International Journal of Language , Literature , Culture and History Studies
Vol.2, NO.1 , P: 31 - 51
Received : 19 January 2020
Accepted : 24 March 2020

A Study of the Relationship between Bilingualism and Language Learning Strategies Accuracy's in Iranian EFL Learners Educational Processes

Jaleh Shafieefar
Master of Linguistics, University of Nebrijia, Manzaranes, Spain
jshafieefar@alumnos.nebrija.es

Abstract
In EFL classrooms, teachers have found that some learners seem to master the difficulties of foreign language learning with great success and little effort, while for others it is neither an enjoyable nor a successful one; what works for one learner might not work for another. The present research intended to find out the relationship between bilingualism and language learning strategy in advanced Iranian EFL Learners. The Research method of the present study was descriptive-analytic and data were collected through questionnaires. A total of 120 students have participated in this study, aged (15-30). It should be noted that, the participants were divided into two groups, 60 students were all native speakers of Persian (Monolingual group) and 60 students were bilingual of Turkish/Kurdish and Persian language (bilingual Group). All the learners were selected through their registration profile in Safir Language Academy of Tehran, Iran and all them were homogenized by proficiency test of PET (Preliminary English Test) and they were intermediate language learners. After homogenization of intermediate level students, they were asked to fill out Oxfords (1990) 50-item version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). Subsequently, the Non-Parametric Chi- square test followed by Phi & Crammers V test was performed using SPSS 23 to answer the three research question. The findings of the present research indicated that there was a meaningful relationship between types of strategies used by EFL learners and their languages.

Keywords: Bilingualism, Monolinguals, Learning Strategies, Intermediate EFL learners

1. Introduction

Nowadays, bilingualism can be broadly defined as the potential to speak two languages (Calabria et al, 2020). Many countries in the world are experiencing this phenomenon. Bilingualism is one of the controversial issues, and researchers have been conducted to find its effect on individuals linguistic development, educational attainment and intelligence. In respect to this, Iran has been a richly multilingual nation, with documented evidence reaching back nearly three millennia (Mohammad et al, 2020). Moreover, one of the current trends in foreign language learning settings is to raise awareness about students personal differences and their potential effects on the learning process and outcomes so as to arrive at the most conclusive explanation of the variance in performance (Jafari Gohar & Sadeghi, 2015). Based on this, it can be mentioned that learning strategies can be differ from one person to other and it can be considered as one of the main personal differences in people and in particular in English learners.

The aim of this study is to investigate the language learning strategies or patterns used

by monolingual and bi/multilingual intermediate EFL Iranian learners. In order to put it clear, the researcher tried to find a relationship between language learning accuracy (based on their learning strategies) and notion of language in mind in terms of bilinguality and monolinguality. Moreover, the researcher tried to compare monolingual and bi/multilingual language learning strategies between monolingual and bilingual learners. In addition to all above, another aim is learning English as L3 and attempt to have autonomous bilingual learners. Based on the provided information, this research study aimed at answering the following questions:

RQ1. What are the most prevalent learning strategies used among bilingual intermediate Iranian EFL students?

RQ2. What are the most prevalent learning strategies used among monolingual intermediate Iranian EFL students?

RQ3. Is there a meaningful relationship between Iranian EFL students learning strategy and bilingualism?

To find logical answers to the research questions, the following null hypotheses were tested:

H1: There is no significant difference beween learning strategies used by monolingual intermediate EFL learners and bilingual intermediate EFL learners in Iran.

H2: There is no meaningful relationship between Iranian EFL learners use of language learning strategies and bilingualism.

2. Review of the Related Literature

2.1 Studies on Language Learning Strategies

It is crucial at this point to overview the various definitions and classifications of language learning strategies and adapt a basic principle of what they are and how they can be taxonomies .Research into language learning strategies began in the 1960s mainly influenced by developments made in cognitive psychology (Williams and Burden, 1997). Since Rubins and Sterns pioneering work in 1975, a great number of important studies into language learning strategies have been carried out and there has been an awareness that language learning strategies have the potential to be an extremely powerful learning tool (O'Malley Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Küpper & Russo, 1985) Rubins definition, one of the earliest in the field, offers a broad description of language learning strategies as he techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge (1981). At about the same time as Rubin (1981) produced a list of ten language learning strategies which in his view were the characteristics of good language learners. Bialystok (1987) defined language learning strategies as optional means for exploiting available information to improve competence in a second language. At the same time, she identified four kinds of language learning strategies: formal practicing, functional practicing monitoring, and inferencing. In 1987, Rubin proposed that language learning strategies are "strategies which contribute to the development of the language system which the learner constructs and affect learning directly" (1981, p. 45). Rubin (1987) categorized language learning strategies into two groups direct and indirect ones. According to Rubin there are six types of direct strategies: clarification/verification, monitoring, memorization, guessing/inductive inferencing, deductive reasoning and practice. She divided the indirect strategies into two types: creating opportunities for practice and production tricks. Finally, O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Russo, and Küpper (1985), based on observation and interviews that they used in their study, identified three main categories of strategies: cognitive, metacognitive and socio affective strategies. Processing of information by using translation, note taking, repetition, etc is achieved by the direct employment of cognitive strategies.

