LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES USED BY ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL OF EFL LEARNERS IN THE UNIVERSITIES OF CYPRUS

Rahat Bashir[1], Nohaiz Mehmood[2], Sana Khan[3]

[1]Principal Lecturer, English Department, University of Central Punjab,
rahat.bashir@ucp.edu.pk

[2](Ph.D. Scholar) Lecturer English, Department of English, University of Central Punjab Lahore, nohaizmehmood7890@gmail.com

[3]lecturer in Education Department, Government College Women University , Faisalabad ,PhD scholar ELTE Department Cyprus International University, sanar708@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study aims to discuss the language learning strategies (LLS), which EFL learners employ during the learning process in the classrooms ofCyprus. As language learning continues to develop, linguistic innovations keep evolving. There are several factors, including motivation, kind of ability, language habits, and gender, that influence the learning strategies. In this study, Cyprus International University EFL students' application of language learning strategies in Cyprus is analyzed, and a mixed-method research technique is employed. The participants included 250 Cyprus International UniversityPreparatory school students. The questionnaire demonstrating different language learning strategies is used for the collection of data. Mixed techniques for information compilation have been used in present studies. A similar technique

was used with the input of Oxford's Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (1990) to define variations in LLS usage and its modifications. For determining the connection between these variables and LLS, the survey information was assessed by utilizing SPSS as a statistical tool. In order to explain their behavior on language education policies, a half-structured debate with two active communities was used. According to the research results, there is a significant connection between the use of language learning strategies with gender and language proficiency. However, it is not so with age. The findings also indicated that memory, cognition, and social strategies all have a positive correlation with the EFL learners' language learning strategies. However, metacognitive, affective, and compensation strategies tend to have an adverse effect.

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study
People of this world are speaking many languages for communication right after their existence. They express their needs, purposes, aims, emotions, and feelings through the medium of a particular language. To this day, languages expanded a lot, and it is becoming hard to know the language of every nation or country. With the passage of time and globalization, the world is moving towards a platform that provides one language used internationally for communication.

In recent years, many researchers have effectively recognized the place of foreign language learning strategies. Their findings show the efficiency of linguistic learning and the massive quantity of linguistic workflows. Several variables have been identified, for example, encouragement and capacity, kinds of learning, sexual identity, and long-stay education, which directly affect linguistic adjustment, and these are embedded in the Language Learning Strategies. As it stands today, the teacher is rather seen as a facilitator of knowledge than as an inculcator of knowledge. How the teacher work or should work, is to show the learner how to catch the proverbial fish and not merely delivering the already caught fish. That is the principle of a learner-centered approach to teaching and learning. Learners should be made to be accountable and responsible for their learning. As far, language learning is concerned; Language Learning Strategies seem to be the round peg in a round hole to achieve this purpose.

With language learning strategies, L2 students can develop an awareness of the most useful aspect of their knowledge for the comprehension and use of the target language. They also develop how the language content can be used to develop their interaction skills, even if they do not join the college (Cohen, 1996). This instruction is based on strategy, as reflected in O'Malley et al. (1987) survey on the role of learning strategies in second language learning. The present survey examines the significant role of these learning strategies EFL students in Cyprus who are majorly Turkish-speaking students. Although many academics have studied this issue in several types of research, there is a particular concern for Turkish-speaking students in Cyprus.

A generally recognized classification is Oxford (1990), which groups LLS into two: direct and indirect LLS. The direct LLS include (1) Memory strategies: These, according to Chikiewicz (2015) it are being deduced that one should always be involvingthe creation of linkages mentally. They should be applied to sounds and images. After that, they should be reviewed well with the help of the employment of actions. (2) Cognitive strategies: this strategy evokes the use of the practice, sending and receiving meaningful information and then after analyzing making use of rationalities. In the last, it is concerned with the creation of structures regarding output and input. (3) Compensation strategies: This way or strategy, which is concerned with the idea of compensation, works on the motif of intelligence, and it, should be in the form of guessing. It

also works for covering the limits regarding writing and speaking. In another way, indirect or unconscious strategies include (4) Meta-cognitive strategies; These involve centering one's learning, arranging and planning one's learning, evaluating the learning process and outcome. (5) Affective strategies: These involve controlling one's anxiety, being self-motivated, and regulating one's emotional temperature (6) Social strategies: These include asking the question, relating well with others, and empathizing with them.

1.2 Statement of Problem

The arbitrary nature of language has always been a problem for the learners. It is even more complicated in a context where the learners only have to learn the language in a formal setting, like school, without any pre-knowledge from home. EFL teaching and learning in Cyprus despite its decades of existence is replete with enormous challenges. It is still challenging for learners to communicate with the target language outside the classroom, even after they graduate. Moreover, the primary essence of language is to serve as an educational tool in society for communication. Researches in the field of language pedagogy, in most cases, focus on teachers' techniques. Researchers tend to leave the learners' success in the hands of teachers, but it seems much progress is not being made with this perspective. An investigation into LLSs is indeed learners-centered. It is in consideration of this gap that this present study is poised to examine the role of learning strategy in an EFL classroom inCyprus International UniversityPreparatory school.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of this study is to find out the role of language learning strategies in an EFL classroom in Cyprus's Preparatory school. To be specific, this study intends: to examine the LLSs used by Preparatory school students in Cyprus, to find out the influence of LLSs on EFL achievement by Preparatory school students in Cyprus; and lastly, to investigate the influence of such factors as age, gender, and duration of learning on the students' use of LLSs.

