RES MILITARIS
REVUE EUROPEENNE D ETUDES EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF MILITARY STUDIES
Social Science Journal

Tenth Grade Students' Level of Practice of Learning Approaches

By

Saleem Nawaf Alhussien
A Ph.D. Candidate, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan

Prof. Mohammad F. Hawamdeh
Faculty of Education, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan

Abstract

This study aimed to assess the self-reported level of learning approach practices among 10th-grade students in Jordan and to examine whether there are any significant differences in the practices of learning approaches based on gender. The research instrument was a scale comprising 52 items categorized into three domains: strategic, deep, and surface learning approaches. The scale was administered to a sample of 341 male and female students. Results indicated that the level of practicing learning approaches among the students was generally high, with the strategic approach being the most commonly used, followed by the deep approach, and the surface approach ranking third with an average score. Additionally, there were no significant differences between male and female students in terms of their practice of learning approaches.

Keywords: learning approaches: deep, strategic, surface.

Introduction

The rapid progress in different aspects of life, including education, has led to an increased interest in exploring effective teaching and learning techniques that can foster creativity and innovation. As the learning and teaching process plays a crucial role in nurturing creativity and innovators, individuals who possess the ability to reason and think creatively are highly valued. To this end, countries have been striving to develop diverse educational programs aimed at improving the competency of educators in both behavioral and academic aspects. Most of the studies and educational research have long been concerned with the variables that care about following up learning methods. Researchers in this field investigated the common teaching methods used by teachers, teaching methods and strategies, learning and teaching styles and approaches and their negative or positive impact on the entire educational process. In addition to the interests of educationalists, especially after the recent Corona pandemic, educational researchers have noticed through experiences in the area of education and training that each student has its own method of receiving information, processing it, understanding it and keeping it. Each individual has become a single class in its visual or auditory learning or reading and writing performance, and student's abilities vary in using and receiving information, whether it is directly received from the teacher or from electronic means of contact and communication, especially in light of traditional or modern learning methods. Teachers and learners should actively participate in the process of teaching, learning and interaction with the environment and its resources in order to learn efficiently and effectively, through which the active participation of the learner is encouraged to create a stimulating learning environment and reinforce the teaching and learning process by shifting from traditional teaching strategies, which focus on passive feeding done by the teacher and negative reception by the learner, to more effective strategies based on the active participation of the learner in the learning process itself, and improving the quality of learning, through supporting

the distinguished empirical evidence, including the existence of the three education curricula represented in: (education curricula, student motives, and intentional choices) (Dinsmore & Alexander, 2012). Teachers are responsible for diagnosing the learners' preferred methods and for helping them encourage learners to learn, through teacher's knowledge of the preferred learning style and approaches of its students, and encouraging them to immerse themselves in active learning. Since the educational situations and the actions associated with them in the classroom environment affect the brain's work and consequently the learning patterns that the learner uses to meet its scientific, academic, psychological needs, and etc.…, through searching for the students' scientific, academic, psychological , and etc.…, and because each learner has a specific style of learning, a learner may resort to summarizing the educational material so that it can absorb and understand it, and another learner may resort to studying in a loud voice so that it can store information in the spatial memory, which is responsible for recording all the daily experiences that the individual is exposed to. While another learner may resort to using the hearing sense before reading or writing the words, and so on (Afana & El-Geish, 2009). The emotional and physiological factors are indicators of how students perceive the learning environment and respond to it, which constitutes the individual's preferred method of thinking, problem-solving and deduction. This method is called the learning style, which involves the inclusion of the learning style theory in the educational process resulting in an increase in thinking and learner's capability of creation and innovation. It is also an entry point that helps teachers to know individual differences, its way of thinking and its learning style, so that teachers can identify and provide appropriate activities and various experiences for the appropriate learning style for each learner, which is reflected in the learners' performance, confidence and satisfaction with their performance, and this motivates them and increases their motivation towards learning, acquiring the necessary knowledge and skills, and achieving good results in the achievement and skill aspect (Abdel-Hussein et al., 2019).

Refining skills of male and female teachers is a non-stop process, whether it is during their enrollment in universities, institutes or during service. Every year we see something new that has occurred in the teachers' professionalism through their enrollment in training courses and identifying the extent to which the teacher has applied methods and approaches to learning and teaching that raise the level of students' achievement. Therefore, teachers' awareness of the learning approaches is a starting point for improving the whole learning process (Attari, 2002).

The majority of studies and educational research have long been interested in the variables that are concerned with following up learning methods, for example: the study of (Ramadan, 1990; Schmeck, 1983; Biggs,1993). Researchers in this field investigated the common teaching methods used by teachers, and the impact of these methods in students' learning, with a reluctance to search for the methods used by students in teaching themselves and their impact on them. But recently we see the tendency of some researchers with an aim to correct this imbalance, from the perspective that the learner is no less important than the perspective of teachers; as the learner determines what it wants to learn, and directs study strategies towards the most appropriate and easiest ways to achieve the desired objectives, and that neglecting paying care to the student may affect the entire educational and learning process negatively For instance, younger students may rely more on repetition and active learning approaches, while older students may use more advanced strategies such as summarization, elaboration, and self-regulated learning (Alhumaid, et al. 2021). Cultural background may also play a role in students' learning approaches, as some cultures value memorization and repetition while others prioritize critical thinking and analysis (Habes et al. 2022; Salloum et al. 2019; Said A Salloum et al. 2021).

