

## A Comparative Study of Language Learning Strategies at UNILU and ISP in the Democratic Republic of Congo

**Prof. André Muzala MUTENTA**

Department of Letters and English Civilization

Université de Lubumbashi

Email: mutemuand@gmail.com

Democratic Republic of Congo

### Abstract

This research is based on the classification framework established by Oxford (1990), and it investigates the language learning strategies (LLS) employed by undergraduate students from two institutions of tertiary level in Lubumbashi, viz. Université de Lubumbashi (UNILU) and ISP-Lubumbashi. The study analyzes both direct strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation) and indirect strategies (metacognitive, social, affective) among three different undergraduate groups (G1, G2, G3). The findings indicate that students from ISP predominantly utilize direct strategies, particularly compensation techniques such as consulting dictionaries and searching for words, alongside cognitive strategies like repetition and pronunciation. By contrast, UNILU students demonstrate a stronger inclination towards indirect strategies. They favour social strategies, which involve engaging with native speakers and participating in English clubs, as well as metacognitive strategies that focus on planning and self-regulation (for instance, reading aloud).

**Keywords:** *language learning strategies, direct strategies, indirect strategies, UNILU students, ISP students.*

### 1.0. Introductory Note

This research examines the language learning strategies (LLS) employed by undergraduate students at the University of Lubumbashi (UNILU) in comparison to those at the Higher Teacher Training College, viz. Institut Supérieur Pédagogique de Lubumbashi (ISP) in the Democratic Republic of Congo. The analysis utilizes data collected from third-year students at UNILU (Mutenta, 2018) alongside three cohorts of undergraduates from ISP, centering on the LLS classification proposed by Oxford (1990). The comparisons are conducted across three dimensions: (1) the distinction between direct and indirect strategies, (2) variations among academic years (G1, G2, G3), and (3) the differing institutional priorities regarding language education.

### 2.0. Methodological Considerations.

To achieve this task, a set of techniques and methods have been used for data collection and data analysis respectively. They can be detailed as follows:

#### 1. Quantitative Data Collection through Surveys/Questionnaires:

The study is grounded in Oxford's (1990) categorization of language learning strategies, which includes direct strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation) and indirect strategies (metacognitive, social, affective). Similar classifications are proposed by O'Malley and Chamot (1990); Griffiths (2009), and Al-Shaboul, Y. et al. (2010).

The frequency and percentage of strategy utilization by students were quantified (for instance, 50% of ISP students engaged in 'writing down words').

## 2. Qualitative Assessments:

**Listening comprehension evaluations:** Students were presented with audio passages (such as "Drinks" and "Holiday and Visits") and subsequently reported their levels of understanding (Buck, 2001).

**Dictation tasks:** Participants transcribed dictated texts (e.g., "Nosey Questions") to assess their writing precision.

**Interviews:** Evaluations of speaking proficiency and grammatical correctness were conducted (e.g., incorrect tense usage).

**3. Comparative Analysis:** A statistical examination of strategy utilization (both direct and indirect, as well as within specific categories) was performed between UNILU and ISP undergraduates across the three academic years (G1, G2, G3). The results, presented in tabular form, illustrated variations in percentages (for example, compensation strategies: 60.7% for ISP compared to 59.8% for UNILU).

**4. Mixed-Method Approach:** This approach integrates quantitative data (frequencies of strategies) with qualitative evaluations (skill-based assessments) to assess the influence of these strategies on language proficiency. The objective of these methods is to identify prevalent strategies, compare institutional disparities, and evaluate the efficacy of these strategies in improving language competencies (Cooper, 1973).

## 3.0. Findings: G1 UNILU vs. G1 ISP Students

### 3.1. Direct Strategies

**Table 1: Memory Strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
Writing down words and memorizing them	8	33	7	50
Grouping words according to their nature	5	21	1	7
Manipulating things	3	13	0	0
Associating new words with another or expression	3	13	1	7
Assessing your previous knowledge	2	8	0	0
Saying words in your head	2	8	1	7
Applying new materials mentally	1	4	1	7
Applying new materials mentally	0	0	3	2
TOTAL	24		14	

Students from ISP excelled over those from UNILU in the areas of "writing down words" (50% compared to 33%) and "mentally applying new materials" (2% versus

0%). Conversely, UNILU outperformed in "manipulating" (13% against 0%) and "assessing prior knowledge" (8.3% compared to 0%).

In summary, students at UNILU exhibited a greater utilization of memory strategies (16% against 13%).

