

2

ABC 2.632

LEARNING STRATEGIES PREFERRED BY THE
FIELD DEPENDENT AND FIELD INDEPENDENT
STUDENTS IN AN EFL ENVIRONMENT
(A CASE STUDY IN IRAN)

ZAHRA NAIMIE

FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR

OCTOBER 2003



LEARNING STRATEGIES PREFERRED BY
THE FIELD DEPENDENT AND FIELD INDEPENDENT
STUDENTS IN AN EFL ENVIRONMENT
(A CASE STUDY IN IRAN)

ZAHRA NAIMIE

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIRMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ENGLISH
AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR

OCTOBER 2003

ACADEMIC WORK FINDINGS TESTIMONY

I, Zahra Naimie, Registration Number TGBY00035 hereby declare that the Dissertation entitled **Learning Strategies Preferred by The Field Dependent and Field Independent Students In An EFL Environment (A Case Study in Iran)** is my own academic work except the materials/citations of which the original sources have been mentioned.

Yours truly

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Zahra Naimie', written over a horizontal line.

Name : Zahra Naimie

Date: 27October 2003

*Dedicated to my first love
Dad and Mom
Who has given me
The wings to fly*

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the study of the language learning strategies of 117 Iranian university students in Iran. The aim of the study was to investigate the influence of field dependent/independent on strategy use among Iranian students majoring in English and also to survey the kind of learning strategies used by each group.

A two part questionnaire was conducted. Part one was GEFT (Group Embedded Figure Test) by Witkin. et al.(1971),the questionnaire contained 25 items in 3 sections. The First section which has a time limit of 3 minutes including 7 easy problems, and the items are not included in the score. The second and third parts which are the main body of the GEFT include 18 items, each with 9 questions and a time limit of 6 minutes. By conducting this test, students were divided in to three groups, FD, FI, and FIM.Part two was the SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning by Oxford, 1990). The SILL consisted of six categories: Memory, Cognitive, Compensation, Metacognitive, Affective and Social. Results from the survey indicated that metacognitive strategy as most frequently used among the three groups, while affective strategy and social strategy were least frequently used respectively by FIM, FD and FI learners. Statistical analysis showed that significant differences were found in the use of Social, Memory, Affective and Compensatory strategies among the learners of the three groups. However, the results of the SILL questionnaire together with the data of the GEFT test showed several strategies employed by Iranian EFL learners who are FD, FI or FIM.

One significant finding of this study is the educational implication. It can help the teachers in designing, selecting and preparing the teaching methods and materials appropriate to the cognitive levels of the students. Classroom implications are also made to facilitate the learning of English as a foreign language for communicative competence.

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini adalah tentang strategi pembelajaran bahasa ke atas 117 orang penuntut peringkat universiti di Iran. Objektif kajian adalah untuk melihat pengaruh pembolehubah bersandar /tidak bersandar ke atas strategi yang digunakan oleh penuntut yang memilih bahasa Inggeris sebagai subjek utama dan juga untuk menganalisa strategi pembelajaran yang digunakan oleh setiap kumpulan kajian.

Satu soal selidik yang terdiri daripada dua bahagian telah dijalankan. Bahagian pertama adalah tentang GEFT oleh Witkin et al.(1971) yang mengandungi 25 soalan dalam 3 bahagian. Bahagian pertama terdiri daripada 7 soalan mudah dengan had masa menjawab selama 3 minit tidak diambilkira dalam nilai pemarkahan. Bahagian kedua dan ketiga yang merupakan rangka utama GEFT mengandungi 9 soalan setiap satu dengan had masa menjawab selama 6 minit. Melalui kajian ini penuntut telah dibahagikan kepada 3 kumpulan iaitu FD, FI dan FIM. Bahagian kedua adalah mengenai SILL (Strategi Inventori untuk mempelajari Bahasa oleh Oxford, 1990). SILL mengandungi 6 kategori iaitu, Daya Ingatan, Kognitif, Compensatory, Metakognitif, Afektif dan Sosial. Keputusan kajian menunjukkan bahawa kaedah yang kerap digunakan dikalangan 3 kumpulan tersebut adalah strategi metakognitif sementara strategi afektif dan sosial adalah kaedah yang paling kurang digunakan. Analisis statistik menunjukkan bahawa terdapat perbezaan yang signifikan di kalangan penggunaan Strategi Sosial, Daya Ingatan, Afektif dan Compensatory di kalangan 3 kumpulan tersebut. Walau bagaimanapun, keputusan soal selidik SILL dan data ujian GEFT menunjukkan bahawa penuntut Iran EFL yang terdiri daripada FD, FI atau FIM menggunakan berbagai kaedah pembelajaran.

