PINOY TELLS: THE TYPOLOGY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES

Joseph B. Quinto,[1]
Assistant Professor III,
Benguet State University

j.quinto@bsu.edu.ph
ORCID: 0000-0002-6155-0693

Manilyn R. Cacanindin,[2]
Instructor 1,
Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University

mcacanindin@dmmmsu.edu.ph
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4034-4935

Abstract. *Despite numerous studies about language learning strategies (LLSs), many learners still misunderstand their effectiveness, thinking they require too much effort for minimal gain. Additionally, students have varied and conflicting preferences for LLSs, and factors like cultural background influence their choices, indicating a need for more research on how these elements affect learning behaviors. It is, therefore, essential to address students' perceptions and use of LLSs to ensure effective language learning. This study developed an inventory of English language learning strategies for Filipino college and university students. Using a **cross-sectional exploratory sequential design**, the researchers collected qualitative data from 544 Filipino university students to understand their language learning experiences and preferences, afterward **developing the Typology of English Language Learning Strategies (TELLS) questionnaire through a validated thematic analysis consisting of three key components: intellective (acquiring and meaning-making), affective (information processing and acclimating), and productive (technological utilization, filtering, practicing, and validating).** In the quantitative phase, 502 Filipino undergraduate respondents identified the most frequently used strategies. **The results revealed that these learners commonly employed most components within the typology, except for the Practicing Productive Component.** This research significantly contributes to the understanding of English language learning strategies among Filipino students. It provides a valuable resource for educators, curriculum designers, and language learning practitioners by developing an empirically validated typology tailored to students' needs and preferences. The findings also suggest avenues for future research, such as examining the relationship between TELLS components and language proficiency outcomes or exploring the implementation of TELLS in language learning.*

---

[1] Author, responsible for Conceptualization, Introduction, and Methodology, Coding, and Thematic analysis
[2] Author, responsible for Coding, Thematic analysis Results, Discussion, Conclusion, References, and Final editing

INTRODUCTION

Students' lack of strategic language learning behavior hinders their ability to acquire vocabulary, grammar, and other critical linguistic skills efficiently. Promoting increased knowledge and implementing empirically verified learning modalities remains a significant problem in language teaching.

Schipor and Hammershaug (2022) espoused that scholars and educators have been interested in the study of Language Learning Strategies (LLSs), and they are slowly turning their attention from teachers and teaching to students and learning. Numerous researchers claimed that language learning strategies are imperative to becoming successful language learners (Ranjan & Philominraj, 2020; Hajar & Karakus, M., 2024). It is vital to understand the strategies language learners employ to acquire the target language (Yunus et al., 2022) because the more strategies employed when studying the target language, the better it will lead to language acquisition (Aziz & Shah, 2020).

Language learning strategies are proven to be advantageous (Taheri et al., 2020). Specifically, the strategies can improve learning efficacy (Senad et al., 2021), can aid learners in resolving challenges with their oral and written communication (Almusharraf & Bailey, 2021), can help in improving academic achievement (Agustin, Wahyudin, & Isnaini, 2021), and can have an overall positive influence on proficiency (Ranjan et al., 2021).

Suwanarak (2019) reported that language learning strategies are generally used consciously or unconsciously. Some learners also hold negative views because they are unfamiliar with language learning strategies. Some also believe these strategies do not enhance language proficiency, as they involve deliberate effort. (Akbari, 2019). Nonetheless, several findings show that learners have various preferences, sometimes contradictory with one another, when it comes to the use of language learning strategies, namely metacognitive strategies, social strategies, compensation strategies, cognitive strategies, memory strategies, and affective strategies (Lestari & Wahyudin, 2020; Widharyanto & Binawan, 2020).

Numerous research widely claims that many additional factors, including motivation, gender, task type, age and second language stage, cultural background, nationality, learning style, tolerance for ambiguity, attitudes, and beliefs, among others, influence the strategies that language learners choose to employ. For instance, Cubukcu and Bayalas (2021) mentioned that learners' varying ages prompted them to choose and use various tactics. Tran (2021) emphasized that females tend to use more language learning strategies than males in language learning, especially social strategies, due to their desire for social approval. Meanwhile, male learners employ more analytic strategies due to their cognitive orientation and their competitive manners. As an example of nationality, Thai public school learners use more language learning techniques than overseas students (Iamudom & Tangkiengsirisin, 2020). Finally, Pagalilauan (2023) uncovered the connections and variations in language learning methods and learning styles among students.

Despite extensive research showing the benefits of Language Learning Strategies (LLSs) for language acquisition, many learners misunderstand their effectiveness, believing they require too much effort for little gain. Additionally, students have varied and sometimes conflicting preferences for using different LLSs, complicating the development of effective teaching methods. Factors like motivation, gender, age, and cultural background also influence which strategies students choose, indicating a need for more research on how these factors affect learning behaviors. Therefore, it is essential to better understand and address students' perceptions and use of LLSs to enhance language proficiency and ensure effective language learning.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Language Learning Strategies Defined

The study of Language Learning Strategies (LLSs) was first conducted in the middle of the 1970s, and it was largely concerned with the qualities of a good language learner (Kölemen, 2021; Ranjan et al., 2021). Language learning strategies are learners' actions and thoughts during the learning process (Griffiths & Soruç, 2020). To make studying more pleasurable, they can choose the strategy that suits them best (Kusuma et al., 2022). Furthermore, Melvina et al. (2020) postulated that LLSs are actions that students use to hasten the acquisition of knowledge, the archiving of that knowledge, and the eventual retrieval of that knowledge. In contrast to weak language learners, successful language learners employ more and better strategies. Hence, it is crucial to note that there are only good and bad applications of the strategies, not good or bad strategies themselves (Derakhshan et al., 2015).