Researchers noted that there are challenges facing the educational process in educating students to become lifelong learners and versatile experts in their respective areas. Fostering and stimulating the development of lifelong learning skills such as problem-solving and critical thinking has become a crucial objective of education in the 21st century. All this prompted educationalist to use different terminology in educational literature. Anyone tracking the educational heritage finds that the term approach to studying was used for the first time in the seventies of the last century, although there are many who do not distinguish between the approach to studying and the learning style and confuse them as if they were one thing. However, a number of researchers have pointed out the distinction between style and approach. Approach to Studying defined as a group of learning strategies and dealing with educational material in a specific academic environment (Biggs, 1987; Sadler-Smith 1999). Attari (2002) pointed out that the approach is closer to the strategy of processing the educational material than to the style which is more closely related to the personality of the individual, and the approach is influenced by the academic and social sphere of the learner to a high extent. This means that the approach is more changeable, and the approach is affected by the style, of course, but it is also affected by the elements and variables of the surrounding environment. There are other terms that are used interchangeably with the term "approach", including the term "orientation".

Dinsmore and Alexander (2012) said that one area that needs critical discussion is the investigation into deep and surface understanding. They also pointed out that the results of studies related to deep and surface learning are inconsistent for reasons including:

- The perception of deep and surface learning differs across studies, in addition to the way these concepts are measured. There is often insufficient evidence for the validity of the tools used to measure deep learning.
- The contexts in which studies are conducted often differ, while deep learning may differ across academic contexts and areas. Consequently, it is important in future research to:

a- Define clearly what is meant by deep learning, starting with a clear theoretical framework.
b- Investigate deep learning in a specific educational context, since the context of the learning environment may influence deep learning.
c- Measure deep learning with valid and true tools.

When addressing the approaches of learning, the three levels of learning approaches should be referred to:

The surface approach is characterized by the reproduction of knowledge, often through rote memorization, with an aim to avoid failure. This style of learning results in surface study behaviors that meet the minimum requirements for completing tasks with minimal effort. Students also do not seem to enjoy learning and see the process as imposed from outside (Dahl et al., 2018). Low levels and quality of understanding are unfortunate results of the surface approach, and therefore surface approaches are undesirable and considered less appropriate as teachers are obviously feeling displeased with them as appropriate ways of learning, as well as their association with poor academic performance (Diseth & Martinsen, 2003). However, there are Increased recognition and preference for certain tasks where a surface approach is adopted, namely: obtaining immediate feedback on newly learned content or comprehending key facts and constituent materials as an introduction to higher levels of learning. Moreover, students are more likely to adopt a surface approach to learning when teachers teach from the perspective of “circulation of information” or indoctrination (Crittenden et al., 2019). The surface approach is

concerned with memorizing and taking information as it is without understanding and analyzing it. This approach may be suitable in cognitive aspects and not others.

As for the deep approach, academics often believe that the ultimate objective of education is the development of "critical thinking" (Entwistle, 1997). Therefore, the deep approach on this premise and according to this approach, students who use a deep approach identify the meaning of a topic, enjoy engaging in intellectual challenges, exploring interrelationships between concepts, as well as learning for fundamental reasons. Deep approaches have been linked to developing critical thinking skills, increasing adaptability and flexibility, subject-related perceptions, and laying the foundation for lifelong learning. In addition, deep approaches are described as the most attractive and valuable approach, mostly because of the consistent relationships found with positive learning outcomes and high-quality educationists (Dahl et al., 2018). The deep learning approach involves discipline understanding by students and engaging in meaningful learning. The deep learning approach usually involves the use of analytical skills, cross-reference, imaginative reconstruct, and independent thinking. It also reinforces lifelong learning. A surface learning approach involves memorizing information without understanding its effects or benefits (Warburton, 2003). The deep learning approach is of particular importance in the context of education for the sake of mastery and survival of the effect of learning. The deep approach makes the student analyze knowledge, share it and critique it, because it understands and enjoys the educational material and explores the interrelationships between the concepts included in it.

The strategic approach in which success is the primary motive of the strategic learning approach and the intent is to excel in performance and achieve the highest possible score through outperforming others (Said A. Salloum et al. 2021). A strategic approach may include elements of surface or deep processing, depending on the one which has the higher potential of achieving high marks (Ballantine et al., 2018). As such, a strategic approach can lead to a deep level of understanding the educational material, but the student considers it as an accidental learning, and not a primary objective) (Gordon & Debus, 2002) Some teachers consider the strategic approach favorable and approve its use (Ballantine et al., 2018). It is not surprising that there are many positive correlations between the strategic approach and academic performance outcomes such as grades. Students who adopt a strategic approach are more achievement-oriented and tend to pay accurate attention to performance evaluation criteria, actively searching for evidence about testable material, and developing highly structured ways of studying through purposeful organization of effort and effective time management (Entwistle & Peterson, 2004). The strategic approach: in which the student is self-reliant, and its objective is to obtain the highest marks, and the student uses all means to achieve its objective.

