67 | ,69 | 2,48 | ,60 | 2,56 | ,65 |
| - Memory | 3,06 | ,71 | 2,67 | ,66 | 3,46 | ,62 | 2,77 | ,91 | 2,48 | ,60 | 2,63 | ,71 | 2,79 | ,75 |
| - Cognitive | 2,63 | ,81 | 2,80 | ,83 | 3,58 | ,55 | 2,26 | ,76 | 2,7 | ,68 | 2,27 | ,67 | 2,28 | ,64 |
| - Compensation | 2,88 | ,86 | 2,38 | ,70 | 3,65 | ,60 | 2,78 | ,84 | 2,28 | ,73 | 2,74 | ,75 | 2,87 | 1,47 |
| 2. Indirect | 2,83 | ,79 | 2,60 | ,69 | 3,72 | ,51 | 2,53 | ,83 | 2,50 | ,60 | 2,51 | ,66 | 2,58 | ,68 |
| - Metacognition | 2,91 | ,96 | 2,78 | ,75 | 4,13 | ,62 | 2,60 | 1,04 | 2,64 | ,63 | 2,48 | ,79 | 2,69 | ,89 |
| - Affective | 2,73 | ,87 | 2,77 | ,88 | 3,06 | ,61 | 2,37 | ,78 | 2,44 | ,84 | 2,50 | ,64 | 2,35 | ,68 |
| - Social | 2,80 | ,80 | 2,55 | ,76 | 3,75 | ,70 | 2,51 | ,84 | 2,31 | ,69 | 2,57 | ,77 | 2,62 | ,72 |
| Total | 2,82 | ,70 | 2,77 | ,73 | 3,62 | ,45 | 2,53 | ,74 | 2,47 | ,66 | 2,49 | ,58 | 2,57 | ,60 |

When Table 1, which presents the scores obtained from the strategy inventory for language learning, is examined, it is determined that English Language Education students reached the highest mean score (3.624), while Computer Education students reached the lowest mean score (2.492). This situation shows that those in English Language Education use these strategies more intensively compared to students in other departments, and regarding sub-strategies, they prefer metacognitive strategies the most and affective strategies the least. Additionally, it is among the findings obtained that those in Mathematics and Science Education departments mostly prefer using direct strategies, whereas others prefer using indirect strategies.

The total scores obtained by the students from the SILL inventory were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and the findings are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Comparison of scores obtained from the strategy inventory for language learning according to departments

| **Source of Variance** | **Sum of Squares** | **df** | **Mean Squares** | **F** | **Significance Level (p)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 53,626 | 6 | 8,938 | 22,260 | ,000* (1-5) (3-1),(3-2),(3-4)** |
| Within Groups | 164,619 | 410 | ,402 | | |
| Total | 218,244 | 416 | | | |
| * p<0.05 | | | | | |
| ** 1. Primary School, 2. Mathematics, 3. English Language, 4. Preschool 5. Science, 6. Computer, 7. Turkish Language | | | | | |

Table 3 reveals that Primary School Education students prefer language learning strategies more than Science Education students, and students in English Language Education prefer them more than students in other departments. However, the scores obtained from the language learning strategies inventory by students in other departments do not show a significant difference at the 0.05 level.

### 3.2 Findings Regarding the Second Sub-Problem

In the second sub-problem of the research, an answer was sought to the question, "Is there a significant difference among the direct language learning strategies—namely memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies—of students newly starting the Faculty of Education according to the departments they study?" and the findings obtained as a result of comparing the mean scores attained by the students regarding this question on direct language learning strategies are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4:** Comparison of scores regarding direct language learning strategies

| Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Squares | F | Significance Level (p) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 48,212 | 6 | 8,035 | 19,070 | ,000* (3-1),(3-2),(3-4)** |
| Within Groups | 172,755 | 410 | ,421 | | |
| Total | 220,967 | 416 | | | |
| * p<0.05 | | | | | |
| ** 1. Primary School, 2. Mathematics, 3. English Language, 4. Preschool 5. Science, 6. Computer, 7. Turkish Language | | | | | |

As seen in Table 4, the scores obtained by the students regarding direct language strategies significantly

differ in favor of those studying English Language Education. This finding shows that those studying English Language Education prefer direct language learning strategies more than students in other departments.