The Classification of Language Learning Strategies

O'Malley and Chamot (1990) created a taxonomy consisting of cognitive, metacognitive, and social/affective strategies. However, Oxford (1990) devised a more comprehensive and arguably the most well-known classification of language learning strategies, as evidenced in many research studies (Iamudom & Tangkiengsirisin, 2020; Lestari & Wahyudin, 2020; Widharyanto & Binawan, 2020). This classification is known as the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). The inventory comprises direct strategies, which include cognitive strategies for comprehension and production, compensation strategies for overcoming limitations in knowledge and language production, and memory strategies used for storing and retrieving information. On the other hand, indirect strategies include affective strategies for controlling motivation and emotions, social strategies for interacting and cooperating with others in the language, and metacognitive strategies for planning, organizing, focusing, and monitoring learning.

Berg et al. (2021) recently made their taxonomy called the Taiwanese Inventory of Language Learning Strategies (TILLS). The inventory is comprised of five factors, namely: production with eleven speaking, vocabulary, and writing strategies that emphasize producing English-language content in order to enhance one's English skills; face-to-face

Communication with seven listening, reading, and speaking strategies that facilitate communication between and among students; technology use with six grammar and vocabulary strategies that emphasize enhancing grammar, vocabulary, and communication through the use of applications and online resources; multimedia use with four varied strategies that emphasize using audio and video to practice English; and grammar and reading with three strategies that support students in developing their grammar and reading abilities.

AIM AND HYPOTHESIS

This research undertaking is guided by the issues to be addressed in Language Learning Strategies by Pawlak (2021) which are as follows: (a) Moving the focus away from researching overall LLS use and toward investigating how strategic devices are used in particular domains is one way the science might advance, which is why this research is focused on the Philippine context only; (b) The goal of achieving balance in the environments where LLS research is conducted would undoubtedly be beneficial. To strike a balance, the target language is English as a Second Language, the educational level covers tertiary students, the program type involves students pursuing various majors, the age group is adults, and the participants are multilingual; (c) There is a need for large-scale studies involving respectable samples to uncover more general patterns of strategy use. To satisfy this, 544 participants were recruited for the qualitative part and 502 respondents were selected for the quantitative part; and (d) Using mixed-methods research is always the best choice when it comes to examining LLS. Therefore, this research utilized a mixed-methods approach, specifically a cross-sectional exploratory sequential design.

The issues of language learning strategies have been heatedly disputed on a variety of levels, but these language learning strategies remain vibrant (Griffiths, 2020). Taking into account the issues mentioned and the taxonomy of language learning strategies created by various researchers, it is time to design an inventory that envelopes various English language learning strategies contextually made for Filipino undergraduate learners. Particularly, the researchers endeavored to address the following queries:

1. What components make up a typology of English language learning strategies for Filipino university learners?
2. How frequently do university learners use the typology of English language learning strategies?

METHOD

Research Design

The cross-sectional exploratory sequential design (Berg et al., 2021) was utilized in the study because it aimed at using qualitative findings to build a quantitative survey or to develop an instrument (Halcomb & Hickman, 2015; Schoonenboom & Johnson, 2017). The phases included the following:

Phases	Description
Phase 1: Qualitative data collection	Gathered data from 544 participants (13 universities) using prompts in a Google Form
Phase 2: Qualitative data analysis	Modified the steps in the thematic analysis of Quinto (2022)
Phase 3: Development of the questionnaire	Sought the aid of 6 validators with doctorate degrees
Phase 4: Quantitative data collection	Gathered data from 502 respondents (3 campuses) in one state university
Phase 5: Quantitative data analysis	Used descriptive statistics to treat the data

Site and Participants

This study was conducted in variegated universities in the Philippines. There were a total of 544 participants from 13 universities for the qualitative part and a total of 502 respondents from three campuses in one state university for the quantitative part. All the subjects were recruited via convenience and purposive sampling (Etikan et al., 2016). Willing university professors from different universities were contacted by the researchers for the data collection.

Instrument and Procedure

The Typology of English Language Learning Strategies (TELLS) Questionnaire served as the primary instrument for this study. It was developed by collecting data on the learning strategies employed by 544 university learners from 13 universities in the Philippines, focusing on English grammar, vocabulary, listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Data were gathered using a Google Form disseminated to the different universities with the help of university language professors, and after three weeks of data collection, the researchers conducted an intensive coding followed by deep thematic analysis to collate the preliminary findings.

To ensure the validity of the qualitative data interpretation, the researchers consulted six experts with doctorate degrees in English language education and communication. This collaboration involved extensive deliberation and endorsement after the researchers incorporated the experts' feedback. This process led to the finalization of the TELLS Questionnaire components, ensuring its relevance to the study's objectives.