Metacognitive strategies, such as planning, monitoring, self-evaluation, etc., help regulate language learning. Cooperation and clarification seeking are examples of socio affective strategies which are related to interactions with others during the learning process. It is crucial at this point to overview the various definitions and classifications of language learning strategies and adapt a basic principle of what they are and how they can be taxonomized.

2.2 Multilingualism in the EFL Classroom

In order to take advantage of the positive aspects of multilingualism in teaching Jessner (2006) proposes creating links among languages and exploiting the resources that multilingual learners bring into the classroom. This can be achieved by using cross-language approaches and strategy training. Jessner (2006) noted research into multilingualism has repeatedly shown that the individual language systems in the multilingual mind are activated together during third language production, yet this fact is ignored or considered an obstacle in the language classroom. The reason for this generally lies in the belief that simultaneous use of the languages by a multilingual (including their L1) will cause confusion in the students mind and inhibit learning. In the ordinary language classroom contact with another language is still regarded as a hindrance to learning. Early contrastive analysis approach to language teaching has influenced this view as it considered the L1 influence on a second language or a foreign language only as an interference to be avoided (Hombitzer, 1971). Although not referring to multilinguals in particular, James (1998) and Hawkins (2000) stressed the importance and usefulness of contrastive analysis as part of language learning and teaching in the classroom as they concerned themselves with the process of learning to learn a language and cross-language comparisons with special emphasis on the role of the L1 in second language learning. Studies into metalinguistic awareness of multilinguals report on the benefits of using teaching methods that allow contact and cooperation among languages (Jessner, 1999; Cummins, 2001). Based on the evidence from numerous studies (Jessner 1999, 2003) and on the claim that various languages simultaneously interact, compete and support each other during language production and reception, Jessner (2006) advocates a cross linguistic approach to language learning/teaching of multilinguals as one of the main goals in future language teaching. She adds that with this approach the development of linguistic awareness in multilinguals will include the activation of any prior language knowledge, not only the L1 to L2. Macaro (2006) points out that learners various language learning experiences can be beneficial to language awareness as long as linkages and pathways among the languages are established. He proposes a cross-curricular approach to curriculum development as a way to achieve this goal. Macaro (2006) address the case for collaboration between teachers who teach L1 English and those who teach modern languages, as well as the researchers in the field, in order to facilitate cross-curricular cooperation which would lead to the development of language learning strategies and raise learners literacy skills. The authors stress the need to make explicit links between the languages taught since their research indicates that those links enable learners to transfer knowledge of their L1 to other languages learnt and vice versa. An emerging classroom practice including contrastive analysis and translation for consciousness-raising and language awareness purposes has been suggested (e.g. James, 1996; Cummins 2007) maintains that conceptual knowledge in L1 and L2 (or, it can be added, in any additional language) is interdependent, meaning that concepts, academic content and

learning strategies transfer across languages. He argues that neither the direct method (instruction exclusively through the target language) nor the two solitudes(strict separation of languages in an immersion program) assumptions have research basis. According to the interdependence hypothesis posed by Cummins (2005) monolingual instructional orientation should be complemented by bilingual/multilingual instructions as they are more efficient and consistent with the interdependence that exists among languages.

3. Methods

3.1 Participants

This research was conducted in English language institutes in Tehran. For this research teenagers intermediate level were the subject of study are focused, the questionnaires distributed among participants to find frequency and type of language learning strategy used by intermediate EFL learners and find whether bi/multilingual learners are different from their monolingual peers in using language learning strategies or not. In other words, the researcher was chosen 60 EFL learners for each group of the study (60 for monolingual and 60 for bilingual participants). These participants were EFL learners with monolingual ability (monolingual of Persian language as an international language of Iran) and bilingual EFL learners (bilinguals of Turkish and Kurdish language). It should be noted that, these students were selected from Iranian Educational System and were observed by same teacher. The questionnaire was distributed among participants to find frequency and type of language learning strategy was used by intermediate EFL learners and it was found that whether bi/multilingual learners are different from their monolingual peers in using language learning strategies or not.

3.2 Instruments

Instrumentation of this study are summarized as follow:

3.2.1 Preliminary English Test (PET)

All students will be measured through the English Preliminary Test in order to have acceptable and appropriate level of English Proficiency. This test will show the homogeneity of the learners at the beginning stage of the study. In other words PET for school will be chosen as an instrument to take a pre-test about the proficiency of the learners.