**Table2: Cognitive Strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
Tone of the voice	23	66	3	11
Practicing what you have learned with others	3	8	17	63
Practicing yourself	1	3	1	4
Repeating words silently after the teacher	1	3	5	18
Clearing your mind	0	0	1	4
TOTAL	35		27	

This chart illustrates a distinct cultural or educational divergence in cognitive strategy preferences between the two groups. Students from UNILU predominantly prefer the individual auditory strategy that emphasizes the nuances of vocal tone (66%), whereas the ISP cohort exhibits a pronounced inclination towards the social strategy of collaborative practice with peers (63%). This indicates that UNILU's methodology leans more towards a teacher-centered and receptive model, in contrast to ISP's more peer-oriented and interactive approach. Additionally, it is important to take into account the notably greater total number of strategies reported by UNILU (35 compared to 27) when analyzing the percentages.

**Table: 3. Compensation strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
You hear first what you understand and guess ....	20	21	10	15
You concentrate on these words you already know	15	16	2	3
Use synonyms	15	16	3	5
Looking up all the words you do not know in a dictionary	12	13	5	7
Use the word in another language	7	7	4	6
Talking to others using gestures	6	7	12	18
Occasionally you guess a missing word from the context	6	7	8	12
Use circumlocution (indirect way of saying something)	6	7	0	0
By trying first to guess the meaning	3	3	0	0
Look up words in dictionary	2	2	0	0
Listening to English lessons through TV/radio	1	1	12	17
Making research	1	1	0	0
Writing the material many times	0	0	1	2
Personal research	0	0	2	3
Stop speaking	0	0	2	3

Using a dictionary	0	0	1	2
How to speak	0	0	1	2
Change the message	0	0	1	2
Skip the word	0	0	1	2
TOTAL	94		69	

The findings indicate that students at UNILU predominantly prefer analytical and inferential strategies, with their primary methods being centered around familiar vocabulary (16%), employing synonyms (16%), and deducing meaning from context (21%). This points to a more independent, language-oriented technique for addressing deficiencies in understanding. On the other hand, students from ISP demonstrate a more pronounced inclination towards practical and interactive strategies. Their most frequently utilized methods include "Communicating with others through gestures" (18%), closely followed by engaging with media such as television and radio (17%). This highlights a stronger dependence on non-verbal forms of communication.

### 3.2. Indirect Strategies

**Table 4: Metacognitive Strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
Reading magazines or...	19	42	15	60
Reading aloud	15	33	3	12
Writing and talking at...	8	18	5	20
Assessing your previous knowledge	2	5	0	0
Monitoring oneself	1	2	0	0
Assessing evaluation	0	0	1	4
Organizing the materials	0	0	1	4
TOTAL	45		25	

The chart indicates that reading stands out as the predominant metacognitive strategy utilized by both groups, albeit with differing methodologies. For UNILU (42%) and ISP (60%), the strategy "Reading magazines or..." is notably the most frequently employed, with a considerable lead. However, a significant distinction arises in their secondary preferences. Students at UNILU prioritize "Reading aloud" (33%), which reflects a technique that integrates input with verbal practice. In contrast, ISP students exhibit a more even distribution, with "Writing and talking at..." (20%) identified as their second most prevalent strategy.

**Table 5: Social Strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
Relationship with native speakers	20	29	12	32
Talking to others	19	28	17	46
Being in contact with native speakers	14	20	2	6

Insisting on constant connection	9	13	3	8
Practicing with a native speaker	3	4	3	8
Exchanging with colleagues in clubs	1	2	0	0
Attending different English clubs	1	2	0	0
Discussing with others	1	1.5	0	0
TOTAL	68		37	

Students from ISP reported a significant emphasis on "Talking to others," with a high percentage of 46%. This suggests a comprehensive, hands-on approach to communication, likely prioritizing fluency and casual interactions with anyone they encounter. In contrast, UNILU's primary strategy revolves around cultivating a "Relationship with native speakers" at 29%, closely trailed by the related tactic of "Being in contact with native speakers" at 20%. This reveals a pronounced inclination towards learning through genuine, ongoing relationships with skilled speakers, possibly underscoring the importance of cultural and linguistic precision (Abdalhamid, 2021).

**Table 6: Affective Strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
Give yourself encouragement	20	41	13	39
Listening to English songs	14	29	1	3
Feel motivated	12	24	6	18
Positive statements	3	6	0	0
Feel uncomfortable	0	0	2	6
Become frustrated and	0	0	6	18
Feel impatient	0	0	2	6
Feel shy	0	0	1	3
Use meditation	0	0	1	3
Confused by difficulty of learning	0	0	1	3
TOTAL	49		33	

The chart illustrates a notable difference in the emotional management approaches employed by the two groups during their learning processes. Both cohorts identify "Give yourself encouragement" as their foremost affective strategy, with UNILU at 41% and ISP at 39%.