There are 3 components: intellective, affective, and productive. Each component is broken down into sub-components with specific statements that bring out learners' English language learning strategies. Intellective components are divided into acquiring intellective component with 7 strategies and meaning-making intellective component with 5 strategies. Next, affective components are composed of the information processing affective component with 4 strategies and the acclimating affective component with 4 strategies. Finally, productive components are comprised of technological utilization of the productive component with 6 strategies, filtering the productive component with 5 strategies, practicing

the productive component with 15 strategies, and validating the productive component with 3 strategies. Overall, the TELLS Questionnaire contains 49 English language learning strategies.

The TELLS Questionnaire underwent pilot testing in one state university with 37 university learners, which garnered a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.942. Therefore, the 4-point scale TELLS Questionnaire achieved excellent reliability.

Data Analysis

To address what components make up a typology of English language learning strategies for Filipino university learners, the researchers modified the steps in the thematic analysis of Quinto (2022) in the qualitative phase. The researchers achieved familiarity with the initial data through open-minded reading, searched for patterns iteratively, organized the themes into meaningful wholeness in which the parts and the total of the texts were continuously reviewed, and drafted the components and strategies of the Typology of English Language Learning Strategies (TELLS) Questionnaire, which was initially coined as Philippine Inventory of Language Learning Strategies (PILLS). Next, the researchers sought the expertise of 6 validators who were individually consulted for their feedback. After quite some time, the researchers synthesized their comments and suggestions and changed the name of the questionnaire from 'PILLS' to Inventory of English Language Learning Strategies (IELLS). At a later period, the questionnaire underwent a reliability test whereby some changes were incorporated. Lastly, the nomenclature 'IELLS' was changed to the Typology of English Language Learning Strategies (TELLS) Questionnaire.

To answer how frequently university learners used the typology of English language learning strategies, the researchers distributed the TELLS Questionnaire to 502 respondents in one state university via a Google Form. Descriptive statistics was used to treat the data.

Ethical Issues

To ensure that ethical considerations were observed both in the qualitative and quantitative data collection, the researchers upheld RA 1073 or the Data Privacy Act of 2012 in the Philippines, which meant that all personal information solicited was used in this research only. Moreover, recruited students and experts alike were willing participants in the study.

RESULTS

This research investigated Filipino university learners' language learning strategies. It sought to identify the components constituting a typology of English language learning strategies for Filipino university learners and the frequency of their use of the typology. The responses were classified into three components: intellectual, affective, and productive, which was utilized as a checklist questionnaire to identify what DMMMSU SLUC college

students were employed as English language learning techniques. The next part of the discussion includes the result of the survey floated to 502 students of the said institution.

Typology of English Language Learning Strategies for Filipino University Learners

Intellective Component

The intellective components are the strategies used by university learners to gain knowledge and comprehend the English language which consist of acquiring and meaning-making strategies.

Table 1. Acquiring Intellective Component

Strategy	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. I study and memorize the spelling of newly acquired words.	3.27	0.57	Always Used
2. I jot down unfamiliar words to study them.	3.15	0.69	Moderately Used
3. I pay attention and listen intently to various speakers.	3.49	0.59	Always Used
4. I constantly expose myself to English language materials.	3.21	0.65	Moderately Used
5. I take down notes of key points from speakers.	3.26	0.70	Always Used
6. I familiarize myself with grammar rules.	3.42	0.60	Always Used
7. I watch social media contents.	3.52	0.62	Always Used
Total Mean	3.33		Always Used

Table 1 explains the acquiring intellective component used according to the strategies by the respondents. Item 7, or watching social media content, garnered the highest mean (mean = 3.52), followed by item 3, or paying attention to various speakers (mean = 3.49), followed by item 6, or familiarizing oneself with grammar rules (3.42). The results underscored the university students' preference for combining strategies like listening and understanding the rules with technology, notably social media usage, in learning English.

Table 2. Meaning-Making Intellective Component

Strategy	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. I understand communicated thoughts through context clues.	3.30	0.57	Always Used
2. I make inferences in different contexts.	3.10	0.60	Moderately Used
3. I do brainstorming before writing.	3.38	0.67	Always Used

Strategy	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
4. I picture and compose conversations in my mind.	3.49	0.61	Always Used
5. I activate my prior knowledge for better comprehension.	3.45	0.60	Always Used
Total Mean	3.34		Always Used

Based on table 2 the meaning-making intellective component as strategies are always used by the students. Picturing and composing conversations in the mind (mean = 3.49) ranked first, followed by activating the prior knowledge for better comprehension (mean = 3.45), then brainstorming before writing (mean = 3.38). It implies that the respondents like doing comprehension exercises in learning the English language and that, the efficacy of reading strategies as meaning-making intellectual component is dependent on the keyword strategy, brainstorming strategy, and memory use strategy used by the respondents to enhance their extent of comprehension which enhances their experience of learning the English language.

Affective Component

The affective component, which is equally identified as the students' self-awareness during the language learning process, is made up of information processing and acclimating strategies.