Penemuan terpenting dalam kajian ini adalah kesan strategi pembelajaran ke atas sistem pendidikan. Penemuan ini dapat membantu guru-guru dalam merekabentuk, memilih serta menyediakan kaedah dan bahan pembelajaran yang bersesuaian dengan tahap kognitif pelajar. Implikasi bilik darjah yang dapat membantu pembelajaran bahasa Inggeris sebagai bahasa asing untuk komunikasi yang berkesan turut diketengahkan.

Acknowledgment

First of all, my gratefulness to Allah almighty for his benevolence and blessing of good health and a caring family in enabling me to complete my study successfully.

I wish to express my gratitude to my supervisor Miss Narindar Kaur for her invaluable guidance and constructive comments throughout the process of this study.

My debt is equally great to Prof. Mahmood Moghavemi for his moral support and care, all the time and especially during the time when the sky of my life was cloudy.

To Haliza and Zuhana, my Malaysian sisters and friends, a million thanks for their love, faith, support, understanding and encouragement which was a great source of strength pushing me through the completion of this thesis. Without them, my stay in Malaysia would have been a lot more difficult. You have a special place in my heart and I love you.

I also would like to thank my lovely, faithful and understanding friend and sister Ran from Saudi Arabia, for all the laughter and cries that we shared together and for her love and care. She let me feel the meaning of the sentence “friends in need are friends indeed”. Your words of inspiration are the light in the road of my life.

My gratitude is also extended to Puan Ainun Rozana Bt. Mohammad Zaid for her care and patience in advising me on my thesis. I would like to extend a special thanks to Dr.Rajeswary and Puan SriDevi for their moral support and encouragement. Their smiles and words of encouragement brought me the world of hope.

I would also like to thank my dear lecturer and friend Mrs.Mandana Arfa who was the one who encouraged me to pursue my study in post graduate level.

Throughout my study in Malaysia, I have been showered by the kindness of friends and I would like to express my thanks to Fairuz from Thailand, Belinda, Siti Ruziah, Azrina Wong, Rose and Juan from Malaysia , Khaled from Jordan, Rodney from Philippines, my dear foster aunt Ayes Shah in Kedah and Oras from Iraq .

I am also most appreciative of the assistance extended to me by the computer lab staff (Encik Nasir) and the library staff of the Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, University of Malaya and University of Alameh Amini in Tehran.

Last but not least to my dear family in Iran who has always been my bedrock of strength, my father made his children “lovers of the words” my mother’s love sustained us and the caring of my siblings, Akram, Mina, Faty and my dear brother Mojtaba keeps me hopeful. They taught me lessons in courage and independence and love. Hearing their voices from Iran and visiting me while I was here makes me feel strong. You mean a lot to me and I love you.

To all of them, I humbly express my sincere appreciation for their kindness, contribution and love, words cannot express my gratitude. May Allah bless all of you.

LISTS OF TABLES

Page

Table 1.1	Characteristics of field dependent/field independent individual	5
Table 2.1	Wong-Fillmore's cognitive and social strategies	37
Table 2.2	Rubin classification for learning strategy	39
Table 2.3	Classification of the language learning strategies by Naiman	41
Table 2.4	Extracted factors and their frequency of use	52
Table 2.5	The strategies used by students intending to learn the Hebrew language	56
Table 3.1	Description of subjects	68
Table 3.2	Time allocated for GEFT sections	69
Table 3.3	Categorization scheme of GEFT score	70
Table 3.4	The Cronbach alpha reliability for the SILL	73
Table 4.1	Distinguishing the different group of learners based on the GEFT results.	78
Table 4.2	The overall language learning strategies used by the learners	79
Table 4.3	Language learning strategies preferred by different group of learners	79
Table 4.4	Oxford's analysis of SILL average	80
Table 4.5	Learners' level of strategy use	80
Table 4.6	Language learning strategies preferred by FD	83
Table 4.7	Language learning strategies preferred by FI	83
Table 4.8	Language learning strategies preferred by FIM	83