1.4 Research Questions

The study seeks to find answersto the following questions:
1- What language learning strategies are most/least frequently used by Preparatory school EFL learners in Cyprus?
2- Is there a significant difference in strategy use in terms of gender?

1.5 Significance of the study

This study is of high importance for the employment of language learning strategies on students of Preparatory school students, especially in Cyprus. By x-raying the LLSs, students can be acquainted with better ways to make significant improvements in EFL. There is no other better way to make the students independent EFL learners than through the use of LLSs. It will, in no small measure, reduce the frustrations that students encounter in the course of learning EFL. To the teachers, the outcome of the study would help them know which strategies are most suitable for the learners.

Researchers, too, would tremendously benefit from the outcome of this study. Proper research solves a problem in the research domain and as well as creates a new problem as a gap for future researchers to fill. In particular, the outcome of this study is a guide to textbook writers to focus on the needed areas in writing problem-solving textbooks.The government would also be guided

to make better policies. For instance, it would motivate them to give teachers more in-service training, particularly on the use of LLSs.

1.6 Definition of Terms

Language Learning Strategies (LLSs): learners-oriented techniques that the learners use to develop proficiency in the target language. It includes memory strategies, cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, compensation strategies, and social strategies.
Duration of Learning: the number of years, the learners have spent learning EFL.

1.7 Limitation of the study

There are certain limitations to this study. First, due to the time limit, the study is only limited toCyprus International UniversityPreparatory school, Cyprus. This, no doubt, affects the generalization of the outcome because the sample is minimal. Also, the study is only making use of students as participants. A combination of students and teachers as participants would have brought about a better outcome.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Concept of LLSs/Classifications

Language learning strategies (LLSs) are receiving increased study interest, owing to their critical significance in second language acquisition (Huang, 2018). Huang implicitly defines LLSs as methods employed to satisfy the learner's linguistic requirements. In some ways, LLSs began as the habits of the ideal language learner (Bruen, 2017). This concept evolved from Rubin's landmark 1975 book, "What excellent language learners can teach us." It places a premium on the adept habits of a proficient language learner. LLS is defined as "the specific actions undertaken by the learner to facilitate, accelerate, and increase the self-directedness, effectiveness, and transferability of learning to new contexts" (Oxford, 1990). This is a completely learner-centered approach. The goal is to foster a learner's autonomy throughout the learning process. According to O'Malley and Chamot (1990), LLSs "seek to improve understanding, learning, and retention of new knowledge." LLS are facilitators selected by learners to assist them in overcoming obstacles encountered throughout the process of language acquisition (Abdullah, 2014). According to Abdulrazaq (2018), LLS is a strategy or tool that students use to complete activities involving language skills such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing.
The LLS Practice assistance suggested that the LLS practice be taken into account in the L2 guideline. Graham (1997) proposed that pupils in L2 should teach other pupils to make use of large LLSs. The use of the LLS metacognitive training in language teaching and of high metacognitive skills empowered ESL learners, according to Neil Anderson (2002). The use of metacognitive strategies encourages individuals to believe in themselves and can help them learn more. The skills that these good learners apply are to be taught to others. While every student uses some kind of learning method using layout, LLS can be more effectively applied to him or her. LLS seeks to improve the capacity of students to study and use their second language through the inclusion of LLS in ESL education and to be best adapted for those operations, and to become independent vocabulary learners (Wenden, 1987).
Classifying LLSs has always been a bone of contention in the field of research. The classifications by O'Malley and Chamot (1990) and Oxford (1990) have, however, been highly

recognized by many researchers (Bruen, 2017). According to O'Malley and Chamot (1990),
LLSs can be grouped into cognitive, metacognitive, and socio/affective strategies.

1) Cognitive strategies: This entails modifying the learning materials in order to achieve the aim
of learning the language. The skills found here are repetition, transfer, grouping, note-taking,
inference, imagery, identifying keywords, recombination, resourcing, elaboration, auditory
representation, contextualization, and deductions. All these tasks can keep the learner fully
engaged in the learning process.

2) Metacognitive strategies: Metacognition is a term that refers to executive functions, which
are techniques that include preparing for learning, thinking about the learning process as it
occurs, monitoring one's own output or understanding, correcting one's own errors, and assessing
learning after an activity. Additionally, this categorization includes techniques such as focused
attention, selective attention, advance organisers, self-management, functional planning, self-
monitoring, delayed production, and self-evaluation. This indicates that learners developed self-
reliance throughout the learning process via the use of metacognitive techniques.

3) Socio-affective strategies: These are interpersonal communication methods that require
learners to engage with one another (Lee & Heinz, 2016). This contact may take place with other
learners' native speakers of the target language. The methods are thought to be highly adaptable
to a wide range of jobs. Cooperation and explanation are the two primary tactics in this area.
Oxford (1990), on the other hand, categorises LLSs as cognitive, metacognitive, social,
emotional, compensatory, and memory-related strategies. She categorises these six categories
into direct and indirect methods. The following are direct strategies:

1) **Memory Strategies:** Memory techniques, according to Oxford (1990), are those that
   assist pupils in storing and retrieving new knowledge. It refers to the methods employed
   to access the learner's latent linguistic knowledge. According to her, memory techniques
   include the following abilities: (a) establishing mental associations, for example,
   grouping new words according to their meaning; (b) using pictures and sounds, for
   example, placing words in a situational context. (c) thorough review (d) the use of action,
   e.g., mechanical remembering methods.