Table 3. Information Processing Affective Component

Strategy	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. I am aware of my speaking habits and body language.	3.34	0.58	Always Used
2. I proofread my own compositions.	3.29	0.64	Always Used
3. I am aware of proper word usage and spelling.	3.42	0.58	Always Used
4. I make my own learning plan in speaking.	3.19	0.67	Moderately Used
Total Mean	3.31		Always Used

The results in Table 3 show that students are mindful of the knowledge they have acquired and how they apply it. The information processing affective component strategies, namely, awareness of proper word usage and spelling (mean = 3.42), awareness of speaking habits and body language (mean = 3.34), and proofreading one's own composition (mean = 3.29), topped the ranking respectively. This implies that self-awareness and self-reflection as strategies in learning English are necessary for the students to truly realize whether or not they are acquiring the language.

Table 4. Acclimating Affective Component

Strategy	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. I condition myself to consistently read materials.	3.27	0.63	Always Used
2. I encourage myself to learn confidently and persistently.	3.52	0.57	Always Used
3. I imagine relatable situations for effective writing.	3.43	0.61	Always Used
4. I always remind myself to listen to others.	3.63	0.54	Always Used
Total Mean	3.46		Always Used

The finding in Table 4 presents that the respondents believe motivation paired with self-reflection are helpful strategies under the acclimating affective component, reminding oneself to listen to others (mean = 3.63), encouraging oneself to learn confidently and persistently (mean = 3.52) and imagining relatable situations for effective writing (mean = 3.43) got the top 3 highest mean, but it is also observable that all of the items were considered as always used by the respondents. The results display the students' high sense of intrinsic motivation in English learning.

Productive Component

The last component used by Filipino university learners is the productive component, which displays learning outputs by utilizing technology, validating prior and existing knowledge from others, and devising a strategy in learning and rehearsing the English language.

Table 5. Technological Utilization Productive Component

Strategy	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. I surf the internet and utilize online grammar checkers.	3.47	0.66	Always Used
2. I use online and offline dictionaries for pronunciation, vocabularies, and grammar.	3.47	0.66	Always Used
3. I use applications that incorporate listening activities.	3.16	0.72	Moderately Used
4. I record myself while speaking for practice.	2.75	0.91	Moderately Used
5. I search for written samples as my basis for writing.	3.34	0.68	Always Used
6. I research a variety of tips in writing.	3.30	0.70	Always Used
Total Mean	3.25		Moderately Used

The data in Table 5 presents that the respondents rely on technology mainly in the use of online grammar checkers (mean = 3.47), online and offline dictionaries for pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar (mean = 3.47), and written samples as a basis for writing (mean = 3.34). This result may be due to the respondents' freedom to choose the learning materials, methods, and learning depth they intend to acquire. This also implies how the respondents take advantage of the accessibility of information in the English learning process.

Table 6. Filtering Productive Components

Strategy	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. I avoid distractions while listening.	3.43	0.63	Always Used
2. I select material/s that interest me.	3.57	0.57	Always Used
3. I avoid jumping to conclusions.	3.12	0.66	Moderately Used
4. I choose less complicated texts.	3.26	0.69	Always Used
5. I organize my ideas before writing.	3.52	0.60	Always Used
Total Mean	3.38		Always Used

Table 6 shows that the respondents employ their critical thinking strategies reflected in the productive filtering component. The strategies always used are selecting materials based on one's interest (mean = 3.57), organizing one's ideas before writing (mean = 3.52), avoiding distractions while listening (mean = 3.43), choosing less complicated texts (mean = 3.26), and avoiding jumping to conclusions was identified as moderately used (mean = 2.12). This implies that the respondents prefer materials they understand when learning the language, how they would like to use them, and how to sift them according to their understanding. This also shows that the students are active in terms of their learning. This posits that they not only acquire knowledge but also reflect on their own thought, which promotes higher-level thinking.

Table 7. Practicing Productive Component

Strategy	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. I incorporate new words in speaking and writing.	3.29	0.60	Always Used
2. I paraphrase different types of texts.	3.33	0.66	Always Used
3. I socialize to practice my English.	3.17	0.72	Moderately Used
4. I do grammar exercises.	3.15	0.73	Moderately Used
5. I practice pronunciation drills.	3.24	0.70	Moderately Used

Strategy	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
6. I play English games.	3.09	0.83	Moderately Used
7. I listen to audio-visual materials repeatedly.	3.15	0.74	Moderately Used
8. I use skimming and scanning as reading techniques.	3.11	0.71	Moderately Used
9. I recite expressions for fluent speaking.	2.98	0.74	Moderately Used
10. I observe appropriate eye contact while speaking.	3.20	0.70	Moderately Used
11. I actively participate in school activities such as role plays, speeches, among others.	2.95	0.80	Moderately Used
12. I compose literary pieces.	2.76	0.84	Moderately Used
13. I write corporate letters.	2.70	0.80	Moderately Used
14. I create story maps to organize information.	2.71	0.80	Moderately Used
15. I synthesize learned concepts.	2.97	0.67	Moderately Used
Total Mean	3.05		Moderately Used

Out of the 15 strategies presented to the respondents, only two are always used. Paraphrasing different types of texts (mean = 3.33) and incorporating new words in speaking and writing (mean = 3.29), which were the top two strategies, imply that the students prefer vocabulary use and sentence organization to practice using English. This result further implies that the respondents have not yet maximized other forms of strategies in practicing English as they learn the language.