Faranda et al., (2021) outlined the three learning approaches: surface, deep, and strategic. The surface approach aims to avoid failing and involves reproduction. The objective is to meet course requirements with minimal effort, leading to incomplete understanding through memorization and rote learning. The deep approach is motivated by intrinsic interest in the topic and involves understanding. The objective is to gain a broad understanding of the topic, connect thoughts to past knowledge and daily experiences, and commit to learning for personal reasons. The strategic approach aims to reinforce achievement and achieve the highest score and involves success. The objective is to achieve high scores by paying attention to the course evaluation criteria, managing time, using space effectively, and acting like a model student.

Marton and Säljö identify two levels of processing, surface and deep, to explain how students direct their attention intentionally towards learning materials to achieve a desired outcome. They later describe these processes as learning approaches to differentiate them from concepts related to memory. A third approach, known as the strategic approach, has also emerged and is sometimes referred to as the "achievement" or "organization" approach by learning approach theorists such as Gordon and Debus (2002).

Empirical evidence supports the existence of these three distinct learning approaches. Learning approaches include students' motivations and intentional choices in terms of its connection with a particular learning situation, as well as the different levels of processing used to achieve those motivations and intentions. Furthermore, the education curricula do not represent the fixed characteristics of students. Instead, curricula are flexible responses and intentional choices that are partially based on students' perceptions of their learning environment (Dahl et al., 2018). Moreover, high internal motivation and their external motivation have a significant positive effect on deep learning. Later, deep learning leads to higher academic performance. By contrast, surface learning leads to lower academic performance (Everaert et al., 2017).

Researchers have noticed, over the past few years, that learners prefer certain ways and styles of learning over others, and teachers' knowledge of their students' preferred learning styles helps them plan and elicit individual-based instructions. (Siddiquei & Khalid, 2021).

Smarandache et al., (2022) conducted a study to reveal a psychometric perspective to investigate the interactions between the elements that determine students' learning preferences, in addition to understanding the basic elements of the behavior patterns that students use to adopt a specific educational approach. In order to achieve the aim of the study, the researcher applied a questionnaire to a high sample of university students consisting of (5357) male and female students, and the results showed that the percentage of interest in the school subject in relation to the effort exerted by the student is the main element for students' preference for deep or surface learning. The results showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the evaluations that are attributable to: specialization, gender, or academic year; and that the interest-to-effort percentage is the central student behavior pattern from which they develop a preference for a learning approach, and that this behavior pattern is stable across different contextual variables (e.g., students' gender, academic year, and specialization). Natoli et al., (2022) conducted a study that aimed at investigating the extent to which learning styles are affected by the learning environment in China and Australia among three groups of accounting students. As for the study tool, a logistic regression tool was used depending on the responses of (1,381) students across five higher education institutions in China and Australia. The results showed original empirical evidence for Chinese accounting students' expectations of deep learning and students' perceptions of good teaching is a main determinant of the deep learning approach for all study groups. In addition, obvious objectives and standards were important for Chinese accounting students studying in both China and Australia, while an appropriate workload was important for the deep learning of the Australian local student cohort. Faranda et al., (2021), conducted a study that aimed at investigating the special education curricula of marketing students and their perceptions of the comprehensive academic quality of their study program. The study population consisted of (345) marketing students and the results showed that the highest use was for the strategic approach, followed by the deep approach, and then the surface approach. The results also showed that strategic and deep learning approaches are associated with higher perceptions of academic program quality. Surface learning approaches are the least preferred approach and is negatively related to perception of academic program quality and satisfaction with academic achievement.

The researcher points to the importance of studying learning approaches and styles; as recent studies have shown that match between learning approaches and teaching methods help stimulate students' learning. Accordingly, this study investigates the preferred learning approaches of tenth year students in Jordan.

Study questions

The study tried to answer the following two questions:

- What is the level of tenth-graders in practice learning approaches in the Arabic language?
- Are there any statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the degree of tenth-graders practice of learning approaches owing to the gender variable?

Significance of the study

The inclusion of learning approaches results an increase in the learner's thinking and ability to create and innovate. The way in which students realize how they receive information and experiences and how they process new information. Teacher's knowledge of the learners' characteristics and their abilities to learn and teach helps teachers to know individual differences and consequently helps to Identify and provide appropriate activities, diverse experiences, educational methods and styles that are appropriate to the educational approach. Accordingly, there are two important things in this study, namely:

Theoretical (scientific) importance

1. The results of the current study and the resulting recommendations may open the way for researchers to conduct other studies.
2. Increasing the Arab library balance in general and the Jordanian library in particular, with studies on the most widely used learning approaches among tenth year students.
3. The criteria that will be used in this study can be developed and utilized in other studies.