3.2.2 Questionnaire

In this study, the researcher uses the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning, EFL/ESL language learning strategies which are used by different Iranian students. Oxford (1990) developed the SILL to measure language learning strategies for speakers of other languages learning, one of the most popularly used questionnaires in the domain of L2 acquisition and teaching. The instrument conducted in Persian to minimize the interference of their English abilities. In order to put it clear, the current study used SILL questionnaire (Oxford, 1990) to determine the type of language learning strategies and frequency of strategy use of intermediate Iranian EFL students (monolingual and bi/multilingual learners).

3.3 Data Collection Procedures

In order to achieve the goals of the study, the researcher was chosen 120 EFL learners (60 for monolingual and 60 for bilingual participants). These participants were EFL learners with monolingual ability (monolingual of Persian language) and bilingual EFL learners (bilinguals of Turkish or Kurdish language). It should be noted that, these students were selected from Iranian Educational System and observed by same teacher. In other words, the researcher used the

term monolingual speaker as a person who speaks one language which acquire unconsciously as mother tongue. In order to explain it clear, the monolingual speaker is a person who "learn" foreign language like English beside his/her mother tongue in order to be semi-bilingual in future. Moreover, the researcher defined the bilingual speaker who acquired two languages at the same time because of the birthplace conditions (Jessner, 2006). According to Jessner (2006), this bilingual speaker mainly "learns" third language like English in order to be multilingual speaker. It should be noted that, monolingual speakers of this study were chosen from Iranian EFL learners who acquired Persian as their L1. In addition to this, bilingual speakers of this were chosen were Iranian EFL learners who acquired two languages of Turkish/Kurdish and Persian at the same time in their childhood. It is worth to mentioning that the researcher chose these learners based on the registration profiles of the learners in language school of Safir, Saadat Abad branch (Tehran, Iran). In second step, all students were measured through the English Preliminary Test (PET) in order to have acceptable and appropriate level of English Proficiency. This test has showed the homogeneity of the learners at the beginning stage of the study. In other words, PET for school was chosen as an instrument to take a pre-test about the proficiency of the learners. In other words, participants were considered as intermediate learners initially based on the placement tests given at the language institute. After that the questionnaire (SILL) was distributed among the participants of the study and was collected after a reasonable time; so that there was sufficient time for them to respond. After the collection of the questionnaire, the responses in the instrument were analyzed. After the collection of the questionnaire, the responses in the instrument were based on the scoring procedure was provided by the authors, coded and analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Moreover, Descriptive statistics were calculated.

4. Results of the Study

RQ1. What are the most prevalent learning strategies used by bilingual intermediate Iranian EFL students?

To provide answer to the first research question, descriptive statistics including mean ranks and standard deviation were computed for the six categories of the strategy inventory as well as different items of the inventory. Item statistics for the six main categories of the strategy inventory are given in following Tables.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for the Memory Strategies Used by Bilingual Language Learners

Item in the Questionnaire	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I think of the relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	3.7167	1.15115	60
I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.	4.0000	0.93881	
I connect the sound of an English word and an image or picture of the	3.9500	1.22716	

world to help me remember the word.			
I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used. I use rhymes to remember new English words.	4.1500 4.6833	0.89868 1.06551	
I use flashcards to remember new English words.	3.5500	1.06445	
I physically act out new English words.	3.3667	0.84305	
I review English lessons often.	3.8333	0.78474	
I remember the new words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	4.2167	0.99305	
Total	3.82	0.453	

The first section of the strategy inventory comprising nine items investigated bilingual participants use of memory strategies. Table 1 depicts the results of analysis for the memory strategies. For the bilingual language learners, the total mean rank for this kind of strategies equaled (M= 3.82) with a standard deviation of (SD= 0.453). The respondents ratings for the items of the strategy inventory showed that remembering new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, was the most favored type of memory strategy for the bilingual language learners (M =4.21). In contrast, physically acting out new English words" was the least favored memory strategy in this category (M = 3.36). The students were highly consistent in their ratings for the eighth item (SD=.784). They expressed relatively identical views towards reviewing English lessons frequently. In comparison, the ratings were somewhat heterogeneous for the third item of this category. They reported divergent views towards connecting the sound of an English word and an image or picture of the world to help them remember the word." (SD= 1.227).

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for the Cognitive Strategies Used by Bilingual Language Learners

Item in the Questionnaire	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I say or write new English words several times	3.8333	0.80605	

I try to talk like native English speakers.	2.6833	1.59970	60
I practice the sounds of English.	3.6667	0.95077	
I use the English word I know in different ways.	4.1500	0.89868	
I start conversations in English.	4.2500	1.05163	
I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	3.7167	0.92226	
I read for pleasure in English.	4.3667	1.00788	
I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.	3.8833	0.88474	
I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	3.4167	1.26614	
I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	3.5000	1.12757	
I try to find patterns in English.	3.6500	0.98849	
I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	3.9667	0.88234	
I try not to translate word-for-word.	3.9000	1.29798	
I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	3.3333	1.05230	
Total	3.72	0.495	

The second section of the strategy inventory dealt with cognitive strategies. The total mean rank for this section came to (M= 3.72) with standard deviation of (SD= .495). While watching English language TV shows spoken in English or going to movies spoken in English received the highest mean rank (M=4.36), trying to talk like native English speakers

was given the least mean rank (M =2.68). Moreover, the bilingual language learners were highly varied in their ratings for this item (SD=1.59). However, the ratings were uniform for the first item that reflected their views

towards saying or writing new English words several times (SD= .806).

