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ABSTRACT
To learn English language, there are some language-learning strategies, which learners need to be familiar with. Thus, the purpose of this study is to investigate the language learning strategies used among Iraqi sixth-grade preparatory students, and how could gender and proficiency level effect on using language-learning strategies. To analyze the collected data, SPSS software version 20 included Independent sample T-Test Besides, one-way ANOVA and Tukey HSD have been used. A total of 210 sixth-grade preparatory students were chosen randomly from four different secondary schools for the academic year 2016-2017 at al-Karkh side of Baghdad city. The study sample consisted of (105 females and 105 males). The findings revealed that EFL learners have shown medium use of language learning strategies, besides, no statistically significant differences between male and female students in the frequency of using LLSs. the findings also showed Cognitive and memory strategies were the most frequent used categories comparing to the compensation strategies that scored the least frequent category. As for language proficiency, the result showed that students with high proficiency used all six categories of learning strategies more than medium and low-proficiency students.

INTRODUCTION
There is no doubt that English language nowadays is conceiving as number one among the world’s languages. It has been termed as a global language for its wide usage in current business communication, navigation, science and above all that in scientific publication. Johansson and Jonsson (2006) stated that two thirds of all scientific publications are written in English language. Mastering English language gives an opportunity for learners to get a better job (Flanegin & Rudd, 2000). However, learning English language as stated over time is not that easy task to be mastered for many learners. In respect of this, numerous studies have found that there is a noticeable discrepancy of acquiring English language as a foreign or second language among learners: this significant difference among learners has triggered the attention of specialists over the world. Since the sixties of last century, numbers of social, cognitive, affective, and metacognitive domains were identified as crucial domains that contribute to learning second language (Brown, 2000). These domains have subsumed under the different types of language learning strategies such as memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, effective, and social strategies.

Language learning strategies known as applicable steps chosen by learners to enhance their language learning process and make it more enjoyable, faster, self-directed, active, and consequently, transfer their knowledge to more advanced level (Oxford, 1990). Boroujeni (2014) reported that two main objectives ascribed to use LLSs: they stimulate learners to apprehend and recognize the target language more efficiently, and the proper practicing of language learning strategies helps learner to enhance his autonomy in the process of learning without the assistance teacher. Rubin (1975) describes language-learning strategies as a set of useful techniques that employ to broaden learners acquired information; she also classified language-learning strategies into two types; these strategies that contribute to learning language directly and those that influence learning language indirectly. In a study of Oxford and Nyikos (1989) showed the positive correlation between learners’ success in acquiring second language and language learning strategies use. O’Malley, Chamot, and Russo (1985) found that LLSs have an enormous influence as effective factors on learners’ development process in getting a new language.

The disparity in learning language among learners could be attributed to a wide variety of potential variables might affect the use of language learning strategies such as gender, proficiency level, attitude, motivation, situation, anxiety, cognitive style, and self-confidence. Among these important
variables, two variables will be addressed in this study: gender and learners’ proficiency level and how they significantly affect the use of LLSs. As one of the variables that have a profound impact on picking up learning strategies, Green & Oxford (1995) reported that gender takes a substantial and vital role in language learning strategies use, they found that females tend to use more strategies than males do which is consistent with the result of Kato (2005) who examined EFL Japanese students. In his study, Tam (2013) investigated LLSs and its relationship to gender and learner proficiency level among university students. He found that males are less use of language learning strategies comparing to females who proved that they utilize LLSs more frequently and effectively in language learning process. Additionally, learners with high-proficiency level showed a high-score mean than those with low proficiency.

According to (Green & Oxford, 1995; Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995) reported that using language-learning strategies is explicitly related to the level of language proficiency. Many scholars and researchers (e.g. Kevin, 2013; Sawako, 2009; Carol, 2003; Chen, 2002) have shown that learners with high-proficiency level use significantly a considerable number of language learning strategies over learning process than those with low-proficiency level. Some other studies (e.g. Abraham & Vann, 1987; Chamot et al., 1988; Vandergrift, 1997) clearly revealed that low-proficiency learners are similar to high-proficiency learners are utilizing actively an abundant number of strategies, but they lack the knowledge of choosing the more efficient and appropriate strategies. The importance of doing this study emerged from the fact that language-learning strategies constitute significant practices through learning process that can not be overlooked by learners, Since they increase the skills of students’ performance and academic achievement, which is controversial matter in Iraqi context. Regarding the context of Iraq, there have been too few research studies considered the use of LLSs among Iraqi young students. Accordingly, this study is attempt to investigate the language learning strategies used among Iraqi sixth-grade preparatory students, and how could gender and proficiency level influence the use of language-learning strategies. The result of this study expects to contribute theoretically and practically to the literature. It could be used as reference for the future studies that deal with acquiring second language, as well as, it will raise students’ awareness, particularly Iraqi high school students, and teachers’ awareness of the usefulness of LLSs used in language learning.