2) **Cognitive Strategies:** These strategies include: (a) Practicing, e.g., formal exercises in
   spelling and pronunciation, students talking to each other about a topic without worrying
   about any mistakes. This practice is manual input, but in the long run, if it is sustained, it
   transforms into automaticity. (b) Reversing and sending the message, e.g., using varied
   sources, for example, dictionaries and magazines. (c) Analyzing and reasoning, e.g.,
   deduction thinking and translation. (d) Creating structure for input and output, e.g.,
   making own notes, summarizing, and underlining the most critical information.

3) **Compensation strategies:** These strategies make up for the mistakes/errors in the
   knowledge of the language while communicating with it. It includes: (a) Guessing
   intelligently, for example, Using pointers, like a student using picture or text structure (b)
   Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing, e.g., using native language, using

gestures and mimic, topic selection, creation of new words and using synonyms or descriptions.

On the other hand, the indirect strategies by Rebecca Oxford help learners regulate their learning, gain emotional requirements, and interact with the target language (Hardan, 2013). Indirect strategies include:

4) **Metacognitive strategies**: The primacy of these strategies is to help students to help coordinate the learning process by centering, arranging, planning, and evaluating the learning process. It gives learners the responsibility of being in control of the learning. These techniques can be chosen as suitable for the context. Students use the metacognitive strategies for controlling performance, planning general development, or the consequence of their learning (Abdulrazaq, 2018).

5) **Affective strategies**: These are techniques to help students control their emotions, attitudes, motivations, and values (Hardan, 2013). It involves the following processes, lowering anxiety, encouraging oneself, and taking one's emotional temperature.

6) **Social strategies:** These are strategies that contain using social connections to help to learn (Abdulrazaq, 2018). These involve asking questions, cooperating with others, and empathizing with others. These are strategies through which learners interact with other learners. With this, students develop the habit of collaboration peers, which results in communicative competence.

Oxford (1990) identifies twelve features of the above Language Learning Strategies:
1. LLS contribute to the primary objective of developing communicative competence.
2. They enable learners to develop a sense of self-direction.
3. They enlarge the function of educators.
4. They are problem-solving individuals.
5. They are the learner's particular activities.
6. Involve many facets of the learner, not simply cognitive facets.
7. Provide direct and indirect support for learning.
8. Are not always visible to the naked eye.
9. Are often aware.
10. It is teachable.
11. Are adaptable.
12. Are affected by a number of different variables.

The six classifications (centered in Oxford, the Strategic Language Learning Inventory (SILL)) have been further split up into instantaneous techniques for many studies into the teaching policy sector (that address relevant language immediately, for example, assessment, and practicality). They have also split the opposite approach (which supports language teachers in teaching schedules, for example). While Oxford's taxonomy (Emilie, 1994, p.539) is probably the most extensive ranking of teaching techniques to date, it is still very limited in importance since Oxford's (1990) recognizes the ability of blending lessons in half of these techniques and perhaps centuries, as an instance of an approach that requires the scheduling approach. It also examines whether synonyms are an educational technique or a policy for interaction, as they are when the

precise term is unsure. Ellis (1994) noted that the inclusion of recompense methods is somewhat confusing but, on the premise that pupils are safer in their knowledge and can be directed to provide additional data on what is relevant and allowed in the target language, it is warranted that behaviors, such as teaching, will be complied with it.

Recently, Oxford (2011) further modified her classifications, particularly in the context of the self-regulation model. She reduced the number of classification from six to four. However, there is an additional variable. The new variable is meta strategies, which include meta-cognitive, meta-affective, meta-sociocultural interactive strategies. So, the four new classifications are meta strategies, cognitive, affective, and sociocultural-interactive strategies. The metastrategy is a kind of conscious thought of all the strategies, which is geared towards improving learning. This new classification is yet to gain general recognition in literature like the one of 1990. Because of this, this present study will adopt Oxford (1990) and, consequently, the corresponding Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) for the collection of data.

Factors that Affect the Use of Language Learning Strategies

Certain features can affect the use of LLSs. Oxford (1990) had aptly admitted that the use of LLSs is subject to a variety of factors.

Gender is a perennially contentious element in research. There is no agreement among researchers on the effect of gender on LLS usage. Female students have been recognised as being more adaptable when it comes to the usage of LLSs than their male counterparts (Zare, 2010). Tang and Tian (2015) investigated the relationships between the beliefs and language learning methods of Chinese EFL graduate students. One of the most significant results is that female student have a more favourable attitude about the usage of LLSs than male students do, and therefore outperform male students on short-term verbal memory tests and second language comprehension. Additionally, Sherafat, Kabiri, and Soori (2014) examined the difference in language learning methods used by Iranian male and female students; they discovered a statistically significant difference in the frequency of language learning strategies used by male and female students. Female students utilised language learning methods more often than their male colleagues, the research found. It was shown, however, that the most commonly used techniques by pupils are memory and cognitive strategies. According to Wang (2015), educators should acknowledge the fact that male and female learners have distinct learning methods, understand their respective benefits of the idea of gender difference in the classroom, and enhance the efficiency of English teaching and learning. Additionally, Bozinovic and Sindik (2011) found that female students employed all learning methods more often than their male counterparts in their study on gender differences in the use of learning strategies in adult foreign language learners.