The scores obtained by the students regarding memory strategies, which constitute the sub-domain of direct strategies in the second sub-problem of the research, were tested using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and the findings are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Comparison of scores regarding memory strategies

| Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Squares | F | Significance Level (p) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 25,821 | 6 | 4,303 | 7,668 | ,000* (1-6) (3-1),(3-2),(3-4), (3-5), (3-6),(3-7) ** |
| Within Groups | 230,111 | 410 | ,561 | | |
| Total | 255,931 | 416 | | | |
| * p<0.05 | | | | | |
| ** 1. Primary School, 2. Mathematics, 3. English Language, 4. Preschool 5. Science, 6. Computer, 7. Turkish Language | | | | | |

When examining the scores obtained from memory strategies indicated in Table 5, it was determined that Primary School Education students received significantly different scores than Computer Education students, and those in English Language Education received significantly different scores than students in other departments. This situation shows that those studying Primary School Education use memory strategies more than those in Computer Education, and those in English Language Education use them more than students in other departments. However, it was determined that the difference between the scores regarding memory strategies obtained by students from other departments included in the study was not statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

The scores obtained by the students regarding cognitive strategies, which constitute the sub-domain of direct strategies in the second sub-problem of the research, were tested using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and the findings are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Comparison of scores regarding cognitive strategies

| Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Squares | F | Significance Level (p) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 75,966 | 6 | 12,661 | 25,404 | ,000* (1-4), (1-7) (3-1), (3-2), (3-4), (3-5), (3-6), (3-7) ** |
| Within Groups | 204,336 | 410 | ,498 | | |
| Total | 280,302 | 416 | | | |
| * p<0.05 | | | | | |
| ** 1. Primary School, 2. Mathematics, 3. English Language, 4. Preschool 5. Science, 6. Computer, 7. Turkish Language | | | | | |

As seen in Table 6, the difference in score obtained from cognitive strategies by those studying Primary School Education was found to be statistically significant at the 0.05 level compared to those studying Preschool and Turkish Language Education. This finding shows that those studying Primary School Education use cognitive strategies more than those studying Preschool and Turkish Language Education. In addition, it is observed that the scores of English Language Education students obtained from cognitive strategies significantly differ from those of students in other departments, and they use these strategies more intensively. Among the findings obtained, it is also included that students studying in departments other than the aforementioned ones use/prefer these strategies at a similar level.

The findings obtained as a result of comparing the scores regarding compensation strategies, which constitute the sub-domain of direct strategies in the second sub-problem of the research, are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Comparison of scores regarding compensation strategies

| Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Squares | F | Significance Level (p) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 36,590 | 6 | 6,098 | 7,194 | ,000* (3-1), (3-2), (3-4), (3-5), (3-6), (3-7)** |
| Within Groups | 345,880 | 408 | ,848 | | |
| Total | 382,469 | 416 | | | |
| * p<0.05 | | | | | |
| ** 1. Primary School, 2. Mathematics, 3. English Language, 4. Preschool 5. Science, 6. Computer, 7. Turkish Language | | | | | |

According to Table 7, the scores obtained by English Language Education students from compensation strategies differ significantly compared to those studying in other departments. This finding indicates that the use levels of compensation strategies of English Language Education students are higher compared to those in other departments. On the other hand, no significant difference was detected among the use levels of compensation language learning strategies of students in other departments included in the study.

### 3.3 Findings Regarding the Third Sub-Problem

The third sub-problem of the research is formulated as, "Is there a significant difference among the indirect language learning strategies—namely metacognitive, affective, and social strategies—of students newly starting the Faculty of Education according to the departments they study?" To answer this question, the mean scores obtained by the students from the scale regarding indirect language learning strategies were compared, and the findings are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Comparison of scores regarding indirect language learning strategies

| Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Squares | F | Significance Level (p) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 62,252 | 6 | 10,375 | 20,679 | ,000* (1-5) (3-1), (3-2), (3-4), (3-5), (3-6), (3-7)** |
| Within Groups | 204,710 | 408 | ,502 | | |
| Total | 266,963 | 416 | | | |
| * p<0.05 | | | | | |
| ** 1. Primary School, 2. Mathematics, 3. English Language, 4. Preschool 5. Science, 6. Computer, 7. Turkish Language | | | | | |