Table 8. Validating Productive Components

Strategy	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. I consult my fluent friends and teachers about grammar.	3.10	0.77	Moderately Used
2. I ask the meanings of words from more proficient classmates and teachers.	3.26	0.75	Always Used
3. I solicit feedback from more knowledgeable others for improvement.	3.30	0.67	Always Used
Total Mean	3.22		Moderately Used

In Table 8, the respondent always used 2 out of 3 strategies. Soliciting feedback from more knowledgeable others for improvement (mean = 3.30) and asking the meanings of words from more proficient classmates and teachers (mean = 3.26) topped in the validating productive components, and consulting friends and teachers about grammar was revealed to be moderately used (mean = 3.10). This result is in line with the result in other components like the consultation of online and online grammar checkers. Since the students have access to technology, they prefer online grammar checking rather than consultations with their friends and teachers regarding grammar. In terms of vocabulary development, the students extensively use online and offline dictionaries while also validating their meanings with their classmates and teachers.

DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that the respondents utilized all components of the English language learning strategies typology in their learning processes. The most frequently used component was the acclimating affective component, followed by the filtering productive components and the meaning-making intellective component. The acquiring intellective component and the information processing affective component were also prominent, while the technological utilization productive component, validating productive components, and practicing productive component were categorized as moderately used. Overall, the results suggest a preference among respondents for input strategies over output strategies, highlighting their inclination to focus on acquiring knowledge and skills rather than actively producing language, despite slight variations in mean scores among the components.

Primarily, the intellective components identified among university learners demonstrate a complex approach to acquiring and understanding the English language, combining acquisition and meaning-making strategies. The data reveals that students use digital tools like e-dictionaries and online platforms like social media, which serve as their practice materials by analyzing the content and listening to different speakers. This trend illustrates their preference to combine traditional methods of listening and grammar comprehension with technological resources, allowing them to be exposed to numerous contexts. The use of social media not only allows access to authentic language but also enriches vocabulary and comprehension skills, as noted by Yadav (2021), Baytekin and Su-Bergil (2021). The findings likewise emphasize the importance of integrating memorization and comprehension strategies, as highlighted by Faisal and Atei (2022), which help students internalize different linguistic systems—phonetic, grammatical, and socio-linguistic—through repeated exposure to diverse language forms, such as excerpts, songs, and dialogues. As Wu et al. (2023) described, active listening further improves students' ability to discern sounds and interpret meanings within sociocultural contexts. By employing these strategies, learners understand English more, becoming effective language acquirers. Adequate vocabulary also plays a critical role in context clue strategies' effectiveness, as Fudhla et al. (2020) emphasized. Additionally, meaning-making techniques enhance their comprehension when they visualize conversations and activate prior knowledge before using a new material. Their reliance on imagery and prior knowledge aligns with schema

theory, suggesting that connecting new information to existing cognitive frameworks reduces cognitive load and creates deeper understanding (Dong et al., 2020).

On the other hand, the affective component, which includes the students' self-awareness and emotional engagement, also plays a role in their acquisition of English. The findings from the information processing strategies indicate that students are actively mindful of their speaking habits, body language, writing skills for awareness of speaking habits, proper word usage, and proofreading. This self-awareness is important to their learning process, enabling students to reflect on their language skills and identify areas for improvement. The emphasis on self-reflection and self-awareness aligns with research suggesting that these elements are essential for effective language acquisition (Chikiwa, 2021). The cognitive processes involved in structuring speech, together with spatial-motoric information, also contribute to a richer language environment, enhancing both speaking and thinking capabilities. In terms of proofreading and editing, the study supports previous findings emphasizing the importance of clarity and understanding in writing. As noted by Alshahrani (2019) and Azeez (2020), editing and proofreading refine content and aid in conveying meaning more effectively. This is important for students as they read complex texts, requiring them to decode words and utilize lexical information to grasp meaning at various levels (Brooks et al., 2021). The students' awareness of their writing processes thus reflects an engagement with the target language, promoting comprehension and fluency. The acclimating strategies further highlight the significance of intrinsic motivation and self-regulation in language learning, attributed to the strategy of reminding oneself to listen to others as students demonstrate a proactive approach to their learning environment. Encouragement and self-reflection, for self-persistence and imagining relatable writing situations, showcase the students' commitment to improving their English skills. These strategies exemplify self-regulated learning, where students manage their emotions, cognition, and motivation to achieve better outcomes (An et al., 2021; Yu, 2023).