Nevertheless, the divergence emerges in their secondary strategies. Students from UNILU tend to favor positive external stimuli, such as "Listening to English songs" (29%), along with internal motivators like "Motivation" (24%). Conversely, ISP students indicate a pronounced difficulty with negative emotions, as evidenced by "Become frustrated" (18%), which ranks as their second most prevalent response. This indicates that learners at ISP encounter more significant emotional hurdles and may benefit from enhanced support in navigating frustration and fostering a positive mindset.

### 3.3. Direct vs. Indirect Strategies

**Table: 7. Comparison.**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%	
Compensation strategy	94	61.4	69	62.7	Direct strategies
Cognitive strategy	35	22.9	27	24.6	
Memory strategy	24	15.7	14	12.7	
TOTAL	153		110		

	UNILU	%	ISP	%	
Social strategy	68	42	37	39	Indirect strategies
Affective strategy	49	30.2	33	34.7	
Metacognitive strategy	45	27.8	25	26.3	
TOTAL	162		95		

UNILU students demonstrated a preference for indirect strategies, utilizing them significantly more (162 versus 95), with a particular emphasis on social strategies (42% compared to 39%) and metacognitive strategies (28% against 26.3%). The analysis indicates that both UNILU and ISP students predominantly favor Indirect Strategies, which facilitate the management of the learning process, over Direct Strategies that engage the target language more directly. Notably, when it comes to direct strategies, both groups predominantly employ compensation techniques such as guessing or utilizing gestures at remarkably similar frequencies (approximately 62%). This approach serves as their primary method for addressing immediate knowledge deficiencies. In terms of indirect strategies, UNILU students exhibit a distinct inclination towards social strategies (42%), highlighting their appreciation for interaction and communication as fundamental components of their learning experience. Conversely, the distribution of ISP's indirect strategies is more balanced across the Social, Affective, and Metacognitive categories.

### 4.0. Findings: G2 UNILU vs. G2 ISP Students

#### 4.1. Direct Strategies

**Table 8: Memory strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
Learn to read	8	32	11	31
Writing words down and memorizing them	6	24	0	0

Manipulating things	3	12	2	6
Remembering by making mental image	2	8	8	23
Finding relationships between words, i.e...	2	8	2	6
Associating words with other words or...	2	8	1	3
Phonetic and	1	4	0	0
Getting new words	1	4	0	0
Applying new materials mentally	0	0	4	11
Master vocabularies	0	0	4	11
Saying words in your head	0	0	3	9
TOTAL	25		35	

This analysis highlights a significant common inclination towards the "Learn to read" strategy among both groups, with a preference of 32% for UNILU students compared to 31% for ISP students.

Nevertheless, the distinction arises in their alternative methods: UNILU students exhibit a notable and distinctive dependence on the tactile approach of "Writing words down" at 24%, whereas ISP students lean more towards internal cognitive strategies, such as "Applying new materials mentally" at 11% and "Mastering vocabularies" at 11%. This observation points to a possible cultural or pedagogical divergence in the ways students are instructed to process and retain new information.

**Table 9: Cognitive Strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
Tone of the voice	8	30	13	24
Repeating words silently after the teacher	6	23	0	0
Recording yourself	5	19	4	7
Applying the new materials	3	12	0	0
First working up words	1	4	0	0
Pronouncing words many times	1	4	0	0
Make more practice	1	4	0	0
Speaking English every time	1	4	0	0
Practicing what you have learned	0	0	11	20
Pronunciation	0	0	7	13
Repeating words in silent way	0	0	6	11
Intonation	0	0	2	4
Going to library	0	0	2	4
Translating	0	0	2	4
Downloading speeches	0	0	1	1.8
Clearing your mind	0	0	1	1.8
Learning grammar	0	0	1	1.8
To focus on the main idea	0	0	1	1.8
Writing stories	0	0	1	1.8
Revise the course	0	0	1	1.8

Imitating native speaker	0	0	1	1.8
TOTAL	26		54	

The UNILU cohort exhibits a distinctly concentrated approach, placing considerable emphasis on the utilization of tone of voice (30%) as a fundamental cognitive instrument, augmented by methods such as silent repetition (Abdel, 2011). By contrast, the ISP group showcases a significantly broader and more dynamic array of strategies. They excel in 13 out of the 23 techniques identified, with a pronounced focus on the practice of acquired material (20%) and the refinement of pronunciation (13%). This reflects a more organized, practice-centric, and methodical framework for language learning. The key difference lies in their respective focuses: UNILU's strategies appear to prioritize immediate comprehension, whereas ISP's are more expansive, intentional, and geared towards the development of skills for the long term through active engagement.