When Table 8 is examined, it is observed that the scores obtained from indirect language learning strategies by those studying Primary School Education show a significant difference compared to those studying Science Education, and they use these strategies more. In addition, it was determined that English Language Education students prefer indirect language learning strategies more compared to those studying in other departments. It was found that students from other departments mentioned in the table use indirect language learning strategies at a similar rate, and the scores they obtained do not show a significant difference.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used in the analysis of the scores obtained by the students regarding metacognition strategies, which constitute the sub-domain of indirect strategies in the third sub-problem of the research, and the obtained findings are presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Comparison of scores regarding metacognition language learning strategies

| Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Squares | F | Significance Level (p) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 108,203 | 6 | 18,034 | 23,294 | ,000* (1-5) (3-1), (3-2), (3-4), (3-5), (3-6), (3-7)** |
| Within Groups | 315,870 | 408 | ,774 | | |
| Total | 424,073 | 416 | | | |
| * p<0.05 | | | | | |
| ** 1. Primary School, 2. Mathematics, 3. English Language, 4. Preschool 5. Science, 6. Computer, 7. Turkish Language | | | | | |

Table 9 shows that Primary School Education students received significantly different scores from metacognitive strategies compared to Science Education students, preferring these strategies more. Additionally, it was revealed that English Language Education students also use metacognitive strategies more compared to students in other departments. However, it was determined that there was no significant difference among the usage levels of metacognitive strategies of students studying in other departments in the research.

The mean scores obtained by the students regarding affective strategies, which constitute the sub-domain of indirect strategies in the third sub-problem of the research, were compared, and the obtained findings are presented in Table 10.

Table 10: Comparison of scores regarding affective language learning strategies

| *Source of Variance* | *Sum of Squares* | *df* | *Mean Squares* | *F* | *Significance Level (p)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 24,743 | 6 | 4,124 | 7,646 | ,000* (1-5), (1-7) (3-2), (3-4), (3-5), (3-6), (3-7) ** |
| Within Groups | 220,061 | 408 | ,539 | | |
| Total | 244,803 | 416 | | | |
| * p<0.05 | | | | | |
| ** 1. Primary School, 2. Mathematics, 3. English Language, 4. Preschool 5. Science, 6. Computer, 7. Turkish Language | | | | | |

When Table 10 is examined, it is observed that Primary School Education students use affective strategies more intensively compared to those studying Science and Turkish Language Education, and the scores they obtained from these strategies show a difference at the 0.05 significance level. It was determined that English Language Education students also use these strategies more compared to students studying in other departments. However, it was found that there was no significant difference among the usage levels of affective strategies of students studying in other departments, and their level of preferring these strategies was similar.

The scores obtained by the students regarding social strategies, which constitute the sub-domain of indirect strategies in the third sub-problem of the research, were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and the findings are presented in Table 11.

Table 11: Comparison of scores regarding social language learning strategies

| **Source of Variance** | **Sum of Squares** | **df** | **Mean Squares** | **F** | **Significance Level (p)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 59,962 | 6 | 9,994 | 17,292 | ,000* (2-4) (3-1), (3-2), (3-4), (3-5), (3-6), (3-7) ** |
| Within Groups | 235,792 | 408 | ,578 | | |
| Total | 295,753 | 416 | | | |
| * p<0.05 | | | | | |
| ** 1. Primary School, 2. Mathematics, 3. English Language, 4. Preschool 5. Science, 6. Computer, 7. Turkish Language | | | | | |

According to Table 11, it was determined that Mathematics Education students prefer social strategies more compared to those studying Preschool Education. In addition, it is observed that the scores of English Language Education students obtained from social strategies significantly differ from those of other departments, and they use these strategies more. Among the other findings obtained, it was found that there was no significant difference among the usage levels of these strategies of students from other departments participating in the research.