Table 3 : Descriptive Statistics for the Compensation Strategies Used by Bilingual Language Learners

Item in the Questionnaire	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	3.7667	0.76727	60
When I cannot think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	3.6333	1.19273	
I make new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	3.0500	1.38301	
I read English without looking up every new word.	3.4333	1.04746	
I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	3.0500	1.37070	
If I cannot think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	3.4000	1.07672	
Total	3.38	0.751	

For the Compensation strategies, the total mean rank measured was (M= 3.38) and standard deviation came to (SD=.751). As regards the ratings for every individual items of this section of the direct strategies, making guesses to understand unfamiliar English words received the highest mean rank (M=3.76). In contrast, making new words if they didn't know the right ones in English and trying to guess what the other person would say next in English received the lowest mean rank (M =3.05). Concerning the extent of the diversity of the ratings made, the highest degree of diversity of ratings was reported for the third item which had the lowest mean rank among other compensation strategies, too (SD= 1.38). Additionally, the responses were consistent for the first item that examined the respondents willingness to make guesses to understand unfamiliar English words (SD= .767).

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for the Metacognitive Strategies Used by Bilingual Language Learners

Item in the Questionnaire	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	4.1667	1.10724	

I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	4.1167	1.07501	60
I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	4.2000	1.20451	
I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	4.4000	1.06086	
I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	3.9500	1.25448	
I look for people I can talk to in English.	3.8500	1.28650	
I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	4.1833	1.08130	
I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	3.9500	1.18501	
I think about my progress in learning English.	3.9333	0.86095	
Total	4.08	0.770	

The second main category of the strategy inventory took measures concerning indirect strategies. It included meta-cognitive, affective, and social strategies. The first subdivision of indirect strategies evaluated the use of metacognitive strategies that included nine items. The total mean rank amounted to (M= 4.08) and standard deviation came to (SD= .770).

From among items that investigated the bilingual language learners use of metacognitive items, the fourth item received the highest mean rank (M= 4.40). This item examined the respondents attitudes towards "trying to find out how to be a better learner of English. However, the lowest rating was made for the sixth item that concerned the respondents willingness to "look for people they could talk to in English. (M =3.85). When it comes to the standard deviation, the highest amount of uniformity among the responses was seen for the ninth item which appraised their viewpoint towards thinking about their progress in learning English (SD=.860). In comparison, the highest degree of variation in ratings was found among the responses for the sixth item that assessed the respondents willingness to look for people they could talk to in English" (SD= 1.286).

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for the Affective Strategies Used by Bilingual Language Learners

Item in the Questionnaire	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	3.4000	1.30449	

I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	3.0333	1.61525	60
I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	3.2500	0.98506	
I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	2.9500	1.34574	
I write down my feelings in a language-learning diary.	3.0667	1.80270	
I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	3.8833	1.40329	
Total	3.26	0.559	

The second subdivision of the indirect strategies examined affective strategies. The total mean rank for this section came to (M=3.26) and the standard deviation was (SD=.559). The sixth item that concerned with the respondents perception of talking to someone else about how they felt when they were learning English received the highest mean rank (M =3.88). In comparison, the lowest rating was reported for the fourth item that looked at the respondents attitudes with respect to noticing if they were tense or nervous when they were studying or using English. (M=2.95).

The highest degree of conformity among the responses was reported for the third item. The respondents were highly consistent in their ratings for this item that estimated their perceptions of giving themselves a reward or treat when they did well in English (SD= .985). In comparison, the ratings made for the fifth item that examined their views towards writing down their feelings in a language-learning diary were somewhat heterogeneous (SD=1.802).

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for the Social Strategies Used by Bilingual Language Learners

Item in the Questionnaire	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	4.2833	1.00998	60
I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	3.7500	0.96770	
I practice my English with other students.	4.0167	1.33393	
I ask for help from English speakers.	2.3833	1.45079	

I ask questions in English.	3.0667	1.80270	
I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	3.8833	1.50892	
Total	3.65	0.793	

The last subdivision of indirect strategies was related to social strategies that included six items. The total mean rank was equal to (M=3.65) with standard deviation of (SD=.793). The highest mean rank was reported for the first item that was related to the respondents attitudes with respect to asking other person to slow down or say something again if they did not understand something in English (M=4.28). In contrast, the fourth item that rated their views towards asking for help from English speakers (M = 2.38) was given the lowest mean rank. Regarding the deviation of the responses, the highest amount of divergence was found for fifth item that evaluated their viewpoints respecting asking questions in English (SD=1.508). In comparison, the highest amount of uniformity among the responses was reported for the second item which was related to the respondents willingness to "ask English speakers to correct them when they talked (SD=.967). To sum up, the total mean rank of the direct strategies for bilingual foreign language learners (M= 3.648) was slightly lower than the total mean rank of indirect strategies (M= 3.665). However, the responses provided for the indirect strategies (SD= .703) were more divergent than that of direct strategies (SD=.563).