Finally, in the productive component of language learning, as demonstrated in the practices of Filipino university learners, emphasizes the strategic use of technology, validation of existing knowledge, and effective practice techniques, highlighting a strong reliance on technological tools, particularly online grammar checkers and dictionaries. This indicates that students subscribe to accessible resources to enhance their understanding of grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. Such practices reflect an advanced trend in education where technology facilitates personalized learning experiences, allowing students to modify their approach to language acquisition. The findings align with previous research suggesting that digital tools effectively support learners in mastering linguistic elements (Ezeh et al., 2022). Additionally, the practice of self-monitoring, such as recording oneself while speaking, suggests an emerging awareness of the importance of self-assessment in language learning. This strategy encourages critical thinking and self-reflection, needed for building a sense of independence and commitment in students' English language development (Jamrus & Razali, 2019). The combination of these technological and self-monitoring strategies indicates a proactive approach by learners to refine their skills and enhance their language proficiency through continuous practice. The filtering productive strategies further illustrate the students' critical thinking skills in selecting materials of personal interest, and the consistent organization of ideas before writing emphasizes the

role of students in curating their learning experiences. This approach not only promotes engagement but also supports metacognitive awareness (Alhamdawee & Abbas, 2021). By avoiding distractions and choosing manageable texts, students demonstrate a strategic method of filtering information that aligns with their learning preferences. This indicates that while foundational practices are in place, students may still benefit from exploring additional strategies, such as participating in more interactive speaking activities or varied writing tasks. This finding suggests that educators should encourage more practice techniques to further enhance students' language skills and confidence. Lastly, the validation strategies, particularly the high engagement in soliciting feedback from peers and teachers, stress the importance of collaborative learning in language development. The act of asking for clarifications on vocabulary and seeking constructive feedback reflects a commitment to learning from more knowledgeable others. This collaborative approach not only reinforces understanding but also promotes a sense of community among learners. When students engage in trial-and-error learning and validating their skills, they enhance their self-regulation and ability to critically assess their progress, leading to more effective and meaningful language acquisition experiences.

These findings imply the need for a comprehensive approach integrating the Typology of English Language Learning Strategies. With the respondents' strong preference for input strategies and the effective use of technological tools, educators should create learning environments that allow these resources to expose students to authentic language contexts. By creating connections between new information and existing cognitive frameworks, educators can help reduce cognitive load and enhance understanding. Focusing on these integrated strategies will influence students to develop greater linguistic competence and confidence, transforming them into effective language learners.

Overall, creating a supportive learning environment that encourages the application of all the strategies will empower students to develop greater linguistic competence and confidence in their English language abilities, and while the results demonstrate that the students did not fully utilize the developed typology of English language learning strategies for Filipino students, the typology surely provides a chance for college students to evaluate their own commitment to studying English as a second language. Based on the related and gathered research results from different countries that utilize many of the strategies in the typology, Filipino students also benefit from using the ideas presented as a guide in planning and implementing English language study at their own pace and style.

LIMITATIONS

There are limitations that can be addressed by other researchers albeit this study's strengths. Although the research included hundreds of Filipino university learners, follow-up studies are encouraged. In fact, typologies of English language learning strategies from the basic education (elementary, junior high school, and senior high school levels) can be devised to ensure that these strategies are collated. On another note, the quantitative part identified the frequency in which Filipino university learners used the typology of English language learning strategies. The questionnaire, in this regard, may be modified to determine which among the components of the typology are most effective in English

language learning as perceived by learners. Finally, this research utilized the cross-sectional exploratory sequential design, so other researchers can use the sequential explanatory mixed-methods design to supply further information on the Typology of English Language Learning Strategies (TELLS).

CONCLUSIONS

By harvesting both qualitative and quantitative data from over a thousand Filipino university learners in the Philippines, the researchers were able to build a Typology of English Language Learning Strategies (TELLS), which is divided into intellective components, affective components, and productive components with 49 English language learning strategies. The typology circumstantiates the necessity of language learning strategies to become successful language learners because it impacts better language acquisition.

Although the majority of the components of the Typology of English Language Learning Strategies (TELLS) were always used by Filipino university learners, practicing productive components, validating productive components, and technological utilization of productive components were only moderately used. This indicates that the respondents have not fully maximized other strategies in learning the English language. Through TELLS, educators can provide various opportunities for Filipino university learners to optimize the application of all the English language learning strategies to make language learning more spontaneous, fast, and enjoyable.

REFERENCES

Agustin, W., Wahyudin, AY., & Isnaini, S. (2021). Language learning strategies and academic achievement of English Department students. *Journal of Arts and Education*, 1(1), 19-29. https://doi.org/10.33365/jae.v1i1.34

Akbari, Z. (2019). EFL Learners' Misconceptions or Erroneous Beliefs about Language Learning: An ESP Context. *Language Teaching*. https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2018.09.03

Alhamdawee, A. L. N. O., & Abbas, A. L. I. S. (2021). Metacognition and language learning. *International Journal on Humanities and Social Sciences*, *26*. https://doi.org/10.33193/ijohss.26.2021.333

Almusharraf, N., & Bailey, D. R. (2021). A regression analysis approach to measuring the influence of student characteristics on language learning strategies. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(4), 463-482. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1319105.pdf

Alshahrani, H. A. (2019). Strategies to improve English vocabulary and spelling in the classroom for ELL, ESL, EO and LD students. *International Journal of Modern Education Studies*, 3(2), 65-81. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1293606.pdf

An, Z, Wang, C., Li, S., Gan, Z. & Li, H. (2021). Technology-assisted self-regulated English language learning: associations with English language self-efficacy, English enjoyment, and learning outcomes. *Frontiers in Psychology,* 11 https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.558466