In contrast, Desjardins and Ederer (2015) did not recognise gender as a real element of impact in their study of sociodemographic and practice-based variables affecting problem-solving competence from a lifelong learning viewpoint. Gender is not a major socio-demographic element in their job. Khamkhien (2010) conducted a study on the variables that influence the language learning strategies reported by Thai and Vietnamese EFL students. The research showed that gender did not influence the choice of LLS. According to the research, therewas minimal variation in the usage of cognitive techniques between men and girls.

Related Researches

Tragant and Victori (2012) conducted a study on language acquisition methods, course grades, and age of EFL Preparatory school students. The study's main objective was to address the two factors separately by evaluating the usage of learning strategies in three groups of (Catalan/Spanish) learners with varying educational levels and their connection to English as a foreign language. The participants comprised 402 pupils from 18 different classes in Spain, who were divided into four groups based on their English school grades. A questionnaire was used to gather data. After analysing the data, it was shown that students in lower grades favoured certain kinds of techniques more than older students; therefore, the connection between learning methods and EFL was greater among younger students. However, the research made no mention of the trainees' linguistic competence.

El Essawi (2013) examined teacher views of how Arabic as a foreign language (AFL) textbooks address LLSs. The participants were 29 instructors from the American University of Cairo's Arabic Language Institute. The data collecting tool was the Oxford et alStrategy .'s Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (2014). This was utilised to ascertain the frequency with which LLS contained in SILL are promoted in AFL textbooks, as perceived by AFL instructors. Following examination, the following conclusions were drawn: To begin, the textbooks' most promising approach is cognitive strategy. There is a statistical difference between cognitive and non-cognitive strategies, such as memory, emotional, metacognitive, and social strategies. All of these techniques, with the exception of cognitive, are categorised as being seldom used in textbooks.

Huang (2018), too, examined language learning methods in context. The research evaluated the methods used by 12 students from two college English courses in Taiwan over time. Interviews, class observations, and document inspections were used to gather data. The study's results revealed that participants' method usage changed in response to various contextual circumstances. This variation in LLS usage is shown to be linked to learners' learning styles and motivational orientations. In summary, the learning environment has a major influence on how learners utilise LLSs.

Bruen (2017) conducted a study on learning methods with 98 of the top students enrolled in an introductory language semester taught in both Japanese and Spanish. The study revealed that the most commonly utilised techniques fell into two categories: cognitive strategies and compensatory strategies. Additionally, the study discovered that when these techniques were used appropriately, reading comprehension was improved.

Salahshour et al. (2012) performed the Iranian high-level college survey, demonstrating how LLS is related to the amount of competence in English. The investigations showed that Iranian Preparatory school students have medium frequency LLSs with far more strategic application by qualified students. Based on their findings, women use strategies more often than men.

Liu and Chang (2013) debated how learners in EFL Strategy can combine the use of LLS with educational autonomy for Taiwanese learners. The learners observed the prevalent, but not personal, strategy for awards. Low-level learners and high-level policymakers usually use compensation approaches. The most significant correlation with the scientific concept was recorded in the financial areas, metacognitive, and cognitive strategies.

Afshar and Movassagh (2017) investigated the relationship between the employment of strategy in university accomplishments for Iranian speakers of English and the use of English as a foreign language in language acquisition. The study included 76 students. The data collecting device

used was Oxford's SILL. A questionnaire was used to gather data. The study's significant findings revealed that, first, there is a favourable correlation between critical thinking and university performance. Second, there is a substantial positive connection between the adoption of language learning strategies and academic performance at the university level. However, it was shown that critical thinking is a more accurate predictor of students' performance than LLSs. This research did not take into account gender, age, or proficiency, all of which may be significant variables.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design
The study is a descriptive survey of a cross-sectional type. It means that the instrument will be administered, and all the needed information will be obtained from it. The design fits the study because it is interested in obtaining information about the students in order to describe their language learning strategies.

Context of the Study
The study is aimed at identifying the case of Language Learning Strategy in the EFL classrooms in CyprusPreparatory school. The specific context isCyprus International UniversityPreparatory school, Cyprus. A case study design was conducted in order to achieve this using the SPSS to analyze the data which was administered and gathered through Oxford's SILL.

3.5 Participants and Setting
The participants of this study are 250 EFL learners from Cyprus International University Secondary School, Cyprus. The research illustrating the various methods of learning was completed. These are Cypriots with Turkish as their first language. Cyprus International University is a school that seeks to incorporate English with its students. It was founded in the year 1955, and about 300 learners were present. The school is in Nicosia district,Cyprus International University. English is mainly used during English lessons as a teaching tool. The pupil has been exposed to this obligatory requirement since JSS 1. All participants were Cyprus International University pupils, and English is spoken and researched as a foreign language. All are young people aged 15 to 18. The first group consists of junior learners. It is divided into two communities. They have a comparatively different Italian ability and commitment than the second set of senior students that speak less English.