Applied importance

1. The results may benefit those in charge of curricula and text books in enriching the curricula prepared for students at this stage with activities and exercises that can contribute to enhancing the effectiveness of students' learning.
2. The results of the study may contribute practically to shifting interest from traditional teaching methods, which depend on stuffing students' heads with information to modern teaching methods, which are concerned with diversification in teaching methods, which depend on thinking, ways of facing problems, and providing creative solutions to them.
3. The study results may help in planning remedial and training programs, if it is found that the degree of students' practice of learning approaches is low.
4. The study may help meet students' desires and needs for learning through helping them to choose the appropriate learning approach for students' learning.

Study limitations

This study was conducted in the light of the following limits and determinants

- Objective limits:The study was limited to identifying the learning approaches of tenth year students.
- Time limits: The study tool was applied in the first semester of the academic year 2022/2023.
- Spatial limits: The study was conducted in public schools affiliated to the Educational Directorate of the Northern Jordan Valley.
- Determinants: They were represented in the fact that the generalization of the results of this study is determined by the degree of validity and reliability of the study tool.

Furthermore, students who struggle academically may be more likely to use passive learning strategies such as reading and highlighting, while high-achieving students may use more sophisticated strategies such as metacognitive monitoring, problem-solving, and reflection.

Terminology of study

- Learning approaches: A group of learning strategies and dealing with educational material in a specific academic environment (Biggs, 1987; Sadler-Smith, 1999) (Attari, 2002).
- Procedurally: The strategy through which the learner processes the educational material in the educational environment.
- Tenth year: One of the obligatory stages of the Jordanian education ladder in the schools of the Northern Jordan Valley during the 2022-2023 academic year.

Method and procedures

Study Approach

The analytical descriptive approach that relies on monitoring, describing, and analyzing data related to the opinions of the target sample was used. The study population consisted of tenth-graders in public schools in the Education Directorate of the Northern Jordan Valley in Irbid Governorate, whose number was (1929) male and female students. to achieve that The study sample consisted of (341) male and female students, with a percentage of 15% (44% males and 56% females), who were chosen using the available method for their ease of access and for the cooperation of the educational administration and teachers with the researcher in the implementation of the study. The researcher prepared a scale to investigate common learning approaches of tenth year students. The scale, in its final form, consisted of (52) items of the five-point Likert type, distributed into three areas: the surface approach, the strategic approach, and the deep approach. The items on the scale were answered according to a five-point scale: “to a very high extent” (5) degrees, “high” (4) degrees, “average” (3) degrees, “low” (2 degrees), and “very low” (1) degree. To interpret the responses of the study sample, the statistical standard was used: from 1.00 - less than 2.34 for low practice, from 2.34 - less than 3.67 for average practice, and from 3.67 - 5.00 for high practice. In order to verify the validity of the scale, it was presented to a group of arbitrators with a specialization in the Area of Arabic and English language curricula and teaching methods, educational techniques, e-learning, educational psychology, measurement and evaluation, special education, and learning difficulties. The arbitrators' notes were taken into consideration.

The validity of the study tool construct was confirmed by applying it to a survey sample of (40) male and female students from the study population and from outside its sample, in order to estimate the Pearson correlation coefficient between the item score and the total score for its area, and the Pearson correlation coefficient between the item score and the total score of the scale, and the Pearson correlation coefficient between the item score and the total score of the scale, and the coefficient of the corrected correlation between the item score and the total score of its area (Corrected item-total correlation). The results showed that the Pearson correlation coefficients between the item score and the total score of its area ranged between (0.35-0.96) for the surface curve, and between (0.44-0.82) for the strategic curve, and between (0.49). -0.88) for the deep curve, and this indicates the validity of the scale construct (Bryman & Cramer, 1997). The corrected correlation coefficients ranged between the item score and the total score of its area, ranged between (0.28-0.95) for the surface curve, and between (0.38-0.80) for the strategic curve, and between (0.41-0.86) for the deep curve. This indicates the validity of the scale construct (Leech et al., 2011).In order to verify the consistency of the study sample's performance on the scale, the internal consistency reliability coefficients (Cronbach alpha) and the Test-retest reliability coefficients (Pearson) were calculated by re-application of the scale. The results showed that the internal consistency reliability coefficients (Cronbach alpha) ranged between (0.91-0.94) for the scale areas (Habes, Ali, and Pasha 2021). The Test-retest reliability coefficients ranged between (0.89-0.93) for the areas. This indicates that the scale has a high degree of reliability (Brown, 1983).

Discussion & results

The results of the first question: “What is the level of tenth-graders in practice learning approaches in the Arabic language?" To answer this question, the means and standard deviations were calculated for the degree of Arabic teachers' practice of approaches in teaching the Arabic language, and Table (1) shows this.