Objectives of Study
1) To identify the extent to which Iraqi sixth-grade preparatory students use language-learning strategies.
2) To compare male and female students in using language-learning strategies.
3) To identify the contribution of proficiency to language-learning strategies use among Iraqi sixth-grade preparatory students.

Research Questions
1) What strategies do Iraqi sixth-grade preparatory students use more frequently?
2) Is there any significant difference between male and female students in using LLSs?
3) Are there significant differences between low, medium, and high-proficiency students in using LLSs?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Language Learning Strategies
As they defined by (O’malley & Chamot, 1990) group of advantageous techniques that second language learners use to enhance their own knowledge and generate better language. Tarone (1983) defined Language learning strategies as “attempts to develop linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the target language and to incorporate these into one’s inter-language competence” (p.67). Oxford (1990) defined language-learning strategies as group of taken actions that help language learner in his learning process to make it more effective, easy, interesting, and more transferable to new situation. She classified language-learning strategies into classes, each class included set of categories. Over years, this classification considers as a comprehensive one. It is noteworthy that both cognitive learning theory (Anderson, 1983; McIaughlin, 1987) and social cognitive theory (Vygotsky, 1978; Bandura, 1986) behind the derivation of second language learning strategies theories as well as they have offered the inspirations to utilize and develop learning strategies.

Language Learning Strategies Classification
This study used Oxford (1990) Language learning strategies inventory that classified into direct strategies that defined as these strategies that have direct effect at target language and necessitate mental processes; they include three strategies: memory, cognitive, and compensation strategy, as for indirect strategies, defined as these strategies that work on supporting and managing language indirectly. They consist of metacognitive, affective, and social strategy.

Table (1) below shows the classification of Oxford’s (1990) Language learning strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct strategies</th>
<th>Indirect strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Memory strategies</td>
<td>1. Metacognitive strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help learners to memorize and generate a new information effectively.</td>
<td>Enable learners to organize and evaluate their language learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cognitive strategies</td>
<td>2. Affective strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable learners to comprehend or create language using mental processes.</td>
<td>Support learners to aware their feelings, motivations and anxiety, and then learners can adjust into better ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow learners to guess or fill in the gaps caused by insufficient language proficiency.</td>
<td>Allow learners to interact with and learn from other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Previous Studies

Over the past few decades, numerous studies have been conducted to investigate language learning strategies use and how the use of these strategies could be influenced by some variables (e.g., gender, language proficiency, attitudes, individual traits, and some other variables). Ali & Devrim (2014) conducted a study to evaluate the relationship between language learning strategies use and variables such as language proficiency, gender, and the age of students. A total of 186 elementary and intermediate level students whom were attending preparatory classes were collected randomly from university of Pamukkale. The researcher had employed strategy inventory for language learning that developed by Oxford (1990) as a basic instrument to round up the required data. The study findings revealed that the adult students showed a moderate use of SILL; males and females did not show significant differences upon using learning strategies. As for proficiency level, the use of language learning strategies significantly related to the level of students’ language proficiency.

Kevin (2013) explored the contribution of language proficiency, gender, and the socioeconomic status of students to language learning strategy use. The researcher selected 50 new students from university of polytechnic in Hong Kong to provide this research with needed data. Kevin used two tools: SILL questionnaire version 7 that designed by oxford (1990) to measure LLSs used among students, and he also utilized the scores of English test to measure students’ proficiency level. The results of the study revealed that females use language-learning strategies more significantly than male do. As a result, females acquire second language faster than that of males. Additionally, the findings indicated that there is a positive correlation between students’ language proficiency and the use of compensation, social, and cognitive strategy.