## 4. Conclusion, Discussion, and Recommendations

Language learning strategies are actions usually employed consciously by the learner, serving to make learning the target language easier, faster, and more enjoyable, and they constitute an important factor in the language learning process (Oxford, 1990). In order to determine the language learning strategies used by students newly starting the faculty of education, the 50-item Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) was used.

It was determined that the scores obtained from the language learning strategies inventory by the students included in the research significantly differed according to the departments they study, in favor of those studying English Language Education. It was concluded that students studying in the English department employ language learning strategies more intensively compared to those in other departments. This obtained result shows similarity in this context with the study by Zhou and Intaraprasert (2015), which states that individuals with high language proficiency use language learning strategies more intensively than those with

lower language proficiency. Furthermore, the results obtained by Tok (2007) in their study, indicating that the use of language learning strategies by English education students has a significant impact on their success, support the conclusion that those trained in this department use language learning strategies more. However, in the studies by Padem (2012) and Balcı and Durak Üğüten (2017), it was concluded that students studying in the preparatory class use language learning strategies at a medium level, and this result differs from the conclusion that language students use strategies more intensively. In addition to these, Uslu, Şahin, and Ödemiş (2016) determined in their study that there is a positive correlation between students' strategy use and their academic success. In this research, it was also determined that those in Primary School Education prefer language learning strategies more than those in Science Education, while students in other departments use these strategies at a similar level.

A significant difference was found between the departments studied by the students newly starting the faculty of education and their use of direct language learning strategies; it was determined that this difference was in favor of those studying English Language Education and that direct language learning strategies were preferred more by these students. On the other hand, it was found that students in other departments preferred direct language learning strategies at a similar level. These reached conclusions comply with the result of the study by Özmen and Gülleroğlu (2013), which states that individuals with high academic success employ these strategies more.

Among the obtained findings is that the scores obtained by the students participating in the research from memory language learning strategies, which are the sub-dimension of direct strategies, also have a statistically significant difference, and while those studying English Language Education use these strategies more intensively, the usage levels of students in other departments are similar; however, those in Primary School Education prefer memory language learning strategies more intensively than those in Computer Education. While these results overlap with the conclusion reached in the study by Özmen and Gülleroğlu (2013) that English learners use memory strategies most intensively, they contradict the result in the study by Chuin and Kaur (2015) that individuals studying in the field of English use these strategies at lower rates.

Regarding cognitive strategies, which are another sub-dimension of direct language learning strategies, a significant difference was found in favor of English Language Education students according to the departments, and this situation indicates that English Language Education students prefer cognitive strategies more compared to those in other departments. It is observed that Zarei and Baharestani (2014) concluded in their study that advanced English learners used cognitive strategies the most, which overlaps with our research result. In the study conducted by Yeşilçınar (2014), the conclusion they reached indicates that university students preferred cognitive strategies at a high rate, and this shows a difference with the result obtained in our research. Additionally, it was determined that the preference rates of these strategies among those in Primary School Education were higher compared to Preschool and Turkish Language Education departments; however, the cognitive language learning levels of students in other departments were found to be similar.

The usage levels of compensation strategies among direct language learning strategies showed a significant difference in favor of English Language Education students according to the departments studied, revealing that English Language Education students used compensation strategies more intensively. No significant difference was obtained among the usage levels of these strategies by students in other departments. The conclusion reached in Syahputra's (2014) study that students studying in the field of English used compensation strategies at a lower rate does not overlap with the result achieved in the research.

A significant difference was found between the participating students' use of indirect language learning strategies; it emerged that this difference was in favor of those studying English Language Education and that indirect language learning strategies were used more intensively by these students. It is among the obtained findings that those in Primary School Education used these strategies more compared to those in Science Education. No significant difference was detected among the preference levels of indirect language learning strategies of other departments. The result in Chuin and Kaur's (2015) study, stating that individuals educated in the field of English preferred indirect language learning strategies more than direct language learning strategies, shows similarity with our research result.

Regarding the preference status of metacognitive strategies among indirect language learning strategies and the departments studied by students, a significant difference was found in favor of English Language Education; this result indicated that the usage rates of metacognitive strategies of English Language Education students were higher. No significant difference was found among the usage levels of these strategies by students in other departments. It is another obtained result that students in Primary School Education preferred metacognitive strategies more compared to those in Science Education. These stated results overlap with the findings of Chuin and Kaur's (2015) study, which indicated that individuals in the field of English had a higher rate of preferring these strategies, and Syahputra's (2014) study, which showed that students in the English Education department employed metacognitive strategies the most.