Data Collection Instrument
The Oxford (1990's) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) was used as our instrument of data collection to elicit information on LLSs use of the students and the variations that exist therein. The internally reliable SILL (Cronbach beta) is said to be 905 for this current research. The questionnaire designed for the students of English as Foreign Language (EFL) include 50 items divided into 6, which are: The following are: Memory techniques (9); Cognitive Strategy Issues (14); Compensational policies (6); Meta-cognitive approach (9); Affective (6); Social (6). This is a five-point Likert index measuring ranging from the first (never or nearly never true for me) to the fifth (Always or almost always true for me). It is considered one of the best tools for evaluating students' language learning strategies.

Data Collection Procedure
The Language Learning Strategy's Inventory (LLSI) questionnaire is usually used to define separate strategy levels for each group. A questionnaire that contributes to combining the use of questions: Oxford designed high uses (3.5-5.0), periodic uses (2.5-3.4), tiny uses (1.0-2.4). In order to ensure that the respondents feel safe and free to share their views without worry, the demographic history was not included in the study. The participants solved a questionnaire with every element of anonymity, and a sense of assurance that all the information gathered is considered secret. The experimental problem was established in the six SILL questionnaire categories. In order to understand and respond readily, the interviewer ensured that the problems of the study were straightforward and transparent.The questionnaires were provided to participants directly. They were given proper time and a conducive environment of the classroom to answer the questions. First of all, they were given proper instructions about the Likert scale and what number means what, and then they were asked to read them carefully, think and then answer what seems them to be true of each item in the questionnaire.

Data Analysis
There were 250 semi-organized respondents. During the momentum assessment, mixed techniques were used to investigate information gathering. Quantitative data were analyzed by the SPSS program to identify the link between the elements listed and their use. In this respect, a semi-organized conference was organized for two key sessions to debate the use of language learning techniques. The SPSS program (v.15) was used to detect significant adjustments in funds according to age, gender, and strategy based on the Mean and standard deviation. To access the items, language learning methods were used; in particular, free T-test samples were used for the first problem. A T-test was used to determine the extent to which the strategy was significantly correlated with the number of students and gender. The ANOVA experiment was used for the analysis of products to detect significant correlations among the pupil concentrations.

Results and Data Analysis

4.2 General analyzes and usage of sub-strategies
For the statistical analysis of this particular study SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences), 15.0 Package is being used. For knowing about the normal distribution of the data Kolmogorov Smirnow, Test is being performed, and parametric tests are used. ANOVA (One-way Analysis of Variance) and Independent Two-Sample T-test is being used for the frequency and descriptive statistics of the particular study.

Table 1. Factors and factor numbers

Factors	Item numbers in the SILL survey
Memory strategies	Part A (1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9)
Cognitive Strategies	Part B (10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23)
Compensation Strategies	Part C (24,25,26,27,28,29)
Metacognitive Strategies	Part D (30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38)
Affective Strategies	Part E (39,40,41,42,43,44)
Social Strategies	Part F (45,46,47,48,49,50)

It can be seen in the Table above that six factors of language learning strategies are being written, which are explaining the instrument strategy inventory. They include memory strategy, cognitive strategy, compensation strategy, metacognitive strategy, affective strategy, and social strategy. The factor numbers in the SILL survey memory strategy comprises Part A which includes items ranging from item one to nine; Cognitive strategies comprises Part B that includes items ranging from item ten to twenty three, Compensation strategies comprises Part C that includes items ranging from item twenty four to twenty nine, Metacognitive strategies consists of Part D that includes items ranging from item thirty to Thirty eight, Affective strategies comprises Part E that includes items ranging from forty five to fifty.

Table 2. The reliability values of factor

Factors	Number	Cronbach Alpha
Memory strategies	9	0.60
Cognitive Strategies	14	0.81
Compensation Strategies	6	0.67
Metacognitive Strategies	9	0.87
Affective Strategies	6	0.59
Social Strategies	6	0.70
General	50	0.92

The above table shows the reliability values of the factors in an instrument. The memory strategies factor possesses 0.60 Cronbach Alpha value for nine items. The cognitive strategies factor possesses 0.81 Cronbach Alpha value for 14 items. The compensation strategies factor possesses 0.67 Cronbach Alpha value for six items. Metacognitive strategies factor possesses 0.87 Cronbach Alpha value for nine items. Affective strategies factor possesses 0.59 Cronbach Alpha value for six items. The social strategies factor possesses 0.70 Cronbach Alpha value for six items. If we see in general (collectively all six strategies), then they possess 0.92 Cronbach value for all 50 values. The values of Cronbach Alpha show that the factors mentioned above are reliable.

Research Question 1: What language learning strategies are most/least frequently used by Preparatory school EFL learners in Cyprus?

The following table 3 shows 250 Preparatory school students' use of memory strategies.

Table 3. The usage of memory strategies by students

Questions	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Item 1	250	3.46	0.99
Item 2	250	2.51	0.91
Item 3	250	2.90	1.23
Item 4	250	3.07	1.28
Item 5	250	2.81	1.30
Item 6	250	2.47	3.03

Item 7	250	2.19	1.10
Item 8	250	2.63	9.48
Item 9	250	3.28	1.24

According to the answers and their evaluation through the statistical tool, it is deduced that the collective mean of memory strategies is 2.82. Thus most of the students use "Somewhat true of me" as an option for memory strategies in all nine items. The highest mean is of item 1, which is 3.46. It means that most of the students see an apparent relationship between what they already know and what new things they are learning in classes where memory strategies are being applied during classroom activities. The lowest mean is of item 7, which is 2.19. It means that most of the students deny the acting of new FL (Foreign Language) taught words physically. Despite some (It is also a considerable number), many went for the first two options, which are against the item.
The following table 4 shows 250 Preparatory school students' use of cognitive strategies.