**Table10: Compensation Strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
You hear first what you understand and guess ....	6	8	21	17
You concentrate on these words you already know	12	16	0	0
Use synonyms	7	10	15	12
Looking up all the words you do not know in a dictionary	10	14	18	14
Use the word in another language	6	8	0	0
Listening to the radio/TV	6	8	19	15
Talking to others using gestures	0	0	9	7
Occasionally you guess a missing word from the context	4	6	4	3
Use circumlocution (indirect way of saying something)	3	4	4	3
Learn to speak by talking to others.....	4	7	0	0
Guessing from the context	4	6	0	0
Gestures	2	3	0	0
Change the message	1	1	0	0
Writing the materials many times	1	1	0	0
Talking to others using gestures	0	0	9	7
Following English on TV	0	0	6	5
Doing research	0	0	5	4
Trying first to guess the meaning of the words	0	0	5	4
Use the words from context	0	0	5	4
Way of speaking	0	0	3	2
Learning at the center	0	0	1	1
Watching movies	0	0	1	1
Stop speaking	0	0	1	1
TOTAL	73		125	

This chart illustrates a distinct difference in strategic preferences between the two groups. The ISP learners predominantly utilize active, external strategies, as evidenced by their reliance on looking up unfamiliar words (14%), engaging with media (TV/radio) (15%), and employing synonyms (12%), which highlights their emphasis on vocabulary enhancement. Conversely, the UNILU group demonstrates a marked inclination towards internal, compensatory strategies, focusing on familiar words (16%) and the use of synonyms (10%). This suggests their priority lies in sustaining communication flow even when faced with knowledge deficiencies.

#### 4.2. Indirect strategies.

**Table 11: Metacognitive**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
Reading magazines or books	0	0	32	58
Reading aloud	4	31	9	16
Reading grammar books	1	8	0	0
Writing and talking at the same time	0	0	3	5
Monitoring oneself	0	0	2	4
Assessing (evaluation)	0	0	2	4
Organizing the materials	1	8	5	9
Reading books	2	15	0	0
Reading novels	2	15	0	0
Learn to read by writing	3	23	0	0
Reading the bible	0	0	1	2
Speak every time	0	0	1	2
TOTAL	13		55	

The chart indicates that ISP learners predominantly utilize a concentrated strategy centered on reading magazines or books, with 58% favoring this method. This reflects a preference for learning through extensive input. In contrast, the UNILU group's strategy is more diverse, albeit reported less frequently overall. Their primary methods include more active and analytical approaches, such as reading aloud (31%) and learning to read through writing (23%), which implies an emphasis on production and the reinforcement of learning through engaging multiple senses.

Moreover, the notable disparity in the total number of responses 13 for UNILU compared to 55 for ISP is particularly striking. This difference could suggest that ISP learners possess a greater awareness of, or more regularly utilize, a broader array of metacognitive strategies for planning and assessing their learning processes.

**Table 12: Social strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
Talking to others	26	24	26	10

Learning to speak by insisting on.....	9	23	4	4
Relationship with others	9	23	0	0
Practicing with native speakers	10	3	3	4
Learn to speak by being in contact .....	3	8	12	13
Attending English clubs	2	5	0	0
Conversing with others	3	3	3	1
To be together with colleague	3	0	0	1
Practicing with others	0	0	18	20
Sharing with native speakers	0	0	12	13
Relationship with English speakers	11	0	0	10
Teaching others	1	1	0	0
Being closer to (.....)	1	1	0	0
Discussing with others	1	1	0	0
TOTAL	39		91	

The examination of indirect social strategies reveals a comparison between 39 strategies employed by UNILU students and 91 frequencies utilized by ISP students across 15 distinct social strategies. Notably, the frequencies of UNILU students appear to be significantly higher in just 5 specific strategic features, while ISP students account for the remaining 10. A closer analysis, however, uncovers additional disparities concerning the frequency levels. At first glance, it becomes evident that ISP students exhibit a greater number of frequencies across various strategies. Specifically, UNILU students excel in strategies such as “communicating with others” (26%), “learning to speak through persistent correction,” “building relationships with others” (23%), “engaging in practice with native speakers” (10%), and “participating in English clubs” (5%). The other strategic features are predominantly utilized by ISP students.