RQ2. What are the most prevalent learning strategies used by monolingual intermediate Iranian EFL students?

To provide answer to the second research question, descriptive statistics including mean ranks and standard deviation were calculated for the six categories of the strategy inventory as well as different items of the inventory that was filled out by monolingual foreign language learners. Item statistics for the six main categories of the strategy inventory are given in following Tables.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for the Memory Strategies Used by Monolingual Language Learners

Item in the Questionnaire	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I think of the relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	2.8333	1.18130	60
I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.	3.0000	1.22128	
I connect the sound of an English word and an image or picture of the world to help me remember the word.	2.9167	1.35661	
I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	3.3500	1.16190	
I use rhymes to remember new English words.	2.8833	1.10610	
I use flashcards to remember new English words.	2.6000	1.53159	
I physically act out new English words.	3.3667	0.84305	
I review English lessons often.	2.5333	1.12697	

I remember the new words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	3.4333	1.43050	
Total	2.96	0.731	

Table 7 shows the results of the analysis for the memory strategies. For the first section of the strategy inventory that comprised nine items and assessed the monolingual participants use of memory strategies , the total mean rank came to (M= 2.96) with a standard deviation of (SD= .731). The monolingual respondentsratings for the items of the strategy inventory reflected that likewise bilingual language learners remembering new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or was the most favored type of memory strategy for the monolingual language learners (M =3.43). In contrast, physically acting out new English words" was the least favored memory strategy for both monolingual and bilingual language learners (M = 2.53). The ratings made by monolingual students were highly uniform for the fifth item (SD=.106). They expressed relatively similar views towards using rhymes to remember new English words. In comparison, the ratings were somewhat varied for the sixth item of this category. They reported differing views towards using flashcards to remember new English words." (SD= 1.531). The second division of direct strategies of the strategy inventory dealt with cognitive strategies. The total mean rank for this section came to (M= 3.03) with standard deviation of (SD= .583).

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics for the Cognitive Strategies Used by Monolingual Language Learners

Item in the Questionnaire	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I say or write new English words several times	3.5567	1.24010	60
I try to talk like native English speakers.	2.6500	1.14721	
I practice the sounds of English.	2.8500	1.38790	
I use the English word I know in different ways.	2.8000	1.45905	
I start conversations in English.	2.9167	1.27946	
I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	2.8500	1.62423	
I read for pleasure in English.	2.9833	1.03321	
I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.	3.2333	1.26714	
I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	3.4167	1.26614	

I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	3.8833	1.36657	
I try to find patterns in English.	3.3833	1.18023	
I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	3.1333	1.04908	
I try not to translate word-for-word.	2.6167	1.39115	
I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	2.8833	1.31602	
Total	3.03	0.583	

Monolingual language learners reported, skimming an English passage and then go back and reading it carefully as their most favored cognitive strategy (M=3.88). In comparison, finding the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that they understood was given the least mean rank (M =2.61). Moreover, the monolingual language learners were highly varied in their ratings for the sixth item (SD=1.624) that evaluated their perceptions towards watching English language TV shows spoken in English or going to movies spoken in English. However, they made relatively uniform ratings for the seventh item that scrutinized their views towards reading for pleasure in English (SD= 1.033) and eleventh items that reflected their views towards trying to find patterns in English (SD= 1.049).

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics for the Compensation Strategies Used by Monolingual Language Learners

Item in the Questionnaire	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	3.1000	1.20310	60
When I cannot think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	2.2167	1.19450	
I make new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	2.2167	1.24997	
I read English without looking up every new word.	2.6333	1.26178	
I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	2.8333	1.58560	
If I cannot think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	3.6500	0.93564	
Total	2.77	0.872	

For the compensation strategies, the total mean rank for the monolingual language learners came to (M= 2.77) and standard deviation came to (SD= .872). Item statistics for every individual items of this section of the direct strategies showed that using a word or phrase that meant the same thing If they could not think of an English word received the highest mean rank (M=3.65). In comparison, using gestures when they could not think of a word during a conversation in English and making new words if they did not know the right ones in English. Received the lowest mean rank (M =2.21). When it comes to the variation of the ratings made by monolingual language learners for the compensation strategies, the highest degree of diversity of the ratings was reported for the fifth item that evaluated the respondents perceptions of trying to guess what the other person would say next in English. (SD= 1.585). However, the responses were homogenous for the sixth item that also had the highest mean rank among the items of this category (SD= .935).