Table 4. The usage of cognitive strategies by students

Questions	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Item 10	250	3.28	1.18
Item 11	250	2.77	1.21
Item 12	250	2.41	1.21
Item 13	250	2.69	1.05
Item 14	250	2.24	1.24
Item 15	250	3.62	1.24
Item 16	250	3.00	1.17
Item 17	250	2.17	1.15
Item 18	250	3.26	1.13
Item 19	250	2.82	1.24
Item 20	250	2.65	1.16
Item 21	250	2.19	1.18
Item 22	250	3.25	1.20
Item 23	250	2.03	1.10

According to the answers and their evaluation through the statistical tool, it is deduced that the collective mean of cognitive strategies is 2.74, and thus most of the students use "Somewhat true for me" as an option for memory strategies in all 14 items. The highest mean is of item 15, which is 3.62. It means most of the students watch TV shows which are in that particular target language and they also like to watch movies in cinemas or somewhere else in the FL language medium. The second biggest mean is item 10, which says that 'I say or write new FL words several times.' It means that most of the students who are in Preparatory schools prefer writing the learned words in FL language. The lowest mean is of item 17, which is 2.17. It means that

most of the students do not utilize the FL while writing their notes, messages, letters, or reports. It could be the case that they are still High students; that is why they are not mature enough or they have not learnt much about the importance of the FL.

The following table 5 shows 250Preparatory school students' use of Compensation strategies.

Table 5. The usage of Compensation strategies by students

Questions	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Item 24	250	3.42	1.08
Item 25	250	3.06	1.22
Item 26	250	2.92	1.27
Item 27	250	2.93	1.22
Item 28	250	2.56	1.22
Item 29	250	3.48	1.15

According to the answers and their evaluation through the statistical tool, it is deduced that the collective mean of compensation strategies is 3.07. Thus most of the students use "Somewhat true for me" as an option for compensation strategies in all six items. The highest mean is of item 29, which is 3.48. It means most of the students, if not remember or memorize the FL words, then they become creative and use a word or phrase which means the same as that word. It means they, due to the application of compensation strategies, can deal with similar ways to cover the problem which is being faced when they cannot remember any FL word, and they have to utilize it. The second highest mean in compensation strategies is of item 24 and worthy of mentioning here because it is very near to the item 29. The mean of item 24 is 3.42. It means that students know the technique through compensation strategies that they will have to guess something closer to a particular word or exactly that one if they do not know it exactly. The students on this also said 'somewhat true of me,' and many also said that it is 'usually true of me.' The lowest mean is of item 28, which is 2.56. It means that most of the students deny the acting of new FL taught words physically.

The following table 6 shows 250Preparatory school students' use of Metacognitive strategies.

Table 6. The usage of Metacognitive strategies by students

Questions	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Item 30	250	3.01	1.14
Item 31	250	3.21	1.11
Item 32	250	3.76	1.20
Item 33	250	3.35	1.19
Item 34	250	2.55	1.20
Item 35	250	3.08	1.26
Item 36	250	2.67	1.07
Item 37	250	3.13	1.22

Item 38	250	3.37	1.18

According to the answers and their evaluation through the statistical tool, it is deduced that the collective mean of metacognitive strategies is 3.13. Thus most of the students use "Somewhat true for me" as an option for metacognitive strategies in all nine items. The highest mean is of item 32, which is 3.76. It means most of the students feel attentive while listening to anyone's speech, and it is due to their training that they automatically because of their cognitive abilities feel attentive and understand FL words. It means they, due to the application of metacognitive strategies, can deal with the unconscious way to cover the problem just because of the role of cognition. The mean is very high, which means that many students also went for the answer 'usually true of me.' The next mean after the highest is 3.37 (item 38) it can be deduced out of this result that the students of Preparatory schools are more concerned with the item 32 when it comes towards the application of metacognitive strategies and abilities. The lowest mean is of item 34, which is 2.55. It means that most of the students deny the fact of defined and scheduled routine regarding learning something. This is obvious that the students at the High level are not much mature to plan things to do in their days for academics, but there is also one positive point in this item that is hidden somewhere and needs to be unveiled. The students possess the metacognitive ability so much that they do not need to schedule things for this; they just act in the present, and this is the best way of checking the learning ability of students.

The following table 7 shows 250 Preparatory school students' use of Affective strategies.