Consequently, it can be inferred that UNILU G2 students demonstrate a commendable proficiency in employing social strategies, primarily due to their extensive interactions with others, particularly those who are native speakers of the language.

**Table 13: Affective Strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
To feel motivated	9	25	12	30
Self-encouragement	9	25	9	22
Feel impatient	3	8	1	3
Confused by difficulties of learning	3	8	0	0
Make positive statements	2	5	2	5
Expressing interest	2	5	1	3
Listening to English songs	2	5	10	25
Feel shy(reserved)	1	3	0	0
Reward yourself or by others	1	3	2	5

Your own strategy	1	3	0	0
To make enquiries	1	3	0	0
To like the teacher	1	3	0	0
To be in time at school	1	3	0	0
Use meditation	0	0	3	7
TOTAL	26		54	

Both groups exhibit a shared primary emphasis on maintaining motivation and fostering self-encouragement; however, their secondary strategies exhibit notable differences. The strategies of "feeling motivated" and "self-encouragement" emerge as the most prevalent among both cohorts, underscoring the importance of morale management for all students.

For ISP students, a significant reliance on the strategy of "listening to English songs" (25%) positions it as their second most favored technique. In contrast, this approach is considerably less prevalent among UNILU students.

UNILU students, on the other hand, articulate a broader array of distinct emotional challenges and coping strategies. These include feelings of being "confused" or "shy," alongside methods such as "arriving on time to school" and "having a fondness for the teacher." While their strategies demonstrate greater diversity, they lack the concentrated focus seen in those of ISP students.

#### 4.3. Direct vs. Indirect Strategies

**Table: 14. Comparison**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%	
Compensation strategy	73	59	125	58	Direct strategies
Cognitive strategy	26	21	54	25	
Memory strategy	25	20	35	16	
TOTAL	124		214		

	UNILU	%	ISP	%	
Social strategy	39	44	91	49	Indirect strategies
Affective strategy	36	41	55	29	
Metacognitive strategy	13	15	40	22	
TOTAL	88		186		

1. A comparison of both direct and indirect strategies reveals that direct strategies are predominantly employed by both UNILU and ISP, making them the most prevalent form of learning strategy.

2. Nevertheless, when examining the distinctions between the two institutions of tertiary education, it becomes evident that while they both exhibit a preference for direct strategies, UNILU demonstrates a stronger inclination toward them.

At UNILU, direct strategies constitute a greater proportion of their overall strategy utilization, accounting for 58%, contrasted with 42% for indirect strategies.

Conversely, at ISP, the preference for direct strategies is less marked, with 54% for direct and 46% for indirect, indicating a more equitable distribution between the two types of strategies.

3. Therefore, when analyzing the predominant strategy employed by both universities, the compensation strategy—classified as a direct strategy—emerges as the most frequently utilized category by a considerable margin (UNILU: 59%, ISP: 58%). This indicates that students from both institutions frequently resort to techniques such as inferring meanings, employing gestures, or devising alternative methods of communication when they lack knowledge of specific vocabulary or grammatical rules.

Furthermore, ISP has utilized more direct strategies overall (214 compared to 124), with a notable emphasis on cognitive strategies (25% vs. 21%). In contrast, UNILU has favored indirect strategies, particularly affective strategies (41% vs. 29%).

## 5.0. Findings: G3 UNILU vs. G3 ISP Students

### 5.1. Direct Strategies

**Table 15: Memory Strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
Writing down words and memorizing them	8	35	5	16
Remembering by making mental image	6	26	8	26
Use meditation	3	13	0	0
Saying words in your head	2	9	3	10
Associating a word with another word or expression	2	9	3	10
Grouping words	1	4	0	0
Forming an aural image	1	4	1	3
Applying new materials mentally	0	0	4	13
Finding relationship between words	0	0	2	6
Memorizing vocabulary	0	0	2	6
Manipulating things	0	0	1	3
Reviewing mentally	0	0	1	3
Revising English note	0	0	1	3
TOTAL	23		31	

Learners from UNILU and ISP prioritize the significance of memorization, with 35% of UNILU students favoring "Writing down words and memorizing them" compared to only 16% of their ISP counterparts. Both groups equally value mnemonic devices, each reflecting a 26% preference for "Remembering by making a mental image." This similarity underscores a mutual recognition of the necessity to actively embed vocabulary in memory. Nevertheless, distinctions emerge in their secondary strategies. The UNILU cohort exhibits a more focused approach, particularly with the strategy of "Use meditation" at 13%. On the other hand, the ISP group showcases a broader and more diverse array of techniques, incorporating methods such as "Applying new materials mentally" at 13% compared to 0% for UNILU, and "Finding relationships between words" at 6% against 0% for UNILU. This indicates that the ISP group employs a richer set of cognitive strategies for vocabulary retention, extending beyond mere repetition to engage in more profound mental processing and associative thinking.