Dongyue (2004) investigated the language learning strategies of Chinese university students who are learning English as a foreign language. Four-hundred-twenty-eight English major (male and female) students at Nanyang Institute of technology were served as the quantitative sample of the study. For data collection, the researcher employed strategy inventory of language learning questionnaire oxford (1990), and to determine students’ proficiency level, students’ examinations scores in listening and speaking were relied on. The research findings revealed that students with low-language proficiency use limited number of strategies; the case is different with those whom interest in high-proficiency level in English language. Furthermore, the research results showed that females use different strategies on their learning process than those that males use. Females proved more time, they use LLSs effectively and frequently in language learning process than those that males use. Females proved over 5 years.

Kevin (2013) stated, numerous important studies have utilized SILL that took various versions over time. The current research administered the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning version 7.0 that adopted from Oxford (1990) as the basic instrument to investigate the employment of language learning strategies among Iraqi sixth-grade preparatory students. It is a self-scoring paper-pencil
questionnaire that consist of six categories, each one has a number of items: (1) Memory strategy (eight items), (2) Cognitive strategy (11 items), (3) Compensation strategy (three items), (4) Metacognitive strategy (eight items), (5) Affective strategy (five items), and (6) Social strategy (five items). To lessen the misunderstanding of using the original version of SILL, It has been translated to the mother tongue of participants. The new-Arabic version was exposed to group of experts after some modification have been done; it observed as a reliable scale. The new-SILL Arabic version tabulated in 40 items with three-point Likert scale measuring the extent of using LLSs through learning process, it begins with (true of me) and ends with (never true of me). Oxford and Nyikos (1989) reported that in-depth reviews of literature were necessitated to put all these strategies together.

Table 1 shows the Alpha Cronbach’s analysis for each category of SILL and the entire questionnaire that found to be 0.71. The discrepancy of the reliability results depends on whether the survey administered in researcher own language or in the target language, but still accepted value even if the SILL’s reliability decline little when taken in different language Oxford and Burry-stock (1995).

As for the second instrument, the scores of students’ final exam in the English course for the academic year 2016/2017 have been used to measure English proficiency level, this exam represents a national-standardized exam that administers all over Iraq at the same time.

Data Analysis
To analyze the collected data, SPSS version 20 has been used. Descriptive statistics were implemented to answer question one that included the mean and standard deviation of all strategy categories used by subjects. Additionally, to determine if there is any significance between males and females on the level of using language-learning strategies, independent sample T-Test was used. Besides, one-way ANOVA and Tukey HSD were used to address the third research question, which is about the significance of proficiency level on language learning strategy use among Iraqi sixth-grade preparatory students. The statistical significance was measured at the level of 0.05.

RESULTS
This section presents the analysis of data that were collected to answer the research questions.

What Strategies do Iraqi Sixth-grade Preparatory Students use More Frequently?
To compare the means of language learning strategies that were used frequently by study subjects, a descriptive analysis was done. As indicated in Table 2, there are two categories fell in the range of high use: Cognitive strategies followed by memory strategies, both of them have reached very high mean scores (3.692) and (3.312), respectively. As for the lowest level of usage, compensation strategies reported to be the least used (2.001). Oxford (1990) defined mean score that register below 2.4 (M≤2.4) as a low use, and those fall between 2.5 and 3.4 (2.5≤M≤3.4) are considered to be medium use, as for mean score that register above 3.5 (M≥3.5) regard as a high use. Thus, the participants of study are categorized as medium strategy users since the overall mean score is (3.0935).

Is there a Significant Difference between Male and Female in causing LLSs?
To answer question two, independent sample T-test was used. As seen in Table 3, the mean scores reveal that male participants engaged in using strategies more frequent than female participants did. T-test results show statistically significant difference in the use of cognitive strategies (P=.015), metacognitive strategies (P=.005), and social strategies (P=.000) between males and females; the latter group employed these strategies less than the former did. On the other hand, Memory strategies (P=.491), Affective strategies (P=.568), and Compensation strategies (P=.875) did not show any difference between the two groups. However, the overall significance value (0.325) is higher than (0.05) which means no significant differences between male and female learners in using language-learning strategies.
Table 3. The difference between male and female in using LLSs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy category</th>
<th>Male group</th>
<th>Female group</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive strategies</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>4.381</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>3.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory strategies</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>2.545</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>2.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive strategies</td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td>4.191</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>3.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective strategies</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>2.359</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>2.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social strategies</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>2.364</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>2.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation strategies</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22.117</td>
<td>4.892</td>
<td>20.754</td>
<td>4.222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. One-way ANOVA results according to students’ proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memory</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>71.527</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.764</td>
<td>6.960</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1058.482</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>5.138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1130.010</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tukey HSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(I) Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there Significant Differences between Low, Medium, and High-Proficiency Students in causing LLSs?