Table 1: *The arithmetic means and standard deviations of students’ practice of Arabic language learning approaches*

Approach	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Rank	Degree of use
Strategic	3.81	.84	1	high
Deep	3.80	.84	2	high
Surface	3.65	.80	3	average
Overall	3.76	.79		high

Table (1) indicates that the overall mean of the degree of students’ practice of learning the Arabic language was (3.76), and the standard deviation was (0.79), with a high degree of use. The mean in the three approaches of the scale ranged between (3.65-3.81), with a degree ranging from average to high. The strategic approach came first with a mean of (3.81), and a standard deviation of (0.84), with a high degree, and the deep approach came second, with a mean of (3.80), and a standard deviation of (0.84), with a high degree, and finally the surface approach came third, with a mean of (3.65), and a standard deviation of (0.80), with an average degree.

The means and standard deviations were also calculated for the degree of students' practice of learning the Arabic language for each approach. The tables (2-4) show that.

First: The surface approach

Table 2: *The means and standard deviations of students' practice of the surface approach.*

No.	Item	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Rank	Degree of importance
25	I concentrate on learning just those bits of information I have to know to pass.	4.06	1.33	1	High
3	Often I find myself wondering whether the work I am doing here is really worthwhile.	3.95	1.21	2	High
35	I often seem to panic if I get behind with my work.	3.91	1.39	3	High
51	I like to be told precisely what to do in essays or other assignments.	3.85	1.39	4	High
32	I'm not really sure what's important in lectures so I try to get down all I can.	3.81	1.31	5	High
45	I often have trouble in making sense of the things I have to remember.	3.70	1.42	6	High
38	I gear my studying closely to just what seems to be required for assignments and exams.	3.68	1.47	7	High
48	Often I lie awake worrying about work I think I won't be able to do	3.67	1.43	8	High
19	Much of what I'm studying makes little sense: it's like unrelated bits and pieces.	3.65	1.44	9	Average
42	I'm not really interested in this course, but I have to take it for other reasons	3.54	1.47	10	Average
29	When I look back, I sometimes wonder why I ever decided to come here	3.50	1.55	11	Average
8	Often I feel I'm drowning in the sheer amount of material we're having to cope with.	3.50	1.45	11	Average
6	I find I have to concentrate on just memorising a good deal of what I have to learn	3.47	1.44	13	Average
12	I tend to read very little beyond what is actually required to pass	3.45	1.46	14	Average
22	I often worry about whether I'll ever be able to cope with the work properly.	3.43	1.41	15	Average
16	There's not much of the work here that I find interesting or relevant	3.19	1.46	16	Average
	Total	**3.65**	**.80**		**Average**

It is noted from Table (2) that the mean of students' practice of the surface approach ranged between (3.19-4.06), with a degree from average to high, and the estimates for items

(25, 3, 35, 51, 32, 45, 38, 48) with a high degree. The estimates for items (19, 42, 29, 8, 6, 12, 22, 16) came with an average degree, and item (25) came first with a mean of (4.06) and a standard deviation of (1.33), while item (16) came last with a mean of (3.19) and a standard deviation of (1.46).

Second: The strategic approach

Table 3: *The means and standard deviations of students' practice of the strategic approach.*

No.	Item	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Rank	Degree of importance
1	I manage to find conditions for studying which allow me to get on with my work easily.	4.28	1.13	1	High
5	I organise my study time carefully to make the best use of it.	4.11	1.22	2	High
15	I look carefully at tutors' comments on course work to see how to get higher marks next time.	4.05	1.28	3	High
7	I go over the work I've done carefully to check the reasoning and that it makes sense	4.01	1.26	4	High
2	When working on an assignment, I'm keeping in mind how best to impress the marker.	3.94	1.37	5	High
20	I think about what I want to get out of this course to keep my studying well focused	3.91	1.38	6	High
34	Before starting work on an assignment or exam question, I think first how best to tackle it	3.86	1.43	7	High
24	I feel that I'm getting on well, and this helps me put more effort into the work.	3.85	1.38	8	High
37	I put a lot of effort into studying because I'm determined to do well	3.85	1.37	8	High
10	It's important for me to feel that I'm doing as well as I really can on the courses here.	3.82	1.42	10	High
27	I'm good at following up some of the reading suggested by lecturers or tutors	3.79	1.41	11	High
41	I keep an eye open for what lecturers seem to think is important and concentrate on that.	3.77	1.40	12	High
18	I'm pretty good at getting down to work whenever I need to	3.76	1.32	13	High
47	When I finish a piece of work, I check it through to see if it really meets the requirements.	3.72	1.42	14	High
31	I work steadily through the term or semester, rather than leave it all until the last minute	3.71	1.44	15	High
14	I think I'm quite systematic and organised when it comes to revising for exams	3.64	1.43	16	Average
50	I don't find it at all difficult to motivate myself.	3.64	1.37	16	Average
28	. I keep in mind who is going to mark an assignment and what they're likely to be looking for.	3.54	1.42	18	Average
40	I usually plan out my week's work in advance, either on paper or in my head.	3.50	1.50	19	Average
44	I generally make good use of my time during the day.	3.49	1.47	20	Average
	Total	**3.81**	**.84**		**High**