Regarding the usage levels of affective strategies among indirect language learning strategies, a significant difference was detected in favor of English Language Education students across the departments they study, and this situation revealed that English Language Education students used affective strategies intensively. Furthermore, it was concluded that Primary School Education students preferred these strategies more compared to Science and Turkish Language Education departments, but the difference among other departments was not significant, and affective strategies were used at a similar level. The conclusion in Zhou and Intaraprasert's (2015) study that students with different language levels preferred affective strategies the most shows similarity with our research result. However, the result obtained by Hamamcı (2012) indicating that English preparatory class students used all strategies at a high level except for affective strategies contradicts the result of this study.

It was determined that the difference between the usage levels of social strategies among indirect language learning strategies and the departments studied was significant in favor of those in English Language Education, and this result showed that the social preference rates of English Language Education students were higher. While a significant difference was also detected between the usage rates of these strategies of those in the mathematics department compared to those in Preschool Education, it was determined that students from other departments included in the research used social strategies at a similar level. These reached conclusions are parallel to the result reached in the study by Hajhashemi, Shakarami, Anderson, Yazdi-Amirkhiz, and Zou (2013), which indicated that university third-year students mostly employed metacognitive and social strategies.

In conclusion, the results obtained from the language learning strategies inventory indicate that students studying in the English Language Education department use language learning strategies more intensively compared to those in other departments.

In light of the findings obtained from the research, the following suggestions are presented:

The individual, who is at the core of the learning process, being self-aware and controlling and managing this situation contributes to effective learning. Based on this fact, enabling individuals to become aware of language learning strategies suitable for themselves—so that they can consciously manage their foreign language learning process and achieve permanent learning—can be provided by offering courses related to language learning processes at universities.

In the research, it was determined that those studying English Language Education preferred language learning strategies more intensively compared to students in other departments. Based on this result, providing diversity such as educational environments, content, and activities that enable individuals studying in the English Language Education department to use language learning strategies more effectively can be suggested.

Specialists teaching in the English Language Education department receiving training on the instruction of language learning strategies may also provide positive contributions to the teaching process as much as the learning process.

## References

[1]. Ö. Balcı and S. Durak Üğüten, "Üniversite hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin kullandıkları dil öğrenme stratejileri [Language learning strategies used by university preparatory school students]," Littera Turca Journal of Turkish Language and Literature, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 41-54, 2017.

[2]. Z. D. Batumlu-Uslu, "YTÜ yabancı diller yüksek okulu hazırlık öğrencilerinin yabancı dil kaygılarının İngilizce başarılarına etkisi [The effect of foreign language anxiety of YTU school of foreign languages preparatory students on their English achievement]," Master's thesis, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, 2006.

[3]. M. O. Cesur, "Üniversite hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin yabancı dil öğrenme stratejileri, öğrenme stili tercihi ve yabancı dil akademik başarısı arasındaki açıklayıcı ve yordayıcı ilişkiler örüntüsü [The explanatory and predictive pattern of relationships among university preparatory school students' foreign language learning strategies, learning style preferences, and foreign language academic success]," Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, 2008.

[4]. A. U. Chamot and L. Küpper, "Learning strategies in foreign language instruction," Foreign Language Annals, vol. 22, pp. 13-22, 1989.

[5]. A. Chamot, "Language learning strategy instruction: current issues and research," Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, vol. 25, pp. 112-130, 2005.

[6]. T. K. Chuin and S. Kaur, "Types of language learning strategies used by tertiary english majors," TEFLIN Journal, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 17-35, 2015.