Table 4.9	Percentages of the learners who answered metacognitive strategies in SILL	87
Table 4.10	Percentages of the learners who answered cognitive strategies in SILL	93
Table 4.11	Percentages of the learners who answered social strategies in SILL	98
Table 4.12	Percentages of the learners who answered compensatory strategies in SILL	103
Table 4.13	Percentages of the learners who answered memory strategies in SILL	105
Table 4.14	Percentages of the learners who answered affective strategies in SILL	111
Table 4.15	The frequency of the SILL strategies across different studies	114
Table 5.1	Summary of the preferred strategies by different cognitive groups	118

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure	2.1	Overview of Oxford strategy system	43
Figure	4.3.1	Classification of the metacognitive strategy based on Oxford (1990)	86
Figure	4.3.2	Classification of the cognitive strategy based on Oxford (1990)	90
Figure	4.3.3	Classification of the social strategy based on Oxford (1990)	96
Figure	4.3.4	Classification of the compensatory strategy based on Oxford (1990)	100
Figure	4.3.5	Classification of the memory strategy based on Oxford (1990)	104
Figure	4.3.6	Classification of the affective strategy based on Oxford (1990)	110

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ESL	English as a Second Language
FD	Field Dependent
FIM	Field Intermediate
FI	Field Independent
L2	Second Language
GEFT	Group Embedded Figure Test
SILL	Strategy Inventory for Language Learning
BA	Bachelor of Art

Table of contents

Abstract	iv
Abstrak	vi
Acknowledgment	vii
List of tables	ix
List of the figures	xi
List of abbreviation	xii
Table of contents	xiii

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1	Overview	1
1.2	Purpose of the study	5
1.3	Research questions	7
1.4	Statement of the problem	7
1.5	Limitation of the study	8
1.6	Significance of the study	9
1.7	The relevance of the issue to teaching	10
1.8	Definition of terms	11
	1.8.1 Style and strategy	11
	1.8.2 Learning style	11
	1.8.3 Learning strategy	11
	1.8.4 Cognitive style	12
	1.8.5 Field dependence cognitive style	12

1.8.6	Field independence cognitive style	12
1.8.7	Strategy inventory for language learning	12
1.8.8	Group embedded figure test	13
1.9	Conclusion	14

Chapter Two: Review of Literature

2.1	Introduction	15
2.2	Cognitive style	17
2.2.1	Prospect models of dual cognitive style	21
2.3	Field dependent /field independent cognitive style	21
2.4	Individual differences, which are related to field dependence / independence	28
2.5	Characteristics differences in field dependence /independence	30
2.6	Field independence /field dependence and language learning	31
2.6.1	Processes	31
2.6.2	Strategies	31
2.6.3	Styles	32
2.7	Language learning strategies	34
2.7.1	Identification and classification of second language learning strategies	36
2.7.2	Language learning strategies for advanced learners	53

2.8	Beliefs about language learning	55
2.9	The importance of learners beliefs	57
2.10	Variables affecting the choice of language	58
	2.10.1 Language proficiency	58
	2.10.2 Gender	59
	2.10.3 Job	61
2.11	The language learning strategies of the good and poor learners	62

Chapter Three: Methodology

3.1	Introduction	67
3.2	Subjects	67
3.3	Instruments	68
	3.3.1 The group embedded figure test (GEFT)	68
	3.3.1.1 GEFT validity	69
	3.3.2 SILL (strategy inventory for language learning)	70
	3.3.2.1 SILL utility	72
	3.3.2.2 SILL reliability	72
	3.3.2.3 SILL validity	73
	3.3.2.4 Advantages &disadvantages of SILL	74
3.4	Design of the study	75
3.5	Procedure	76
3.6	Data analysis	77
3.7	Summary	77

Chapter Four: Data Analysis

4.1	Introduction	78
4.2	Research question one	78
4.3	Research question two	82
	4.3.1. Learners language learning strategies	84
	4.3.1.1. Metacognitive strategy	84
	4.3.1.2. Cognitive strategy	89
	4.3.1.3. Social strategy	95
	4.3.1.4. Compensatory strategy	99
	4.3.1.5. Memory strategy	103
	4.3.1.6. Affective strategy	108
4.4	General strategy use among the subjects	113

Chapter Five: Conclusion & Implication

5.1	Introduction	115
5.2	General strategy use among the subjects	116
5.3	Strategy use and cognitive style	117
5.4	Classroom implication	121
5.5	Conclusion	123
5.6	Suggestion for further research on language learning strategies	124
	Bibliography	125
	Appendixes	133