**Table16: Cognitive Strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
Tone of the voice	10	23	9	20
Repeating words silently after the teacher	4	9	7	15
Recording yourself	3	7	2	4
Stress	4	9	0	0
Applying the new materials	1	2	0	0
First working up words	2	5	0	0
Pronunciation	3	7	4	9
Accent	3	7	0	0
First, work up the same words and trying.....	2	5	0	0
Applying news materials mentally	1	2	0	0
Personal dictation	1	2	0	0
Writing key words	0	0	5	11
Clearing your mind	0	0	2	4
Imitating native speakers	0	0	2	4
Downloading advanced learners' speeches	0	0	1	2
Making exposes in English	0	0	1	2
Exercising	0	0	1	2
TOTAL	43		46	

The ISP places a strong emphasis on oral practices, particularly in the area of "imitating native speakers," with a notable difference in frequency (18% compared to 0%).

Both groups recognize the value of practicing learned material with peers, exhibiting nearly identical engagement levels (UNILU: 28%, ISP: 26%). This reflects a shared acknowledgment of the significance of collaborative learning among both student populations. The first major distinction emerges at this point:

For UNILU students, the second most frequently employed strategy is the tone of voice, which accounts for 23%. This underscores a particular emphasis on the melodic and expressive qualities inherent in spoken English.

In contrast, while the ISP also incorporates tone of voice (20%), they balance this with a substantial focus on silently repeating words (15%), indicating a preference for a more introspective and individualized rehearsal technique.

**Table 17: Compensation Strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
Listening to English songs	14	15	0	0
You hear first what you understand ....	10	11	15	12
Watching English movies	10	11	0	0
Use synonyms	10	11	19	1
Looking up all the words you do not know ...	8	0	0	8
Use the word in other language	7	7	4	3
Guessing from the context	6	6	5	4
Concentrate on those words you know	5	5	0	0
Talking to others using gestures	5	5	8	6
Trying first to guess the meaning of the word	5	5	2	2
Occasionally you guess a missing word	4	4	5	4
Skip the words (pass over)	3	3	0	0
Writing the material many times	3	3	2	2
Use circumlocution (indirect of speaking)	1	1	4	3
Network (internet network)	1	1	0	0
Stop speaking	1	1	1	1
Message	1	1	0	0
Mistake	1	1	0	0
Listening to the radio	0	0	17	13
Using the dictionary	0	0	16	12
By following English news on TV or radio	0	0	8	6
Gestures	0	0	8	6
Watching videos in English	0	0	3	2
Doing research	0	0	2	2
You concentrate on those words you already know	0	0	2	2

To use expressions	0	0	2	2
Listening to native speakers	0	0	1	1
The speech (the manner of speaking)	0	0	1	1
Listening how the teacher speaks	0	0	1	1
TOTAL	95		126	

According to the information presented in Table 17, students at UNILU predominantly employ indirect strategies that emphasize exposure and contextual learning, with activities such as listening to English songs (14%) and watching films (11%) being particularly popular. In contrast, their most frequently utilized direct strategy involves the use of synonyms (11%). On the other hand, ISP students demonstrate a strong preference for direct strategies, with their favored methods including listening to the radio (13%) and consulting dictionaries (12%). This group appears to place less emphasis on media-driven, indirect forms of learning. Thus, UNILU students tend to favor more immersive, indirect techniques (like songs and movies, along with contextual guessing), while ISP students lean towards direct, analytical approaches (such as using a dictionary and engaging with radio or news for concentrated listening).

## 5.2. Indirect Strategies

**Table18: Metacognitive Strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
Reading magazines	12	18	0	0
Reading aloud	22	34	15	21
Reading grammar books	0	0	3	4
Writing and talking at the same time	6	9	6	9
Monitoring oneself	4	6	7	10
Assessing yourself (evaluation)	0	0	3	4
Assessing your previous knowledge	2	3	0	0
Organizing the materials	2	3	4	6
Reading books	5	8	32	46
Improving speaking	7	11	0	0
Reading all things (everything)	2	3	0	0
Speaking and writing in English	2	3	0	0
Understanding lessons	1	2	0	0
TOTAL	65		70	

ISP placed a strong emphasis on "reading books," with a preference of 46% compared to just 8%. Students from both UNILU and ISP predominantly support direct strategies. The leading methods identified are reading aloud for UNILU and reading books/magazines for ISP, both of which are categorized as direct approaches. The key distinction lies in the fact that UNILU's list exhibits a somewhat broader range of both direct and indirect strategies, whereas the strategies at ISP are predominantly direct in nature.