Table 10: Descriptive Statistics for the Metacognitive Strategies Used by Monolingual Language Learners

Item in the Questionnaire	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	3.1000	1.24465	60
I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	3.1833	1.38383	
I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	3.9333	1.24692	
I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	3.6000	1.27824	
I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	3.2333	1.22636	
I look for people I can talk to in English.	3.1667	1.22359	
I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	3.2667	1.35129	
I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	3.1833	1.32117	
I think about my progress in learning English.	3.5333	1.29493	
Total	3.35	0.781	

Monolingual language learners ratings for the first subdivision of indirect strategies that evaluated the use of metacognitive strategies included nine items. The total mean rank amounted to (3.35) and standard deviation came to (.781). From among items that investigated the monolingual language learners use of metacognitive items, the third

item received the highest mean rank (M= 3.93). This item examined the respondents attitudes towards paying attention when someone is speaking English However, the lowest rating was made for the first item of this section that looked at the respondents willingness to try to find as many ways as they could to use their English (M =3.10). With respect to the variation among the ratings made for this section, the highest amount of uniformity among the responses was seen for the ninth item, which appraised their viewpoint towards looking for people they could talk to in English. (SD=1.223) and planning their schedule so they would have enough time to study English (SD= 1.226). In comparison, the highest degree of variation in ratings was found among the responses for the sixth item that assessed the respondents willingness to notice their English mistakes and use that information to help them do better. (SD= 1.383).

Table 11: Descriptive Statistics for the Affective Strategies Used by Monolingual Language Learners

Item in the Questionnaire	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	3.1667	1.23737	60
I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	2.7500	1.48009	
I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	2.5833	1.29263	
I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	2.0667	1.03934	
I write down my feelings in a language-learning diary.	2.1167	0.99305	
I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	2.5000	1.21432	
Total	2.53	0.706	

In the second subdivision of the indirect strategies, the respondents rated their use of affective strategies. The total mean rank for this section came to (M=2.53) and the standard deviation was (SD=.706). The monolingual language learners favored trying to relax whenever they felt afraid of using English (M =3.16). In comparison, they made the lowest rating for the fifth item that looked at the respondents attitudes with respect to writing down their feelings in a language-learning diary (M=2.16). The highest degree of consistency among the responses was reported for the fifth item. The respondents were highly consistent in their ratings for this item that appraised their attitudes towards writing down their feelings in a language-learning diary. (SD= .993). In comparison, the ratings made for the fifth item that examined their views towards encouraging themselves to speak English even when they were afraid of making a mistake were somewhat heterogeneous (SD=1.480).

Table 12: Descriptive Statistics for the Social Strategies Used by Monolingual Language Learners

Item in the Questionnaire	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	3.8867	1.32085	60
I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	2.8500	1.44767	
I practice my English with other students.	2.9000	1.17459	
I ask for help from English speakers.	3.3667	0.91996	
I ask questions in English.	3.1833	0.92958	
I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	2.2833	1.23634	
Total	3.07	0.694	

For the use of social strategies that included six items, the total mean rank was equal to (3.07) with standard deviation of (.694). Likewise the ratings made by the bilingual language learners, for the monolingual EFL leaners, the highest mean rank was reported for the first item that Asked the respondents about their attitudes towards asking other person to slow down or say something again if they did not understand something in English (M=3.86). In contrast, the sixth item that assessed their views towards trying to learn about the culture of English speakers (M = 2.28) was given the lowest mean rank. When it comes to the diversity of the responses provided to this section of the strategy inventory, the highest degree of variance was found for the second item that evaluated their viewpoints with respect to asking English speakers to correct them when they talked (SD=1.447). In comparison, the highest amount of consistency among the ratings was reported for the fourth item that looked at the respondents willingness to ask for help from English speakers. (SD=.919). In general, the total mean rank of the direct strategies for monolingual foreign language learners (M= 2.92) was slightly lower than the total mean rank of indirect strategies (M= 2.98). Moreover, the ratings made for the indirect strategies (SD= .727) were somewhat similar to the ratings done for the direct strategies (SD=.728). In order to examine the most prevalent language-learning strategies used by monolinguals and bilinguals, the descriptive table was used to display the mean ranks and standard deviation for the six categories of the strategy inventory for both monolinguals and bilinguals. The results are presented in the following table:

Table 13: Group Statistics for the Monolinguals and Bilinguals

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Memory Strategies	Bilingual	60	3.8296	0.45398	0.05861
	Monolingual	60	2.9685	0.73193	0.9449
Cognitive Strategies	Bilingual	60	3.7262	0.49560	0.6398
	Monolingual	60	3.0393	0.58347	0.7533

Compensation Strategies	Bilingual	60	3.3889	0.75144	0.9701
	Monolingual	60	2.7750	0.87216	0.11260
Metacognitive Stratgies	Bilingual	60	4.0833	0.77051	0.09947
	Monolingual	60	3.3556	0.78188	0.10094
Affective Strategies	Bilingual	60	3.2639	0.55937	0.7221
	Monolingual	60	2.5306	0.70610	0.9116
Social Strategies	Bilingual	60	3.6500	0.79351	0.10244
	Monolingual	60	3.0750	0.69463	0.8968
Total	Bilingual	60	3.7040	0.36686	0.4736
	Monolingual	60	2.9950	0.54824	0.07078

In terms of general foreign language learning strategy use strategies, the total mean rank for the bilingual group (M total =3.70) was higher than that of the monolingual group (M=2.99). In other words, bilingual language learners reported higher levels of strategy use than the monolingual group. In addition, both groups made the ratings to the items that evaluated their strategy use with relatively identical degree of diversity. However, bilingual language learners (SD bilingual =.366) seemed to be more consistent in their ratings for the strategies than the monolingual group (SD monolingual =.548). Bilingual EFL learners used metacognitive strategies (M= 4.08) more frequently than other types of strategies. In contrast, affective strategies were the least prevalent strategies used by bilingual students (M= 3.26). Correspondingly, for the monolingual EFL learners, the most prevent language-learning strategy was metacognitive strategy (M=3.35). In a similar vein, the least frequently used strategy among monolinguals was affective strategy (M= 2.53).

RQ3. Is there any statistically significant relationship between Iranian EFL students learning strategy use and bilingualism?

In order to provide answer to the third research question, first, the frequencies of each category as well as the total frequency for the strategy inventory in monolingual and bilingual language learners were calculated. In order to check the possible relationship between EFL learners use of strategies and their language, the results of the frequency tables were analyzed using a Chi-Square test.

Table 14: Chi-Square Test for the Strategies used by Intermediate Monolingual and Bilingual EFL Learners

	Value	df	Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square Memory strategies * group	66.477	27	0.000
Pearson Chi-Square cognitive strategies* group	65.521	32	0.000
Pearson Chi-Square compensation strategies * group	49.990	22	0.001
Pearson Chi-Square metacognitive strategies * group	48.997	27	0.006

Pearson Chi-Square affective strategies * group	41.875	19	0.002
Pearson Chi-Square social strategies* group	37.463	20	0.10
Pearson Chi-Square total strategy use* group	88.333	67	0.42

The two-sided asymptotic significance of the chi-square statistic for the types of strategies used by EFL learners in Monolingual and Bilingual groups was lower than (.05). Therefore, it could be concluded that the relationships between these variables were not due to chance variation, which implied that Monolingual and Bilingual EFL learners had employed specific strategies, which was statistically different from each other. To show the strength and direction of this relationship, Phi and Cramers V test was run.

Table 15: Phi and Cramers V for the Strategies used by Monolingual and Bilingual EFL Learners

		Value	Approx. Sig
Nominal by Nominal (memory strategies)	Phi	0.744	0.000
	Cramers V	0.744	0.000
Nominal by Nominal (cognitive strategies)	Phi	0.739	0.000
	Cramers V	0.739	0.000
Nominal by Nominal (compensation strategies)	Phi	0.645	0.001
	Cramers V	0.645	0.001
Nominal by Nominal (metacognitive strategies)	Phi	0.639	0.006
	Cramers V	0.639	0.006
Nominal by Nominal (social strategies)	Phi	0.591	0.002
	Cramers V	0.591	0.002
Nominal by Nominal (total strategy use)	Phi	0.588	0.42
	Cramers V	0.858	0.42

Based on the results of Phi and Cramers V, there was a significant association between types of strategies used by EFL learners and their language. The value of Cramers V for the total strategy use came to (V= .858; sig. (042) ≤.05). The highest degree of association was reported between memory strategies and bilingualism (V= .744) closely followed by the relationship between cognitive strategies and bilingualism (V= .739). In contrast, the lowest degree of relationship was reported between affective strategies and bilingualism (V= .591) and social strategies and bilingualism (V= .591). The relationship suggested that the Monolingual and Bilingual EFL learners preferred to make use of specific type of strategies. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected indicating that there was a statistically significant relationship between Iranian EFL

learners use of language learning strategies and their language.