Azeez, P. (2020). Investigating Editing and Proofreading Strategies used by Koya University Lecturers. *Evaluation Study of Three Diagnostic Methods for Helicobacter Pylori Infection,* 7(3), 341–361. https://doi.org/10.24271/garmian.2070324

Aziz, S. N. S. M., & Shah, P. M. (2020). Language learning strategy (LLS) for English language learners in polytechnic. *Journal of Personalized Learning*, *3*(1), 71-78. https://spaj.ukm.my/jplearning/index.php/jplearning/article/viewFile/121/91

Baytekin, M. E., & Su-Bergil, A. (2021). The role of Web2.0 and social media tools in foreign language learning. *˜the œTurkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, *20*(2), 104–115. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1304891.pdf

Berg, D. R., Lu, Y., & Huang, S. C. (2021). Developing a socioculturally-appropriate language learning strategies questionnaire for Taiwanese university students. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, 18(1), 63-98. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1288990

Brooks, G., Clenton, J., & Fraser, S. (2021). Exploring the importance of vocabulary for English as an additional language learners' reading comprehension. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*,11(3) 351-376. http://dx.doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2021.11.3.3

Chikiwa, C. (2021) Gestures and the spoken language: A crucial semiotic and symbiotic relationship in multilingual mathematics classes. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 17(12). https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/11279

Cubukcu, F., & Bayalas, M. (2021). Age, language difference and proficiency as determinant factors in learning strategy use. *Lenguaje*, *49*(1), 165–197. https://doi.org/10.25100/lenguaje.v49i1.10499

Derakhshan, A., Tamaskani, R., & Faribi, M. (2015). Issues in language learning strategies. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 5(4), 613-621. http://ijsse.com/sites/default/files/issues/2015/v5i4/Paper-09.pdf

Dong, A, Jong, M. & King, R. (2020). How does prior knowledge influence learning engagement? The mediating roles of cognitive load and help-seeking. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11:591203. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.591203/full

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1-4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Ezeh, N. G., Anyanwu, E. C., & Onunkwo, C. M. (2022). Dictionary as an effective resource in teaching and learning of English as a second language: Complementing instructions. *English Language Teaching*, *15*(4), 108. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v15n4p108

Faisal, W. & Atei, A (2022). Using "memory strategies" to enhance EFL grammar to 6th secondary students. *Multicultural Education,* 8(1). http://ijdri.com/me/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/37.pdf

Fudhla, N., Solusia, C., & Oktoviandry, R. (2020). Context Clues as a Vocabulary Learning Strategy: A View of Its Implementation in EFL Classroom. *Atlantis Press*. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200306.014

Griffiths, C. (2020). Language learning strategies: Is the baby still in the bathwater? *Applied Linguistics*, 41(4), 607-611. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amy024

Griffiths, C., and Soruç, A. (2020). Individual differences in language learning: A complex systems theory perspective. Palgrave Macmillan.

Hajar, A., & Karakus, M. (2024). Five decades of language learning strategy research: a bibliometric review and research agenda. *Language Learning Journal*, 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2024.2361145

Halcomb, E. J., & Hickman, L. (2015). Mixed methods research. *Nursing Standard: Promoting Excellence in Nursing Care*, 29(32), 41-47. https://ro.uow.edu.au/smhpapers/2656/

Iamudom, T., & Tangkiengsirisin, S. (2020). A comparison study of learner autonomy and language learning strategies among Thai EFL learners. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(2). 199-212.https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1249113.pdf

Jamrus, M. & Razali, A. (2019). Using self-assessment as a tool for English language learning. *English Language Teaching*, 12(11). 64-73. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n11p64

Kölemen, Ü. (2021). A systematic review of studies on language learning strategies from 1977 to 2018. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 3(1), 151-169. https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v3i1.485

Kusuma, A., Dewanti, R., & Principe, R. A. (2022). English learning strategies among senior high schools in Yogyakarta. *Tamansiswa International Journal in Education and Science*, 4(1), 29-34. https://jurnal.ustjogja.ac.id/index.php/TIJES/article/view/13527

Lestari, M., & Wahyudin, A. Y. (2020). Language learning strategies of undergraduate EFL students. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 25-30. https://doi.org/10.33365/jeltl.v1i1.242

Melvina, M., Lengkanawati, N. S., & Wirza, Y. (2020). EFL learners' language learning strategies: Field specialization and gender. *International Journal of Education*, 13(2), 63-69. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Melvina-Melvina2/publication/348845449

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). Learning strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know. Heinle & Heinle.