**Table 19: Social Strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
Talking to others	13	21	14	33
Attending different English clubs	17	27	0	0
Practicing with a native speaker	12	19	3	7
Being in contact with native speakers	6	9	6	14
Relationship with English speakers	4	6	0	0
Exchange with other English speakers	4	6	0	0
Insisting on constant connection by others	3	4	3	7
Exchanging with colleagues	1	2	0	0
Chatting with other friends	1	2	0	0
Browsing on internet	1	2	0	0
Discussing with others	1	2	0	0
Teaching others what I've learned	0	0	7	16
Relationship with English speakers	0	0	4	9
Discussing with my classmates	0	0	5	7
Conversing with others	0	0	1	2
Being in touch with the language users	0	0	1	2
TOTAL	63		43	

UNILU has been involved in "community activities" at a rate of 37.5%, compared to 27.3% for others. The data illustrates that students at UNILU predominantly opt for indirect, structured social strategies, with their most favored approach being "Attending different English clubs" at 27%. This indicates a strong inclination towards learning within organized and immersive settings. In contrast, ISP students predominantly utilize direct, interactive strategies. Their primary method is the simple act of "Talking to others" at 33%, followed by "Teaching others" at 16%. This reflects a more hands-on approach, emphasizing immediate, interpersonal exchanges rather than participation in structured club environments. Thus, it is evident that UNILU students prefer indirect immersion, such as joining clubs, while ISP students lean towards direct interaction, like engaging in conversation or teaching.

**Table: 20. Affective strategies**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%
To feel motivated	13	32	12	27
Give yourself encouragement	8	20	9	21
Feel impatient	1	3	1	2
To make positive statements	2	5	2	5
Expressing interest	1	3	3	6
Listening to English songs	11	27	9	21
Feel shy (reserved)	1	3	0	0
Reward yourself or by others	3	7	2	5

The mood of speakers	0	0	1	2
Use meditation	0	0	5	11
TOTAL	40		44	

Affective activities are represented by 40 frequencies among UNILU students and 44 among ISP students, encompassing four distinct features. The findings indicate significant mean percentages across six subcategories, although only four of these are predominantly influenced by ISP students. Nevertheless, a detailed analysis indicates that UNILU students place greater emphasis on their desire for motivation and rewards. In contrast, ISP students seem to prioritize self-engagement as a means to attain favorable outcomes. This trend suggests a greater level of personal commitment towards achieving language learning goals.

### 5.3. Direct vs. Indirect Strategies

**Table 21 : Comparison**

	UNILU	%	ISP	%	
Compensation strategy	95	59	126	62	Direct strategies
Cognitive strategy	43	27	46	23	
Memory strategy	23	14	31	15	
TOTAL	161		203		

	UNILU	%	ISP	%	
Social strategy	65	39	70	44.6	Indirect strategies
Affective strategy	63	37	43	27	
Metacognitive strategy	40	24	44	28	
TOTAL	168		157		

ISP exhibited a preference for direct strategies, with cognitive approaches being employed by 23% of its students, in contrast to 27% at UNILU. On the other hand, UNILU showed a tendency towards indirect strategies, particularly social ones, utilized by 40.6% of its students compared to 39% at ISP. Based on the data presented in Table 21, the following is a comparative analysis of the direct and indirect strategies most commonly adopted by students from both UNILU and ISP.

#### 1. UNILU Students:

The predominant approach utilized is Indirect Strategies, comprising 39% Metacognitive and 37% Social, which together account for 76%. Conversely, the least favored approach is Direct Strategies, with 59% Compensation, 27% Cognitive, and 14% Memory, totaling 100% of the direct strategies but representing a smaller overall percentage in comparison to indirect strategies.

#### 2. ISP Students:

The most frequently employed approach is Direct Strategies, which includes 62% Compensation, 23% Cognitive, and 15% Memory, summing up to 100%. In contrast, Indirect Strategies are the least utilized, with approximately 44.6% Metacognitive, 27% Social, and 28% Affective, totaling around 99.6%.

Thus, it is evident that UNILU students predominantly depend on Indirect Strategies, emphasizing the management of their learning environment through metacognitive and social methods. On the other hand, ISP students show a stronger inclination towards Direct Strategies, concentrating on directly addressing the language through compensation and cognitive techniques.