Table 7. The usage of Affective strategies by students

Questions	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Item 39	250	3.10	1.19
Item 40	250	2.97	1.22
Item 41	250	2.29	1.27
Item 42	250	3.48	1.25
Item 43	250	1.42	0.90
Item 44	250	2.18	1.26

According to the answers and their evaluation through the statistical tool, it is deduced that the collective mean of Affective strategies is 2.58. Thus most of the students use "Somewhat true of me" as an option for Affective strategies in all six items. The highest mean is of item 42, which is 3.48. It means most of the students have reservations regarding studying or using FL because they feel not much upheaval while becoming an active part of the strategy in the classroom setting. They feel nervous, too, in this scenario. The lowest mean is item 43, which is very low even if we compare it with all six strategies. It is 1.42. It means that most of the students do not have the habit of noting things in daily diaries after being taught. They do not prefer to make a language learning diary and then note in that for a useful purpose. Before gathering results, it was the perceived hypothesis that students make use of the language learning diary for learning and remembering effectively and efficiently, but when the survey was completed, and the result of item 43 was different than expected.

The following table 8 shows 250Preparatory school students' use of social strategies.

Table 8. The usage of Social strategies by students

Questions	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Item 45	250	3.89	1.16
Item 46	250	3.36	1.31
Item 47	250	2.01	1.09
Item 48	250	3.40	1.18
Item 49	250	2.46	1.14
Item 50	250	2.69	1.35

According to the answers and their evaluation through the statistical tool, it is deduced that the collective mean of social strategies is 2.97. Thus most of the students use "Somewhat true of me" as an option for social strategies in all six items. The highest mean is of item 45, which is 3.89. It means that most of the students see an apparent relationship between the learner and the teacher. They value the understanding of being social and know that it will help them to learn more and prosper through their correction, repetition by the speaker, and speak slowly in order to increase the knowledge more proficiently. They do not feel shy about saying such things because they know and admire the importance of social strategies in the process of learning a language. The lowest mean is of item 47, which is 2.01. It means that most of the students do not practice what they have learned. They just want to know and listen about FL but do not want to practice for their better memorization.

Research Question 2: Is there a significant difference in strategy use in terms of gender?

The use of language learning strategies in respect to Gender variation in general
The language learning strategies, in general, are discussed in this part of the study. The debate is not on sub-strategies of language learning. It is investigated through the survey that what effect or impact factor is of females and males on having the views on language learning strategies. The following table is making everything clear regarding gender variation and its use in language learning strategies.

Table10. The difference between the usage of Gender variation and General strategies

	Gender	N	Mean	Std Error	T account	P value
General Strategies	Female	93	148.76	3.21		
	Male	157	140.73	2.50	1.97	0.05

The independent Two-Sample T-test is being performed, and the results are being calculated and investigated according to the gender variations on general strategies. It is seen from the table mentioned above that the mean of male students is 140.73, and of female students is 148.76. It has been seen that global variables are useful for language learning strategies because their P-value is 0.05. In this scenario, it is being deduced that female students possess more and higher scores than male students in this test of language learning strategies.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Discussion

This study found out that memory strategy, cognitive strategy, and social strategy all has a significant positive relationship with the EFL learners. It means that these strategies increase the students' achievement in EFL, and the students are used to it. Liu and Chang (2013) had particularly emphasized the significant impact of cognitive strategies and how the students use it more frequently. Also, El Essawi (2013) agrees with this. Similarly, Heider and Hemayati (2017) agreed that memory strategy is quite significant for EFL learners to consolidate on their vocabulary skills. Just like this present study, they also posited that affective strategy is of little or no significance. Not only the compensation strategy, but others like metacognitive, affective, and social strategies were also found not to have a significant impact on the EFL achievement of the learners.

This study, however, revealed that the metacognitive strategy, affective strategy compensation strategy does not show a positive and significant relationship with the LLSs of the EFL learners. This contradicts with Chen (2014), who revealed that the tertiary students use compensation strategy more in order to have higher achievement in foreign language learning. However, in this study, the compensation strategy does not make a significant impact on the EFL achievement of the learners.

Specific pedagogical implications are deduced from this study. The first linguistic strategy has an essential impact on the linguistic teaching system. These techniques are most often used in the teaching method by linguistic students. Teachers should, therefore, take consideration of the personal requirements of their learners. In order to meet the requirements of these learners, teaching should be ready and scheduled. The teacher should make every student aware of linguistic methods in such a manner that these methods are focused on. After this has been accomplished, students will learn more with less stress and fun.

This study has empirically established that gender is an influential factor as far as EFL learners are concerned in their use of LLSs. This finding is in agreement with Zare (2010); Tang and Tian (2015); Sherafat, Kabiri, and Soori (2014), whom all agreed with the significant influence of gender on the use of LLSs by EFL learners. The study, however, negates Desjardins and Ederer (2015) and Khamkhien (2010), who both said gender is not a significant influence.

Conclusion

The study sought to examine the role of learning strategy in the EFL classroom in Cyprus International UniversityPreparatory school, Cyprus. The participants of the study included 160 students from the school. The instrument for data collection was Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). The essence of this is to find out how different learning strategies impact on EFL learners. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used for the analysis of data. Percentage and frequency count were used to describe the demographic data. However, hypotheses were tested using t-test and ANOVA.

Language Learning Strategies (LLS) "is the particular activities performed by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations" (Oxford, 1990). These learners' strategies are tools that the learners can use to improve on the target language. The strategies have been classified in diverse forms, but Oxford (1990) remains a veritable classification, amongst others. The six classifications, according to Oxford, have variations on their impacts on the EFL learners. In this study, it is found out that

memory strategy, cognitive strategy, and social strategy all have a significant positive relationship on the EFL learners. However, metacognitive strategy, effective strategy, and compensation strategy do not have a significant positive impact on EFL learners. The study also indicated that gender, duration of learning, and English proficiency level all have a significant influence on EFL learners and their learning strategies. However, it was found out that age is not a significant factor.