Pagalilauan, J. B. (2023). Language learning Strategies and Learning Styles among BSED students of SJCBI. *American Journal of Education and Technology*, 1(4), 37–45. https://doi.org/10.54536/ajet.v1i4.1108

Pawlak, M. (2021). Investigating language learning strategies: Prospects, pitfalls and challenges. *Language Teaching Research,* 25(5), 817-835. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819876156

Quinto, J. B. (2022). Seize the day or seize theses? The challenges in undergraduate thesis writing. *Issues in Educational Research,* 32(4), 1567-1583. http://www.iier.org.au/iier32/quinto.pdf

Ranjan, R., & Philominraj, A. (2020). Language learning strategies, motivation and gender in foreign language context. *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 8(2), 591-604. https://www.hrpub.org/journals/article_info.php?aid=8800

Ranjan, R., Philominraj, A., & Saavedra, R. A. (2021). On the relationship between language learning strategies and language proficiency in Indian universities. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(3), 73-94. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1304555

Schipor, D., & Hammershaug, V. S. (2022). Language learning strategies in the 2020 national curriculum for English. In M. Dypedahl (Ed.), *Moving English language teaching forward* (Ch. 12, pp. 271–294). Cappelen Damm Akademisk. https://doi.org/10.23865/noasp.166.ch12

Schoonenboom, J., & Johnson, R. B. (2017). How to construct a mixed methods research design. *KZfSS Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 69(2), 107-131. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11577-017-0454-1

Senad, B., Amna, B. Č., & Edda, P. (2021). Exploring the relationship between language learning strategies, academic achievement, grade level, and gender. *Journal of Language and Education*, 7(2 (26), 93-106. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2021.10771

Suwanarak, K. (2019). Use of learning strategies and their effects on English language learning of Thai adult learners. *3L, Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 25(4). http://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2019-2504-07

Taheri, H., Sadighi, F., Bagheri, M. S., & Bavali, M. (2020). Investigating the relationship between Iranian EFL learners' use of language learning strategies and foreign language

skills achievement. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 7(1),1710944. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2019.1710944

Tran, N. T. N. (2021). The relationship between language learning strategies and gender in learning English as a second or foreign language. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, *3*(6), 120–126. https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.6.17

Widharyanto, B., & Binawan, H. (2020). Learning style and language learning strategies of students from various ethnics in Indonesia. *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 39(2), 514-528. https://garuda.kemdikbud.go.id/documents/detail/1692273

Wu, W.-C., Yang, C.-H., & Turner, M. (2023). Exploring the Interdisciplinary Relationship between Music and Language for Enhanced Bilingual Curriculum. *Journal Of Curriculum Studies Research*, *5*(3), 96-112. https://doi.org/10.46303/jcsr.2023.33

Yu, B. (2023). Self-regulated learning: A key factor in the effectiveness of online learning for second language learners. *Frontier Psychology*, 12(13). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1051349

Yadav, M. S. (2021). Role of Social Media in English Language Learning to the Adult Learners. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, *4*(1), 238–247. https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.1.25

Yunus, N. A. M., Mustafa, Z., & Zaharuddin, A. (2022). Strategies in language learning: A survey among undergraduate Japanese language students in USIM. *Al-Azkiyaa-Jurnal Antarabangsa Bahasa dan Pendidikan*, 1(2), 103-114. https://azkiyaa.usim.edu.my/index.php/jurnal/article/view/30/18

Funding

Conflict of interest

The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

PINOY TELLS: ТИПОЛОГІЯ СТРАТЕГІЙ ВИВЧЕННЯ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ

Анотація. Незважаючи на численні дослідження стратегій вивчення мов (LLS — Language Learning Strategies), багато студентів все ще неправильно розуміють їхню ефективність, вважаючи, що вони вимагають надто багато зусиль за мінімальних результатів. Крім того, студенти мають різноманітні та часто суперечливі уподобання щодо LLS, а такі чинники, як культурне середовище, впливають на їхній вибір, що свідчить про необхідність подальших досліджень, які б вивчали, як ці елементи впливають на навчальну поведінку. Тому важливо враховувати сприйняття студентами LLS та їхнє використання для забезпечення ефективного вивчення мови. У цьому дослідженні було розроблено перелік стратегій вивчення англійської мови для філіппінських студентів коледжів та університетів. Використовуючи поперечний послідовний дизайн дослідження, що поєднує етапи якісного аналізу та кількісної оцінки, дослідники зібрали якісні дані від 544 філіппінських студентів університетів, щоб зрозуміти їхній досвід і вподобання у вивченні мови. Після цього було розроблено анкету "Типологія стратегій вивчення англійської мови" (TELLS — Typology of English Language Learning Strategies) шляхом валідованого тематичного аналізу, який включав три ключові компоненти: інтелектуальний (засвоєння та осмислення), афективний (обробка інформації та адаптація) і продуктивний (використання технологій, відбір, практикування та валідація). У кількісному етапі 502 філіппінських студенти бакалаврату визначили найчастіше використовувані стратегії. Результати показали, що ці студенти зазвичай використовують більшість компонентів типології, за винятком продуктивного компонента "Практикування". Це дослідження значно сприяє розумінню стратегій вивчення англійської мови серед філіппінських студентів. Воно надає цінний ресурс для викладачів, розробників навчальних програм і практиків у сфері вивчення мов, розробляючи емпірично валідовану типологію, яка відповідає потребам і вподобанням студентів. Висновки також пропонують напрямки для майбутніх досліджень, зокрема вивчення зв'язку між компонентами TELLS та результатами володіння мовою або впровадження TELLS у процес вивчення мови.

Ключові слова: стратегії вивчення мов, поперечний послідовний дизайн дослідження, студенти бакалаврату, перелік стратегій вивчення англійської мови