To answer question three, one way ANOVA was used to examine if there is statistically significant difference among groups based on their proficiency level in using SILL. Further, the researcher used post hoc tests to identify which level is more significant when he finds statistical differences among groups through running ANOVA.

Memory strategy

To compare the using of strategies based on students’ proficiency level in English language, one way ANOVA was used. As shown in Table 4, there are statistically significant differences among proficiency levels in term of using memory strategies (F=6.960, P<.05). So as to find out which one of the proficiency levels is significantly different from other, post hoc tests have been used specifically tukey test to compare the means of students’ levels. The results revealed that there are two significant values (.001,.047<.05) high proficiency and middle proficiency respectively comparing to low proficiency level. For this end, we conclude that middle-proficiency students, as well as, high proficiency students use memory strategies more than low-proficiency students do.

Table 5. One way ANOVA results according to students’ proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compensation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2.010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>0.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>358.014</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>360.024</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compensation

As indicated in Table 5, the significance value is greater than 0.05 (P=.560). We conclude that there is no statistically significant difference between low, middle, and high proficiency levels in using compensation strategies.

Affective

Since the p. value has shown a higher score than 0.05 in ANOVA analysis as we see in Table 6. It can be concludes that using effective strategies did not have statistically significant differences among groups according to proficiency level.

Cognitive

Table 7 reveals significant differences among learners’ groups in respect of using cognitive strategies; the sig-
nificance score shows (0.000) which is less than (0.05). Thus, to identify which group among these three groups has a significant difference. It is necessary to run tukey HSD test. The results of multiple comparison analysis show significant differences of high proficiency and middle proficiency groups (.000,.000<0.5) comparing to low proficiency group. In short, both of high and middle-proficiency groups use cognitive strategies in learning English language more than low-proficiency group do.

**Table 6.** One way ANOVA results according to students’ proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>21.629</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.814</td>
<td>2.025</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1105.686</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>5.341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1127.314</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Metacognitive**

Table 8 shows the p-value of all groups is (.018); it is greater than (0.05) which means, there is a statistically significant difference among groups in using metacognitive strategies. So as to diagnose the multiple differences among the strategy users, post hoc tests were run. The multiple comparisons reveal middle-proficiency groups records a significant score (0.015, P<0.05) in comparison to high and low-proficiency groups (.611), (.150) respectively. In a brief, students with middle proficiency employ metacognitive strategies in learning language more than high and low-proficiency groups do.

**Social**

Since the p-value is (.003<0.05) as the ANOVA results presented in Table 9, it can be concluded, there is a statistically significant difference between high, middle, and low-proficiency groups in employing language learning strategies. Consequently, post hoc tests were used to determine group that use strategies more significantly than others do. The re-
The overall use mean of language-learning strategies has reported medium frequency. However, memory and cognitive strategies scored the highest mean comparing to the other strategy categories. These findings inconsistent with the result of study carried out by (Abid et al, 2010) who investigated the using of language learning strategies among Iraqi university students. They found that both metacognitive and social strategies were more frequently used by learners among the six categories of LLSs, on the other hand, the mean score of using LLSs’ by learners was similar to the current study at medium use. As for the less used strategy, compensation strategies is found to be the least category which comes to be in line with the result of Abid et al (2010) study. It is unlike to studies conduct by Liao (2000), Chen (2002), and Yang (1992) reported that learners have used compensation strategies greater than other categories of learning strategies.

In line with current study, Abid et al (2010), Hoang (2013), Henno (2012), Griffiths (2003), Cao (2009), Yang (2010), Dodour & Robbins (1996) found there is no statistically significant difference between males and females on overall language learning strategy use. This result contradicts with some previous studies that confirmed there is significant difference between males and females in using LLSs (Salahshour et al, 2013; Kevin, 2013; Lan & Oxford, 2003; Taguchi, 2002; Ehrman & Oxford, 1988). It is notable to mention that males revealed significant differences on using three categories (social, Cognitive, and metacognitive).