It is noted from Table (3) that the mean of students' practice of the strategic approach ranged between (3.49-4.28), with a degree ranging from average to high, and the estimates for items (1, 5, 15, 7, 2, 20, 34, 24, 37, 10, 27, 41, 18, 47, 31) with a high degree, and the estimates for items (14, 50, 28, 40, 44) with an average degree. Item (1) came first with a mean of (4.28) and a standard deviation of (1.13). Item (44) came last, with a mean of (3.49) and a standard deviation of (1.47)

Third: The deep approach

Table 4: *The means and standard deviations of students' practice of the deep approach.*

No.	Item	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Rank	Degree of importance
17	When I read an article or book, I try to find out for myself exactly what the author means.	4.23	1.24	1	High
9	I look at the evidence carefully and try to reach my own conclusion about what I'm studying	3.99	1.26	2	High
4	I usually set out to understand for myself the meaning of what we have to learn	3.94	1.33	3	High
36	When I read, I examine the details carefully to see how they fit in with what's being said	3.91	1.33	4	High
21	When I'm working on a new topic, I try to see in my own mind how all the ideas fit together	3.90	1.38	5	High
13	Regularly I find myself thinking about ideas from lectures when I'm doing other things.	3.85	1.37	6	High
43	Before tackling a problem or assignment, I first try to work out what lies behind it	3.81	1.34	7	High
33	Ideas in course books or articles often set me off on long chains of thought of my own.	3.77	1.38	8	High
39	Some of the ideas I come across on the course I find really gripping	3.77	1.38	8	High
30	When I am reading, I stop from time to time to reflect on what I am trying to learn from it	3.75	1.40	10	High
11	I try to relate ideas I come across to those in other topics or other courses whenever possible	3.75	1.42	10	High
46	I like to play around with ideas of my own even if they don't get me very far	3.73	1.47	12	High
23	Often I find myself questioning things I hear in lectures or read in books.	3.72	1.39	13	High
49	It's important for me to be able to follow the argument, or to see the reason behind things.	3.72	1.36	13	High
52	I sometimes get 'hooked' on academic topics and feel I would like to keep on studying them.	3.55	1.48	15	Average
26	I find that studying academic topics can be quite exciting at times	3.47	1.45	16	Average
	Total	**3.80**	**.84**		**High**

It is noted from Table (4) that the mean of students' practice of the deep approach ranged between (3.47-4.23), with an average to a high degree, and the estimates for items (17, 9, 4, 36, 21, 13, 43, 33, 39, 30, 11, 46, 23, 49) with a high degree, and the estimates for items (52, 26) came with an average degree, and item (25) came first with a mean of (4.23) and a standard deviation of (1.24), while item (26) came last with a mean of (3.47) and a standard

deviation of (1.45).The results related to the first question showed that the overall mean of the students' practice of the Arabic language learning approaches came with a high degree of use, where the strategic approach came first, followed by the deep approach second, and finally the surface approach came third .The researcher states that this result may be attributed to the different degrees of students' use of all approaches to learning in different and varying degrees, as some students tend to achieve a high level of academic achievement as measured by end-of-semester or the end of the academic year tests, and this is what the strategic approach is based on in making appropriate effort and time management, teachers' practices of educational styles, the diversity of their teaching experience, the difference in gender, and the inequality in their possession of appropriate teaching strategies.Using a variety of modern teaching methods that are in line with the students' cognitive and psychological characteristics, the use of appropriate preparation and motivation at the beginning of the lesson, raising students' motivation, providing appropriate feedback, making topics interesting, creating an atmosphere of interaction within the classroom, effective communication, disparity of motivation, desire and inclination to make an effort to perform duties and study tasks well, and release of the emotional potential energy.The results of the current study were different from the results of some previous studies on the learning style prevailing among students, such as the study of (Natoli et al., 2022), which showed that the learning style prevailing among students is the deep style.The results of the second question: "Are there statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the degree of students' practice of learning the Arabic language owing to the gender variable?" To answer this question, the means and standard deviations were calculated for the students' practice of approaches to learning the Arabic language separately according to the gender variable. Table (5) shows this:

Table 5: *The means and standard deviations of the degree of students' practice of the three approaches to learning the Arabic languages separately according to the gender variable.*

Area	Variable	Rank	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation
Surface	Gender	Males	3.61	.85
		Females	3.69	.74
		Total	3.65	.80
Strategic	Gender	Males	3.75	.87
		Females	3.87	.81
		Total	3.81	.84
Deep	Gender	Males	3.74	.86
		Females	3.87	.81
		Total	3.80	.84

It is noted from Table (5) that there are obvious differences between the mean of the students' practice of the approaches to learning the three Arabic languages separately according to the gender variable. To determine the statistical significance of the obvious differences, one-way multivariate analysis of variance (one-way MANOVA) was used, using (Hotelling's Trace) test. Table (6) shows that:

Table 6: *Results of the one-way multivariate analysis of variance (one-way MANOVA) of the effect of gender on learning approaches*

Variable	Value	F Value	Degree of freedom	Degree of freedom of error	Statistical significance
Gender	.007	.765	3.000	337.000	.514

The results of the (Hotelling's Trace) test showed that there was no statistically significant effect of the gender variable on the students' estimate score for the three Arabic language learning approaches. The one-way analysis of variance (Tests of between subjects effects, Follow-up ANOVAs) was used. Table (7) shows this:

Table 7: *Results of one-way analysis of variance to compare the mean scores of students' learning approaches in the three Arabic language separately, according to gender variable.*

Source of variance	dependent variable (approach)	Total sum of squares	degrees of freedom	Average sum of squares	Statistic F	Statistical significance
Gender	surface	.568	1	.568	.883	.348
	strategic	1.201	1	1.201	1.699	.193
	deep	1.478	1	1.478	2.112	.147
Error	surface	217.913	339	.643		
	strategic	239.546	339	.707		
	deep	237.164	339	.700		
Adjusted total	surface	218.480	340			
	strategic	240.747	340			
	deep	238.642	340			

It is clear from Table (7) that there are no statistically significant differences between the mean of the students' practice of the three learning approaches separately, according to the gender variable. The results related to the second question showed that there were no statistically significant differences between the means of students' practice of the three Arabic language approaches separately, according to the gender variable. The researcher states that this result may be attributed to the fact that the students (females and males) are subject to the same learning conditions, and that they study the same curricula, they study in similar learning environments, and that they learn using similar teaching methods, and their classifications in the secondary stage may be according to their similar academic tendencies and capabilities, and their learning motives that are directly related to academic achievement, memorization, rote learning and obtaining marks as an end. This result agreed with the results of some previous studies on the learning style prevailing among students in the absence of differences owing to the gender variable in the learning styles of students, such as: the study of Samar and ache et al. (Smarandache et al., 2022).

Conclusion and future research

Learning approaches are methods that students use to acquire and retain information. There are several common learning approaches that are used in schools and educational settings to support student learning. These approaches can vary depending on the subject matter, grade level, and individual student needs. In this essay, we will investigate some of the most common learning approaches used in schools. Active learning involves students engaging with the material through hands-on activities, group work, and discussions. This approach encourages students to take an active role in their own learning and helps to make the material more engaging and relevant. Active learning can take many forms, including project-based learning, inquiry-based learning, and problem-based learning. In these approaches, students are challenged to apply their knowledge and skills to real-world problems, which can help to deepen their understanding and foster critical thinking skills. Teachers and educators may use different approaches depending on the subject matter, student needs, and other factors, and may also combine different approaches to create a more effective and engaging learning experience

for students. It is important for educators to be aware of different learning styles and to provide opportunities for students to engage with material in different ways, in order to support their learning and help them achieve their full potential.In light of the results of the study, the researcher recommends the following Conducting more studies in an attempt to reveal the level of students' practice of the most used learning approaches among students of other classes, from the point of view of teachers and students, Educating students about the importance of learning approaches, and taking them into consideration, because of their impact on their progress to achieve their objectives. Reducing dealing with the surface approach and adopting the deep and strategic approaches in education, through designing curricula that are based on higher levels of mental processing, providing a supportive and stimulating classroom environment for innovation and creativity, in addition to an experienced and competent teacher who is a facilitator and motivator, focusing on teaching methods that stimulate both strategic and deep approaches.

References

Abdel-Hussein, W., Hamoudi, L., & Jabr, M. (2019). Learning styles and their applications between the teacher and the learner. Amman: Dar Al-Radwan.

Afana, E., & El-Geish, Y. (2009). Teaching with the Brain of Two Sides. Amman: House of Culture.

Alhumaid, Khadija, Mohammed Habes, and Said A. Salloum. 2021. “Examining the Factors Influencing the Mobile Learning Usage during COVID-19 Pandemic: An Integrated SEM-ANN Method.” IEEE Access 9(1):02567-102578.

Attari, A. (2002). The preferred learning approach used by students of the International Islamic University - Malaysia. Educational Journal, Kuwait University - Academic Publishing Council, 16(63), 155-191.

Ballantine, J. A., Guo, X., & Larres, P. (2018). Can future managers and business executives be influenced to behave more ethically in the workplace? The impact of approaches to learning on business students’ cheating behavior. Journal of Business Ethics, 149(1), 245-258.

Biggs, J. (1987). Student Approaches to Learning and Studying**.** Mel-bourn: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Biggs, J. (1993). What do inventories of students' learning processes really measure? A theoretical review and classification. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 63(1), 3-19.

Brown, F. (1983). Principles of educational and psychological testing (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Crittenden, W. F., Biel, I. K., & Lovely, W. A., III. (2019). Embracing digitalization: Student learning and new technologies. Journal of Marketing Education, 41(1), 5-14.