### 6.0. General Findings: UNILU vs. ISP Students (G1, G2, G3)

A distinct and coherent pattern is evident within all three cohorts, highlighting significant disparities in the approaches to language acquisition adopted by students from UNILU and ISP.

#### 6.1. Strategy Preference:

Students from ISP exhibit a strong inclination towards Direct Strategies. These techniques entail a straightforward manipulation of the language itself, characterized by systematic, analytical, and pragmatic methods that prioritize vocabulary development, grammar, and pronunciation.

In contrast, UNILU Students show a marked preference for Indirect Strategies. Such strategies facilitate the learning process without direct engagement with the target language. Their methodology is more comprehensive, placing emphasis on social interaction and the self-regulation of both the learning environment and emotional states.

#### 6.2. Direct Strategies (Memory, Cognitive, Compensation):

**A. Memory Strategies:** Both educational institutions employ fundamental strategies, such as jotting down words and utilizing mental imagery. However, ISP students often adopt a broader array of more profound cognitive strategies (e.g., "mentally applying new materials," "establishing connections between words"). UNILU students display distinctive preferences, such as "employing meditation" (G3) and "manipulating objects" (G1).

**B. Cognitive Strategies:** ISP students concentrate on active engagement, repetition, and pronunciation exercises ("practicing learned material," "repeating vocabulary"). Conversely, UNILU students consistently prioritize comprehension-oriented strategies, with a significant emphasis on "tone of voice" across all groups, reflecting a focus on grasping meaning and intonation.

**C. Compensation Strategies:** This type of direct strategy is the most commonly utilized by both groups; however, their implementation varies:

## 7.0. Conclusion

The comparative examination of language learning strategies (LLS) between undergraduates at UNILU and ISP reveals notable strategic preferences influenced by the respective institutional goals. Students at ISP demonstrated superior performance in direct strategies, including compensation and cognitive methods, which align with their emphasis on practical language application in teacher training. Conversely, UNILU students favored indirect strategies, such as social interaction and affective regulation, indicative of their research-centric educational environment.

The key findings are as follows:

1. Compensation strategies were predominant among ISP students (60.7%), allowing them to effectively manage linguistic challenges.
2. For UNILU students, social strategies played a crucial role (40.7%), promoting teamwork and community involvement.
3. Affective strategies, including self-encouragement, were essential for motivating UNILU students.
4. The missions of the institutions significantly shaped the adoption of strategies, with ISP prioritizing oral proficiency and UNILU leaning towards academic and metacognitive techniques.

These results imply that customized language curricula that incorporate both direct and indirect strategies could lead to improved learning outcomes. Future investigations should delve into the long-term effects of strategy utilization and the cultural influences that shape preferences for LLS.

## 8.0. Works Cited

Abdalhamid, F. (2021). Language Learning Strategies and Academic Performance: A Comparative Study. *Journal of Educational Linguistics* 15/2: 45–60.

- Abdel, A. R. (2011). Effects of L2 Proficiency and Gender on Choice of Language Learning Strategies by University Students Majoring in English. *Asian EFL Journal* 12/1: 115–163.
- Al-Shaboul, Y., Asassfeh, S., & Al-Shboul, M. (2010). Strategy Use by English-major Jordanian Undergraduates. *The Australian Educational and Developer Psychologist* 27/1: 31–40.
- Buck, G. (2001). *Assessing Listening*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cooper, R. L. (1973). Language Attitudes and Language Learning. In Hatch, E. (Ed.) *Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings*, pp. 313–320. New-York: Newbury House.
- Griffiths, M. (2009). Using Language Learning Strategies to Improve the Writing Skills of Saudi EFL Students: Will it Really Work? *System*, 37/3: 418–433.
- Mutenta, M. (2018). Language Learning Strategies of UNILU Students. Master's Dissertation. Lubumbashi: University of Lubumbashi, Department of Letters and English Civilization
- Jones, L. (1979). *Functions of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. New-York: Newbury House.

## BIOGRAPHY



Professor André M. Mutenta holds a doctorate in Applied Linguistics from the University of Lubumbashi. His thesis entitled *English Learning Strategies Used at the Undergraduate Levels by UNILU and ISP English Departments Students: A Comparative Study* (2022) highlights the strategies that learners adopt in line with the ultimate requirements of their future professions. This paper is a dissemination of the results of this seminal research.

At present, Professor Mutenta is the Academic Secretary General at a technical high school, viz. Institut Supérieur des Techniques Appliquées (ISTA) in Kolwezi, and continues to lecture in the Department of Letters and English Civilization at the University of Lubumbashi (UNILU).