When we consider proficiency level, the findings revealed that the learners with low-language proficiency; the less frequently they use language learning strategies, and the learners with high-language proficiency; the more frequently they use language learning strategies. This result is compatible with results of studies conducted by (Kevin, 2013; Sawako, 2009; Carol, 2003; Chen, 2002) have shown that learners with high-proficiency level use significantly-frequently a considerable number of language learning strategies over learning process than those with low-proficiency level. Two-strategy categories out of six have shown no significant differences between high, medium, and low-proficiency levels of learners namely affective and compensation strategies. It means, despite the various-proficiency levels, students did not show any discrepancy in using affective and compensation strategies; they are not used to exchange feelings, praise others when they present an interesting performance, and talk about issues that engage them. Moreover, the idea of using guessing, gestures, and hands movements is not common through their attempts speaking English. It is clear evidence of lacking the knowledge that boosts them to use all language learning strategies. Oxford and Ehrman (1995) stated the significance of using compensation and affective strategies, since they help EFL learners to overcome the barriers that encounter them when they come to interact with others.

## DISCUSSION

In general, the overall use mean of language-learning strategies has reported medium frequency. However, memory and cognitive strategies scored the highest mean comparing to the other strategy categories. These findings inconsistent with the result of study carried out by (Abid et al, 2010) who investigated the using of language learning strategies among Iraqi university students. They found that both metacognitive and social strategies were more frequently used by learners among the six categories of LLSs, on the other hand, the mean score of using LLSs’ by learners was similar to the current study at medium use. As for the less used strategy, compensation strategies is found to be the least category which comes to be in line with the result of Abid et al (2010) study. It is unlike to studies conduct by Liao (2000), Chen (2002), and Yang (1992) reported that learners have used compensation strategies greater than other categories of learning strategies.

In line with current study, Abid et al (2010), Hoang (2013), Henno (2012), Griffiths (2003), Cao (2009), Yang (2010), Dodour & Robbins (1996) found there is no statistically significant difference between males and females on overall language learning strategy use. This result contradicts with some previous studies that confirmed there is significant difference between males and females in using LLSs (Salahshour et al, 2013; Kevin, 2013; Lan & Oxford, 2003; Taguchi, 2002; Ehrman & Oxford, 1988). It is notable to mention that males revealed significant differences on using three categories (social, Cognitive, and metacognitive).

When we consider proficiency level, the findings revealed that the learners with low-language proficiency; the less frequently they use language learning strategies, and the learners with high-language proficiency; the more frequently they use language learning strategies. This result is compatible with results of studies conducted by (Kevin, 2013; Sawako, 2009; Carol, 2003; Chen, 2002) have shown that learners with high-proficiency level use significantly-frequently a considerable number of language learning strategies over learning process than those with low-proficiency level. Two-strategy categories out of six have shown no significant differences between high, medium, and low-proficiency levels of learners namely affective and compensation strategies. It means, despite the various-proficiency levels, students did not show any discrepancy in using affective and compensation strategies; they are not used to exchange feelings, praise others when they present an interesting performance, and talk about issues that engage them. Moreover, the idea of using guessing, gestures, and hands movements is not common through their attempts speaking English. It is clear evidence of lacking the knowledge that boosts them to use all language learning strategies. Oxford and Ehrman (1995) stated the significance of using compensation and affective strategies, since they help EFL learners to overcome the barriers that encounter them when they come to interact with others.

## CONCLUSION

This study was conducted to investigate the use of language learning strategies among Iraqi sixth-grade preparatory students and how could gender and proficiency level influence the use of language-learning strategies. The findings revealed that EFL learners have shown medium use of language learning strategies, there is no statistically significant difference between male and female students in the frequency of using LLSs. However, cognitive and memory strategies were the most frequent used categories comparing to compensation strategies that scored the least frequent category. As for language proficiency, the result showed that students with high proficiency used all six categories of learning strategies more than medium and low-proficiency students.

## PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATION AND SUGGESTIONS

Since the medium use of overall strategies, it is significant to raise students’ awareness of the feasibility of using
SILLs in learning foreign language. Teachers should expose these different types of strategies to students and illustrate that learning process could be more efficient and successful through employing the appropriate strategies. It is necessary to involve students in micro-teaching sessions that revolve around the benefit of using Language learning strategies. Chamot et al. (1999) stated students who recognize the proper use of LLLs; they will be more motivated, efficient, and independent because LLSs reinforce students consciously to control the way they learn and examine their own progress. Despite interesting findings have been revealed, the researcher suggests conducting studies considering other factors such as (age, context, motivation, attitudes, and educational background) in relation with using language-learning strategies. Additionally, adopting mixed method approach in such studies since it gives in-depth understanding of research problem.
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