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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.

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.
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