Recommendations for future studies
In this study, the researcher have discussed the efficacy of language education strategies. However, specific gaps need to be filled. First, it is necessary to investigate the connection between language teaching methods and learning techniques/strategies. Also, the overall response of the students and educators to the use of teaching methods should be researched. Again, research should emphasize the connection between teaching methods and rewards in order to attain their communicative abilities for ESL / EFL linguistic students.

Pedagogical Implications

Learning a foreign language can be very challenging, and tasking; hence, achieving success is not quite easy. This can be dealt with language learning strategies, and it will also be helpful for researchers and especially for teachers to teach students by utilizing the best strategies in the classrooms and equip students with the technique of learning a foreign language. There is a need to reach out to EFL students in Cyprus and acquaint them with the necessary knowledge on the importance of Language learning strategies (LLSs).

References:

Abdullah, A. A., 2014. The role of language learning strategies (LLS) and the effect of different individuals in learning target or second language. International Journal of Language and Linguistics,2(3) 197-202.

Abdulrazaq, J. N., 2018. Vocabulary learning strategies of Kurdish language. International Journal of Rural Development, Environment and Health Research (UREH)2(5),48-56.

Afshar, H. S. and Movassagh, H., 2017. On the relationship among critical thinking, language learning strategy use and university achievement of Iranian English as a foreign language majors. The Language Learning Journal, 43(3), 382-398.

Alhaysony, M., 2017. Language learning strategy use by Saudi EFL Students: the effect of duration of English language study and gender. Theory and Practice in Language Studies7(1), 18-28.

Alseid, S., Ibrahim, N. & Pathan, M, 2018. The use of grammar learning strategies by Libyan EFL learners at sebha university. ASIAN TEFL, 3(1), 37-51.

Bruen, J., 2017. Language learning strategies for reading comprehension: assessing the strategy use of young adults at beginners' level taking Chinese, German, Japanese or Spanish as foreign languages at university. Available at https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2017.1370606 [Accessed Dec., 30 2019].

Cheng, W., 2015. A case study of action research on communicative language teaching. Journal ofInterdisciplinary Mathematics, 18(6), 705-717.

Cohen, A.D., 1996. Strategies for learning and using a second language. Essex, U.K.:Longman

Desjardins, R. and Ederer, P., 2015. Socio-demographic-oriented factors related to proficiency in problem solving: a lifelong learning perspective. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2015.1060027 [Accessed Dec., 28, 2019]

El Essawi, R. 2013., Language learning strategies in Arabic as a foreign language textbook. Al-'Arabiyya, 46. pp37-59. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/43195546?seq=1&cid=pdf-references_tab_contents [Accessed Dec., 30 2019]

Ellis, R., 1994. The study of second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Graham, S., 1997. Effective language learning. positive strategies for advanced level learning. England: Multilingual Matters.

Hardan, A. A., 2013. Language learning strategies: A general overview. 4th International Conference on New Horizons in Education. Procedia- Social and Behavioural Sciences106, 1712-1726.

Huang, S. C., 2018. Language learning strategies in context. The Language Learning Journal, 46(5), 647-659.

Khamkhien, A., 2010. Factors Affecting Language Learning Strategy Reported Usage by Thai and Vietnamese EFL Learners. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 7(1), 66-85.

O' Malley, J.M. A. U. Chamot and Walker., 1987. Some applications of cognitive theory to second language acquisition. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 9(4), 297-306.

O' Malley, J., and Chamot, A., 1990. Learning strategies in second language acquisition. England: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. L., 1990. Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Newbury House.

Oxford, R., 1994. Language learning strategies: An update. Online Resources: Digests

Oxford, R., 2011. Teaching and researching language strategy. U.K.: Pearson Education

Oxford, R., Rubin, J., Chamot, A. U., Schramm, K., Lavine, R., Gunning, P, and Nel, C., 2014. The learning strategy prism: Perspective of learning strategy experts. System, 43, 30-49.

Rubin, J., 1975. What the good language learner can teach us. TESOL Quarterly, 9, 41- 51.

Salahshour, F., Sharifi, M., and Salahshour, N., 2012. The relationship between language learning strategy use, language proficiency level and learner gender. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 634-643.

Saleky, A. P., 2018. Opinion gap: a strategy in improving students' speaking abilities. LEKSEMA, 3(1), 81-91.

Sherafat, Z., Kabiri, P. & Soori, A., 2015. The differences between Iranian male and female students in using language learning strategies. Australian International Academic Centre, Australia, 2(2).

Sung, K., 2011. Factors influencing Chinese language learners' strategy use. International Journal of Multilingualism,8(2), 117-134.

Tang, M. and Tian, J., 2015. Associations between Chinese EFL graduate students' beliefs and language learning strategies. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,18(2), 131-152.

Tragant, E. and Victori, M., 2012. Language learning strategies, course grades, and age in EFL secondary school learners. Language Awareness,21(3), 293-308.

Wang. A., 2015. The wear out effect of a game based student response system. Computers & Education, 82, 217-227.

Wenden. A.L., 1987. conceptual background and utility. In A.L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds), Learner strategies in language learning, 3-13. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall