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Abstract— This study explores the patterns of language learning strategies and the degree of tolerance of ambiguity of Diploma students of UTM Perak Branch. It involved 180 participants who were randomly chosen from a number of faculties at the university. The study also sought to find out any relationships between language learning strategies and tolerance of ambiguity. For the study, the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL for EFL/ESL) and the Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale were used. It was found that language learning strategies mean was moderate overall. It shows that the language learning strategies usage is common among the samples. Students’ most preferred language learning strategies were Metacognitive strategies, while the least preferred was Memory strategies. Their overall tolerance towards ambiguities caused by the use of English inside and outside the language classrooms was also moderate. This signifies that they do not exhibit high tolerance that would lead them to accept new and ambiguous language elements unquestioningly. On the other hand, they also do not possess high intolerance that could impede their L2 learning process. Correlations between tolerance of ambiguity and language learning strategies were weak and not significant, although positive. There is no relationship between students’ tolerance of ambiguity and their language learning strategies usage.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Despite its prominence in daily life and the great emphasis on the language from kindergartens to secondary schools, the average English level of Malaysian students is still being questioned. This could be seen from the SPM results for 2014 in which the performance of students in English saw a decline. Even the Minister of Education himself is “baffled” with Malaysian students who are still struggling to master the language after learning it for almost two decades (1). In fact, a 2013 survey by online recruitment agency JobStreet.com found that 55% of senior managers and companies that participated in the survey were unanimous in that poor command of the English language was the main factor that caused undergraduates to remain jobless (2).

This damaging situation could be contributed to a number of factors. One of it is the exam-based curriculum (3,4). Teachers usually resort to the short term methods such as memorizing key phrases or remembering grammar points through drilling and rote learning. Language is then often perceived as a set of rules and formula that must be followed rigidly in which no fun and varieties are allowed. It is believed that this makes language learning full of uncertainties where a good language learner must have a good degree of tolerance towards ambiguity in order to overcome it (5).

The heavy emphasis on examination results also has in fact forced educators to employ teaching strategies that are more teacher-centered (3,6). Therefore, the student develops their character to be more passive in class (3). This passivity will diminish any attempts to promote a thinking culture in the classroom (7).

Therefore, it is thought that in order to help Malaysian university students to be a more independent and self-directed English learner, students need to be equipped and trained with proper language learning strategies. A number of studies on language learning strategies have been conducted in the Malaysian context. These studies focused mainly on the level and the patterns of language learning strategies use among Malaysian students (8,9,10,11) and variables that affect students’ use of language learning strategies; motivation (12,13), gender (13,14,15,16), anxiety (17,18), and language proficiency (19,20).

However, there is not any documented attempt to examine another variable that might affect the choice of language learning strategies of Malaysian students, which is tolerance of ambiguity, even though it is regarded as one of the most important variable in predicting students’ language learning strategies (21,22,23,24,25,26,27) Moreover, majority of studies in this area as previously mentioned focused more on foreign language context. Therefore, this study aims to fill this gap of knowledge, while assuming that such relationship also exists in a second language environment like Malaysia, in which learners’ tolerance of ambiguity will affect their choice of language learning strategies.

This study will be guided by these questions

1. What is the level of language learning strategies use by the Diploma students of UTM Perak?
2. How tolerant are the Diploma students of UITM Perak of ambiguity?
3. Is there any relationship between language learning strategies employed by the Diploma students of UITM Perak with their tolerance of ambiguity?

This study aims to:
1. To examine the kind of language learning strategies employed by the Diploma students of UITM Perak
2. To explore the degree of tolerance of ambiguity of the Diploma students of UITM Perak
3. To investigate the relationship between language learning strategies employed by the Diploma students of UITM Perak and their tolerance of ambiguity.

It is hoped that the present study will be a useful addition to the current body of knowledge regarding the language learning strategies and tolerance of ambiguity especially in the English as a Second Language setting. To date, the bulk of the studies in these two were more focused on the context of foreign language learning. This study which looks at the process of language learning in the context of a tertiary level institution which employs English both as its medium of instruction and as a subject could provide a broader and more complete understanding of the language learning process of the second language learners.

The findings of this study should also have important implications for English instructors and learners in various tertiary level institutions in the country. It could provide a new direction for practitioners in designing curriculum and devising their teaching strategies to ensure that both practitioners and their students will find success in the teaching and learning of English as a second language. They in addition will also be better informed about factors that affect students’ various learning characteristics and strategies. Only with a better understanding of such factors that practitioners could appropriately help their students to capitalize on their own strengths and weaknesses to achieve success in language learning

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Language Learning Strategies

The language learning strategies model used for this study comes from Oxford (28). It is classified into two major direct and indirect strategies. Each category was broken down into subcategories reflecting the specific strategies that would fit under the labels.

Direct Strategies requires mental processing of the language. It involves three strategies. Firstly, memory strategies which have specific functions such as creating mental linkages, applying images and sounds, reviewing well, and employing actions in storing and retrieving information. Secondly, cognitive strategies which enable learners to understand and produce new language. These strategies include practicing, analyzing and reasoning, receiving and sending messages, and taking notes. Thirdly, compensation strategies which allow the use of the target language to fill their gaps in knowledge. These strategies include guessing intelligently and using mime or gesture.

Indirect Strategies on the other hand enable direct strategies to occur and/or increase their successful application. Firstly, it involves metacognitive strategies which allow learners to control their own cognition to coordinate the learning process by using functions like centering, planning, arranging, and evaluating one’s own learning. Secondly, affective strategies, which help learners control their emotions, motivations, and attitudes by using functions such as lowering their anxiety, encouraging themselves, and taking their own emotional temperature. Thirdly, social strategies which enable learners to learn through interaction with others, by asking questions, cooperating, and empathizing with others.

2.2 Tolerance of Ambiguity

2.2.1 Definition of Tolerance of Ambiguity

In terms of foreign language (FL) learning, tolerance of ambiguity is defined (TOA) as “a person’s ability to function rationally and calmly in a situation in which interpretation of all stimuli is not clear” (21, p.30). Students with a higher level of TOA were thought to be more comfortable with learning a new language, as they can cope effectively and remain unthreatened ambiguous situations as mentioned earlier. It was also found that individuals who were more tolerant of ambiguity were also willing to take risks and were more receptive to change (23). On the other hand, it was also reported that individual with a low TOA “tend to look for black and white solutions, and jump into conclusions rather than taking time to consider all of the essential elements of an unclear situations (21, p.31). In addition, a low level of TOA might impede language learning (23).

2.2.2 Studies Related to Tolerance of Ambiguity

A number of studies have indicated that tolerance of ambiguity (TOA) could play a pivotal role in determining success in foreign/second language learning (5,21,29,30). Some of these early studies however did not utilize the specific instrument to measure TOA specifically for second language (L2) or foreign language (FL) learning.

It was only in 1989 that a specific scale to measure tolerance of ambiguity (TOA) in second language (L2) acquisition was developed by Ely (5). By using
this instrument, a study was conducted with students who learn Spanish as a L2. It was found that there was a direct relationship between TOA and language learning. It is known as the Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale (SLTAS).

2.2.3 Implications for Language Learning
Studies on the relationship between tolerance of ambiguity (TOA) and success in foreign/second language (FL/L2) learning indicated that TOA could be a positive feature for language learners, with individuals with a high level of TOA are thought to be more accepted an open to uncertainties in language learning, which in turn will result in a greater success in language learning. However, it was indicated that a person who is extremely high in TOA has been shown as a poor language learner (31). It was also argued that “…such excess tolerance has the effect of hampering or preventing meaningful subsumption of ideas. Linguistic rules, for example, might not be effectively integrated into a whole system rather; they may be gulped down in meaningless chunks learned by rote” (31, p. 127).

At the same time, the person with very little tolerance of ambiguity (TOA) on the other hand does not enjoy ambiguous learning situations (21,23,31). It was claimed that the learning of English as a second language may be seriously hampered “if a student experiences a feeling of “threat” or discomfort when confronted with linguistic uncertainty and is less inclined to take risks” (23,p.88). Ely (23) further identified three areas of threats; leaning individual linguistic elements (phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic), practicing language learning skills, and adapting those skills as permanent strategies. This notion is in line with Chapelle and Roberts (21), as they claimed that with low TOA, students may not only resist these threatening situations that caused discomfort; they will also discard the opportunities to learn a new language. Later, Brown (31) also supported this idea, by stating that “intolerance can close the mind too soon, especially if ambiguity is perceived as a threat; the result is a rigid, domestic, brittle mind that is too narrow to be creative’ (31, p. 127).

It is therefore suggested that moderate levels of tolerance of ambiguity (TOA) are recommended for optimum results in language learning (31,32) as Ely (23) felt that since high tolerance may cause cognitive passivity and low tolerance may impede language learning The ideal case, of course, is that of the learner who is neither inhibited by low tolerance of ambiguity nor oblivious to linguistics subtleties (23, p.93). Unfortunately, it is thought that nobody up to now has operationalized this mid-point TOA (32). However, as Brown (31) tried to provide more credence to this claim as he stated that “it is hard to imagine a person who sees everything in black and white without any shades of gray to ever being successful in learning a second language, which in itself is an overwhelmingly ambiguous process” (31, p. 127).

2.3 Tolerance of Ambiguity and Language Learning Strategies
An individual level of tolerance of ambiguity (TOA) is also thought to have some influences on an individual’s use of certain language learning strategies (22,24,26). However, the studies in this area are relatively few and focused more on foreign language (FL) learning. In a study with a group of young officers who learns FL in the School of Language Studies at one of the Foreign Services in the United States, Ehrman and Oxford (28) discovered that intuitive type of learners, who have relatively high levels of TOA, stated that they relied heavily on guessing from context, did not need complete comprehension, and were comfortable with linguistics risks and strategies. They also often used cognitive strategies, such as analyzing and reasoning to impose order on chaotic outputs. Sensing types of personality with generally low TOA, on the other hand, reported that they disliked having to guess from context. Instead, they would love to have a more rigid and organized approach, where all things and outputs are organized in a step-by-step manner.

Lee (24) also indicated that there was a relationship between language learning strategies adopted by Korean midshipmen who learn English as a foreign language and their level of tolerance of ambiguity (TOA), even though the values of the correlations can be regarded as very weak. Its correlation however, was also not strong (r= 0.14 to 0.17),Nishimo’s (26) case study of two Japanese learners of English on the other hand illustrated the influence of tolerance of ambiguity on the use of language learning strategies. Even though both of her subjects were found to share many commonalities in their reading strategies, they however were found to employ different strategies when confronted with unknown vocabularies.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design
Descriptive research was used for the study and the best way in conducting it is using qualitative approach which requires less depth but more data collected on participants.

3.2 Subjects
The subjects are 180 second year Diploma students of MARA University of Technology (UITM) in Perak. They take various academic majors at the university, such as Surveying, Planning, & Estimating, Art & Design, Accountancy, and Business Management. As in most higher level educational institutions in Malaysia, English is used as the major medium of instruction. They are also required to complete a
number English courses in the University, namely Consolidating Language Skill and Preparatory English for the first year students, English for Academic Purposes and English for Occupational Purposes for the second year students, and English for Critical Thinking for the third year students. These students in addition have been officially taught English as a second language since as early as 7 years old.

3.3 Instruments

For this study, two instruments were used; the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford (1990) and the Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale (SLTAS) by Ely (1995). Apart from these two instruments, a brief individual background survey was also included at the end of the questionnaire.

3.3.1 Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) is formulated by Oxford (28) to measure the frequency and variety of language learning strategies used by the students. The ESL/EFL SILL (7.0 version) was used in this study to measure the strategy use of second year English learners at UITM Perak. The SILL is divided into two major categories: direct strategies and indirect strategies. Each category is divided into three sub strategies. Direct strategies include memory, compensation, and cognitive strategies while indirect strategies involve metacognitive, affective and social strategies.

In order to measure the scores of the six categories above, a total of fifty items were devised by Oxford (28) as can be seen in Table 1. The figure in the parenthesis represents the number of questions in each sub-strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Language Learning Strategies and Number of SILL Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Strategies (27)</td>
<td>Memory Strategies (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compensation Strategies (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive Strategies (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Strategies (23)</td>
<td>Metacognitive Strategies (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affective Strategies (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Strategies (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SILL is a self-reported instrument. Students will indicate their response to questions such as “I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English” and “I try to learn about the culture of English speakers by using a five-point Likert-scale system for each strategy. The scale is ranging from 1 to 5 (1= never or almost never true of me, 2= generally not true of me, 3= somewhat true of me, 4= generally true of me, and 5= always or almost always true of me). The average scores for groups of strategies on the SILL were interpreted based on the reporting scale established by Oxford (28, p.300) as shown in Table 2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Standpoint for Language Learning Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Always or almost always used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Sometimes used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Generally not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never or almost never used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is reported that the SILL is the most widely used instrument for measuring the language-learning strategy use of learners to date. This is due to its high level of reliability in many studies. With Cronbach alpha, a measure of internal consistency, almost all studies reported a very high reliability, which is above .90 (.92 with 315 Japanese university students, .87 with 141 college ESL students, .94 with 505 Taiwanese university students, .93 with 332 Korean university students, .93 with 337 Korean Naval Academy midshipmen, and .92 with 149 Chinese students in Hong Kong (as reported by Hong, 2006)). The reliability of the SILL for the main study was .92.

3.3.2 Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale (SLTAS)

An instrument called Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale (SLTAS) by Ely (1995) was used to understand the influence of tolerance of ambiguity to second language learners. This instrument has 12 items and the responses are in Likert scale format with a set of four possible responses; Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. These responses will be used to respond to questions such as “It bothers me that I don’t understand everything the teacher says in English” and “I don’t like the fact that sometimes I can’t find English words that mean the same as some words in my language. Each of the scores will be counted in this way; Strongly Agree = 1, Agree = 2, Disagree = 3, and Strongly Disagree = 4. The total scores of each student were compared with their mean score, ranging from 4 points (least tolerant of ambiguity) to 1 point (more tolerant of ambiguity). The instrument was reported to have an average of .85 for its internal consistency reliability. For this study, the reliability was .84.

A pilot study was conducted prior to the main study and the reliability for both SILL and SLTAS for this pilot study was high, at .87, using Cronbach’s alpha.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Demographic Information about the Participants

This study involved 180 Diploma students of UITM Perak, which consisted of 110 female students (61.1%) and 70 male students (38.9%). The academic choices of these students consisted of 34.4% Business Management majors (n = 62), 30% Surveying,
Planning, Estimating majors (n = 54), 19.5% Art & Design majors (n = 19.5), and 16.1% Accountancy majors (n = 29). On the other hand, 34.5% of the students are First Year student (n = 63), 34.4% of them are Second Year students (n = 62) and 30.6% of them are Third Year students (n = 55).

4.2 Research Question 1: What is the level of language learning strategies use by the Diploma students of UTM Perak?

4.2.1 Overall language learning strategies usage

By Oxford’s (1990) categories of language learning strategies (LLS), it is found that the Diploma students of UTM Perak were generally moderate users of LLS. This is indicated by the overall mean of LLS use (M = 3.34). In addition, the SILL mean of each participant differed from the others (M = 2.52 to 4.52).

This also showed that the average language learning strategies usage by these students was moderate towards high. Apart from this, the standard deviation of the overall LLS was not great (SD = 0.40). In other words, most subjects’ mean for SILL were fairly concentrated around the mean score.

4.2.2 Preferred Language Learning Strategies (By Categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 3, we knew that the strategies preferred by the second year Diploma students of UTM Perak were (in order by means from highest to lowest) Metacognitive strategies (M = 3.50), Social strategies (M = 3.38), Compensation strategies (M = 3.34), Cognitive strategies (M = 3.34), Affective strategies (M = 3.27), and Memory strategies (M = 3.19). Metacognitive strategies seemed to be the most preferred language learning strategies used by these students. It had the highest mean score (M = 3.50), which fell within the lower high range for LLS usage (LLS mean range between 3.50 - 5.00). This score also surpassed the overall average score (M = 3.39) for LLS use. Students reported that they preferred to use these strategies to regulate and control their own language learning, such as thinking about their progress in learning English, seeking out ways to be a better learner, setting clear goals in learning English, and planning their schedule to study English. This result in addition is on par with other Malaysian tertiary level institutions students (M = 3.69, N = 400) as studied by Hamzah and Abdullah (8). In a study of four institutes of higher education, namely the polytechnic, teacher training institution, Form Six, and Matriculation colleges, it was also reported that these strategies were the most preferred LLS used by the students of these institutions. Oxford thinks that it is indeed a good thing if students preferred metacognitive strategies than other LLS, since she believes that these strategies are higher order executive skills that may entail planning, monitoring, and evaluating the success of language learning activities.

On the other hand, the students were not very keen to use the Memory strategies while learning English. It had the lowest mean score (M = 3.19) among all strategies. Students appeared to not frequently create mental linkage or apply images or sounds to help themselves in storing and retrieving new information in learning English. This result is also on par with the findings of Hamzah and Abdullah (8), which discovered that students of Malaysian tertiary level students preferred Memory strategies the least. A similar result in addition was also reported by Chu, Lin, Chen, Tsai, and Wang (27). In a study on Taiwanese students who learnt Chinese as a second language, among the six categories of SILL, only the mean score of memory strategies is below 3, suggesting that the participants in general did not resort to such strategies often. One probable reason for these findings might have been that some of the types of memory strategies on the SILL may not have been considered appropriate for adult learners, such as the participants in this study. For example, physically acting out new English words or making up rhymes, may be strategies preferred by learners at lower grade levels.

4.3 Research Question 2: How tolerant are the Diploma students of UTM Perak of ambiguity?

Before reporting the results for this part, it is necessary to explain the terms adopted to refer to different scores. When employing tolerance of ambiguity score, reference is made to the score produced after having calculated the score of all items included in the Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale (SLTAS). This score show the general tolerance/intolerance learners show and it ranges from 1 to 4. The higher the score, the more intolerant learners are of second language (L2) ambiguities. On the other hand, when using tolerance of ambiguity item score, reference is made to the score of individual items of the SLTAS. This score reflects learners’ tolerance/intolerance in the specific situation described in the tolerance of ambiguity item. It can range from 1 to 4, and in this case too, the higher the score, the more intolerant learners are of second language (L2) ambiguities.
4.3.1 Tolerance of Ambiguity Score

The results obtained indicated that the tolerance of ambiguity mean score is 2.75 (SD= 0.66, N= 180). This score could be located near to the mid-point of the scoring continuum of 1 to 4. They had a moderate level of tolerance towards ambiguity. This signified that the Diploma students of Uitm Perak did not exhibit high tolerance that would lead them to accept new and ambiguous language elements unquestioningly. On the other hand, they also did not possess high intolerance that could impede their L2 learning process. This is indeed great news, since it is previously claimed by Ely (23) and Kazamia (32) that moderate level of tolerance of ambiguity (TOA) are recommended for optimum results in language learning. Apart from this, the standard deviation of the overall tolerance of ambiguity was not great (SD: 0.66). In other words, most subjects’ means for SLTAS were fairly concentrated around the mean score.

4.4 Research Question 3: Is there any relationship between language learning strategies employed by the Diploma students of Uitm Perak with their tolerance of ambiguity

4.4.1 Overall Coefficient Correlation

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between students’ tolerance towards ambiguities in learning a language and their overall use of language learning strategies. There was a weak, negative correlation between the two variables, tolerance of ambiguity (M = 2.75, SD = 0.66) and students’ overall use of language learning strategies (M = 3.34, SD = 0.40). For an alpha level of .05, the correlation between these two variables was found to be not statistically significant, r = -0.26, n = 180, p= 0.425. This indicates that students’ tolerance towards ambiguity and their overall use of language learning strategies are not related.

It is worth mentioning that Chu, Lin, Chen, Tsai, and Wang’s study (27) on the relationships among tolerance of ambiguity, language learning strategies, and L2 proficiency in the context of learning Chinese as a second language (CSL) in Taiwan showed similar results, where it was revealed that tolerance of ambiguity did not have any significant main effect on the overall strategy use and the six SILL categories. In addition Hosseinand Ahmad (33) and Kamran and Maftoon (34) in their studies on the reading strategies of Intermediate Iranian EFL learners in Qazvin Payam-e-Noor University and Iran Language Institute respectively have indicated that there was no statistically significant correlation between tolerance of ambiguity and the overall reading strategy use.

4.5 Recommendations

Based on the results of the study, the following implications are derived. First, more emphasis should be placed on language learning activities that involve interaction and communication such as games, role-plays, simulations, and group discussions. Such activities not only provide a medium for students to practice the use of language learning strategies, but also will expose them to new and different language learning strategies.

Secondly, practitioners should also assist their learners to diagnose and discover their own preferred language learning strategies. This could be done not only by using instruments such as the Strategy Inventory in Language Learning (SILL), but also by providing students with tasks that require them to use language learning strategies as a means to an end or in arriving at final solutions. It is believed that such tasks could enable students to recognize their own strengths and weaknesses in terms of strategy use.

Thirdly, practitioners should also be aware of a host of variables that might affect students’ choice of language learning strategies, such as their level of motivation in learning a L2, attitudes and beliefs towards the L2, learning styles, and tolerance of ambiguity. They should try to ensure that these variables will have a positive impact on students’ choice of strategy. It is believed that only with a deeper understanding of such variables that practitioners could identify and work on the appropriate language learning strategies that they should encourage the students to employ. Apart from internal factors as mentioned before, the choice of language learning strategies might also be affected by external factors such as students’ surroundings, their daily activities, and the way their English courses is structured. Perhaps, the English curriculum or program could be redesigned or restructured so that it will cater to the needs of students’ academic majors. This measure is crucial in increasing the adaptability of the strategies that students have learnt and used during their English classes when they attend their academic major’s classes.

Fourthly, it is accentuated that “teachers probably influence the character of the learning climate more than any other single factor” (35, p.65). Nesamalar, Saratha, and Teh(36) echo this, by suggesting that “teachers are important in bringing about success in the L2 teaching and learning, as they can increase or diminish students’ interest” (36, p.10). Because teachers are taught to have such influences on students’ interest in learning a L2, they are encouraged to extend their ‘power’ by becoming a good role model of language learning strategies use for students by demonstrating the process of thinking, their enthusiasm and their personal experiences while using the strategies.
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