5. Discussion of Findings and Research Questions

There are many research investigations in previous literature that confirm the results of the study (Bialystok, 2001; Cummins, 1978; Oxford, 2002; Frye, Zelazo, and Palfai, 1995). According to what has been mentioned in theoretical framework section, bilingual EFL learners can perform different from monolingual learners (Bialystok, 2001). As the results of the study showed, they can acquire and learn language through experiencing in school through social strategies or patterns which is consistent with the results of the study in Bialystok (2001). More clearly, the results of the study showed that having two different language systems for examination may make structural patterns more strong and perceptible for bilinguals and stimulate their attention to the systematic features of language (Bialystok, 2001). In addition to this, results of the study can be in line with the results of Cummins (1978) who emphasizes on the higher cognitive flexibility. In other words, the results of the study showed that bilingual EFL learners prefer to us cognitive language learning strategies like watching language programs in English and try to activate their knowledge through the. According to Cummins (1978) and also results of the current study, there are three ways one might explain the cognitive superiority of bilinguals over monolinguals. The first explanation is that bilinguals have a wider and more varied range of experiences than monolinguals because of their functioning in two cultures. The second explanation relates to a shifting mechanism. Because bilingual children shift between their two languages, they are more flexible in their thinking. The third explanation is the process of objectification. As it was shown in the results of the study, bilinguals may consciously and subconsciously compare and contrast their two languages. Moreover, bilinguals examine their two languages carefully and figure out interference between languages which can be achieved through the process of affective strategies (Oxford, 2002). Furthermore, Frye, Zelazo, and Palfai (1995) relate the superiority of bilinguals in sorting problems to their superiority in conceptualizing the rules. As the results of the study showed, bilingual learners try to conceptualized the language rules through metacognitive strategies. That is, bilinguals can conceive the rules in all the conditions and outperform monolinguals on all sorting tasks. Moreover, Kessler and Quinn (1987) believe that the ability of bilinguals in integrating different views to the solution, the ability evolved from their experiences with two languages and cultures, is the reason for their outperforming in creativity and scientific problem-solving which is in line with the results of the study.

6. Conclusion

We have various language learning strategies or patters that can influence the language learning among EFL learners. Moreover, we have monolingual and bilingual speakers in multi-language countries like Iran where EFL learners are not the same in case of language learning patterns or strategies. Based on the provided information, the researcher of the study came across to this idea that, the relationship between language learning strategies and mono/bilingual learners in Iran can be good topic in order to research on them. According what has mentioned in the previous sections, the results of the study revealed that both hypotheses were rejected. In other words, the researcher proved that there is significant difference between learning strategies used by monolingual intermediate EFL learners and bilingual intermediate EFL learners in Iran. According to the second hypothesis which is rejected, the researcher showed that, there is

meaningful relationship between Iranian EFL learners use of language learning strategies and bilingualism. In sum, examining language strategy use between monolingual and bilingual learners revealed that although the context of learning for Persian monolingual learners of this study is more favorable due to more facilities they had at schools, bilingual learners reported more strategy use than monolingual ones. Despite the relatively small sample, the findings of this study can have important implications in foreign language teaching and especially in the case of monolingual and bilingual students. The results of the current study must be carefully explored and understood in order to find beneficial instructional implications in different areas of language teaching like methodology and materials development.

References

1. Bialystok, E. (1981). The role of linguistic knowledge in second language use. Studies in second language acquisition, 31-45.
2. Bialystok, E. (1987). Words as things. Development of word concept by bilingual children. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 9, 133-140.
3. Bialystok, E. (1990). The competence of processing: Classifying theories of second language acquisition. TESOL quarterly, 24(4), 635-648.
4. Calabria, M., Hernández, M., Cattaneo, G., Suades, A., Serra, M., Juncadella, M., ... & Ugas, L. (2020). Active bilingualism delays the onset of mild cognitive impairment. Neuropsychologia, 107528.
5. Cummins, J. (2000). Academic language learning, transformative pedagogy, and information technology: Towards a critical balance. TESOL quarterly, 34(3), 537-548.
6. Cummins, J. (2000). Academic language learning, transformative pedagogy, and information technology: Towards a critical balance. TESOL quarterly, 34(3), 537-548.
7. Frye, D., Zelazo, P.D., & Palfai, T. (1995). Theory of mind and rule based reasoning. Cognitive Development, 10, 483–527.
8. Jafari Gohar, M., & Sadeghi, N. (2015). The impact of learning style preferences on foreign language achievement: A case study of Iranian EFL students. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 171, 754-764.
9. Jessner, U. (2006). Linguistic awareness in multilinguals: English as a third language: English as a third language. Edinburgh University Press.
10. Jessner, U. (2014). On multilingual awareness or why the multilingual learner is a specific language learner. In Essential topics in applied linguistics and multilingualism (pp. 175-184). Springer, Cham.
11. Kessler, C., & Quinn, M. E. (1987). Language minority childrens linguistic and cognitive creativity. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 8, 173–186.
12. Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: Revising the theoretical framework. The modern language journal, 90(3), 320-337.
13. O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U. (1990). Learning strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge university press.
14. O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Kupper, L., & Russo, R. P. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. Language learning, 35(1), 21-46.
15. Oxford, R. (1990). Language learning strategies around the world: cross cultural perspective. Second language teaching & curriculum center, university of Hawaii.
16. Oxford, R. L. (2002). Language learning strategies in a nutshell: Update and ESL suggestions. Methodology in language

teaching: An anthology of current practice, 4(3), 124-132.
17. Rubin, J (1975). What the good language learner can teach us, TESOL Quarterly, 9, 41-51.
18. Rubin, J (1981). Study of cognitive processes in second language learning, Applied Linguistics, 11, 117-131
19. Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). Psycology for language teachers. Ernst Klett Sprachen.