Dahl, A. J., Peltier, J. W., & Schibrowsky, J. A. (2018). Critical thinking and reflective learning in the marketing education literature: A historical perspective and future research needs. Journal of Marketing Education, 40(2), 101-116.

Dinsmore, D. L., & Alexander, P. A. (2012). A critical discussion of deep and surface processing: What it means, how it is measured, the role of context, and model specification. Educational Psychology Review, 24(4), 499–567.

Diseth, Å., & Martinsen, Ø. (2003). Approaches to learning, cognitive style, and motives as predictors of academic achievement. Educational Psychology, 23(2), 195-207.

Emari, E. (2018). The Big Five factors of personality and learning environment as predictors of surface and deep learning styles among a sample of Yarmouk University students. (Doctoral dissertation). Yarmouk University, Jordan.

Entwistle, N. J. (1997). Reconstituting approaches to learning: A response to Webb. Higher Education, 33(2), 213-218.

Entwistle, N. J., & Peterson, E. R. (2004). Conceptions of learning and knowledge in higher education: Relationships with study behavior and influences of learning environments. International Journal of Educational Research, 41(6), 407-428.

Everaert, P., Opdecam, E., & Maussen, S. (2017). The relationship between motivation, learning approaches, academic performance and time spent. Accounting Education, 26(1), 78-107.

Faranda, W. T., Clarke, T. B., & Clarke III, I. (2021). Marketing student perceptions of academic program quality and relationships to surface, deep, and strategic learning approaches. Journal of Marketing Education, 43(1), 9-24.

Gordon, C., & Debus, R. (2002). Developing deep learning approaches and personal teaching efficacy within a preservice teacher education context. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 72(4), 483-511.

Habes, Mohammed, Mokhtar Elareshi, Said A. Salloum, Sana Ali, Raghad Alfaisal, Abdulkrim Ziani, and Hetam Alsridi. 2022. "Students' Perceptions of Mobile Learning Technology Acceptance during Covid-19: WhatsApp in Focus." Educational Media International 1–19.

Habes, Mohammed, Sana Ali, and Saadia Anwar Pasha. 2021. "Statistical Package for Social Sciences Acceptance in Quantitative Research: From the Technology Acceptance Model's Perspective." FWU Journal of Social Sciences 15(4):34–46. doi: http://doi.org/10.51709/19951272/Winter-2021/3 Statistical.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Theoretical Perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), Handbook of personality: Theory and research (2nd ed., pp. 102-138). Guilford Press

Leech, N. G., Barrett, K.C., & Morgan, G.A. (2011). SPSS for intermediate statistics: Use and interpretation (4th edition). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

Mohammed, R. (1990). The effect of the interaction of the teacher's learning style, the cognitive style, and the learner's learning style on academic achievement. (Doctoral dissertation). Menoufia University, Egypt.

Natoli, R., McDowall, T., Wei, Z., & Jackling, B. (2022). Learning Environment and Approaches to Learning in China and Australia: A Tale of Three Accounting Cohorts. Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal, 16(3), 147-166.

Sadler-Smith, E. (1999). Intuition-Analysis style and approaches to studying. Educational Studies, 25(2), 159-173.

Salloum, Said A, Mostafa Al-Emran, Mohammed Habes, Mahmoud Alghizzawi, Mazuri Abd Ghani, and Khaled Shaalan. 2021. "What Impacts the Acceptance of E-Learning Through Social Media? An Empirical Study." Recent Advances in Technology Acceptance Models and Theories 419–31.

Salloum, Said A., Mostafa Al-Emran, Mohammed Habes, Mahmoud Alghizzawi, Mazuri Abd Ghani, and Khaled Shaalan. 2019. "Understanding the Impact of Social Media Practices on E-Learning Systems Acceptance." Pp. 360–69 in International Conference on Advanced Intelligent Systems and Informatics. Springer.

Salloum, Said A., Nafla Mahdi Nasser AlAhbabi, Mohammed Habes, Ahmad Aburayya, and Iman Akour. 2021. "Predicting the Intention to Use Social Media Sites: A Hybrid SEM - Machine Learning Approach." Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing 1339(March):324–34. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-69717-4_32.

Schmeck, R. (1983). Learning styles of college students. In R. Dillon & R. Schmeck (Eds.), Individual Differences in Cognition (pp. 283-328). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Siddiquei, N. L., & Khalid, R. (2021). Development and validation of learning style scale for e-learners. SAGE Open, 11(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211022324

Smarandache, I., Maricutoiu, L., Ilie, M., Iancu, D., & Mladenovici, V. (2022). Students' approach to learning: evidence regarding the importance of the interest-to-effort ratio. Higher Education Research & Development, 41(2), 546-561.

Warburton, K. (2003). Deep learning and education for sustainability. International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 4(1), 44–56.

Willson, K., Lizzio, A., & Ramsden, P. (1997). The development, validation, and application of the Course Experience Questionnaire. Studies in Higher Education, 22(1), 33-53.