[7]. B. Coşkun, "Türkiye'nin Yabancı Dil Öğretimiyle İmtihanı Sorunlar ve Çözüm Önerileri [Turkey's Ordeal with Foreign Language Teaching: Problems and Solution Proposals]," SETA, Analiz No. 132, Ankara, 2015

[8]. M. G. Çoban, "Türkiye'de zorunlu eğitimde yabancı dil öğretimi [Foreign language teaching in compulsory education in Turkey]," İlke Politika Notları, no. 63, pp. 4-17, 2025

[9]. K. Davis, C. Christodoulou, S. Seider, and H. Gardner, "The theory of multiple intelligences," in The Cambridge Handbook of Intelligence, R. J. Sternberg and S. B. Kaufman, Eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, pp. 485-503..
[10]. Ö. Demirel and Z. Kaya, Eğitimle İlgili Temel Kavramlar [Basic Concepts Related to Education]. Ankara: Pegem Akademi, 2006.
[11]. M. E. Ehrman, B. L. Leaver, and R. L. Oxford, "A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning," System, vol. 31, pp. 313-330, 2003.
[12]. H. Hajhashemi, A. Shakarami, N. Anderson, S. Y. Yazdi-Amirkhiz, and W. Zou, "Relations between language learning strategies, language proficiency and multiple intelligences," Academic Research International, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 418-429, 2013.
[13]. Z. Hamamcı, "Üniversite hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin dil öğrenme strateji tercihleri [Language learning strategy preferences of university preparatory class students]," Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 191-197, 2012. (journal style)
[14]. N. Karasar, Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi: Kavramlar, İlkeler, Teknikler [Scientific Research Method: Concepts, Principles, Techniques]. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 2005.
[15]. J. M. O'Malley and A. U. Chamot, Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
[16]. J. M. O'Malley, A. U. Chamot, G. Stewner-Manzanares, L. Küpper, and R. P. Russo, "Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language," TESOL Quarterly, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 21-46, 1985.
[17]. R. L. Oxford, Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know. New York: Newbury House, 1990.
[18]. D. T. Özmen and H. D. Gülleroğlu, "Eğitim bilimleri fakültesi öğrencileri tarafından kullanılan dil öğrenme stratejilerinin bazı değişkenlere göre belirlenmesi [Determination of language learning strategies used by faculty of educational sciences students according to some variables]," Eğitim ve Bilim, vol. 38, no. 169, pp. 30-40, 2013.
[19]. S. Padem, "Üniversite hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin dil öğrenme stratejilerinin çeşitli değişkenlere göre incelenmesi [Investigation of language learning strategies of university preparatory class students according to various variables]," Master's thesis, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Duzce University, Duzce, 2012. (thesis style)
[20]. I. Syahputra, "Language learning strategies: gender and proficiency," Marwah: Jurnal Perempuan, Agama dan Jender, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 104-131, 2014.
[21]. H. Tok, "Öğretmen adaylarının kullandıkları yabancı dil öğrenme stratejileri [Foreign language learning strategies used by pre-service teachers]," Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi Araştırmaları Dergisi, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 191-197, 2007.
[22]. M. E. Uslu, E. Şahin, and İ. S. Ödemiş, "The effect of language learning strategies on academic achievement," Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 73-78, 2016.
[23]. C. E. Weinstein and R. E. Mayer, "The teaching of learning strategies," in Handbook of Research on Teaching, M. Wittrock, Ed. New York: MacMillan, 1986, pp. 315-327.
[24]. S. Yeşilçınar, "Identifying learner strategies of university students in an EFL context," Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 225-239, 2014.
[25]. A. A. Zarei and N. Baharestani, "Language learning strategy use across proficiency levels," i-manager's Journal on English Language Teaching, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 27-38, 2014.
[26]. C. Zhou and C. Intaraprasert, "Language learning strategies employed by English-major pre-service teachers with different levels of language proficiency," Theory and Practice in Language Studies, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 919-926, 2015.

## Author Profile

**Derya KILIÇ** received the B.S. degree in English Language Education from Ankara Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education, in 2010. She completed her M.S. degree and is currently pursuing her Ph.D. degree in Curriculum and Instruction at Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Institute of Educational Sciences, in Türkiye.

**Kenan DEMİR** received the B.S. (1990) and M.S. (1998) degree in Educational Measurement and Evaluation from Ankara Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education in Türkiye. He completed his Ph.D. degree in Curriculum and Instruction at same university. He has been working as a Professor Doctor at Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Institute of Educational Sciences, since 2009.