

Influence of Language Learning Strategies to the English Proficiency Test Performance of College Students

HARIETH C. CAWAGDAN – CUARTO

<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8040-4918>

hariethcawagdancuarto@gmail.com

Mindoro State College of Agriculture and Technology, Philippines

EMELINDA E. RIVERA

<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7325-6144>

Mindoro State College of Agriculture and Technology, Philippines
Masipit, Calapan City, Oriental Mindoro, Philippines 5200

Originality: 100 • Grammar Check: 97 • Plagiarism: 0



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

ABSTRACT

Learning of English as second and even foreign language has been stressed out in all levels of education. Thus, teachers and researchers have been focusing on describing externally observable behaviors of language learners, followed by attempts to label categorized strategic behaviors and link them to language proficiency. This descriptive correlational study aimed to describe the extent of learners' use of the language learning strategies (LLS) and determine its relationship with the English proficiency test performance of college students (N=82). The Oxford's Strategy Inventory Language Learning (SILL) and a standardized College English Proficiency Test were the main instruments of the study. Results showed that memory, metacognitive, cognitive, compensation, organizing and evaluation and affective learning strategies do not significantly

affect students' English proficiency test performance; whereas social learning strategies is a strong predictor of students' English proficiency test performance. This research provides a basis for utilizing social learning strategies as an intervention for improving students' English proficiency.

Keywords — English as a Second and Foreign Language, Language Learning Strategies, English proficiency, Oxford's Strategy Inventory Language Learning (SILL), descriptive correlation, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

The English language has been requisite to global competitiveness. For decades now, it is a necessity for people to speak English if they are to enter a global workforce. Thus, learning of English as second and even foreign language has been stressed out in all levels of education. The fact that English is used as an alternative form of communication for countries where English is not the national language cannot be denied. In fact, some major examples include the member nations of ASEAN countries (Toomnan, 2015). The universities around the world highlight the strengthening of the teaching-learning process of the language. Hence, teachers and researchers, since the 1970s have been focusing on describing externally observable behaviors of language learners, followed by attempts to label strategic behaviors and ultimately categorize those strategic behaviors and link them to language proficiency (Zare, 2012). Language proficiency is one of the traits of a good language learner, which will enable the English language learners (ELLs) to communicate well with diverse populations around the world. The study conducted by Rao (2012) shows that English proficiency has a significantly positive effect on Chinese students' strategy use.

Language learning strategies (LLS) refer to the actions learners employ to improve the development of their language learning skills. It has been taken by many practitioners and scholars as an effective and workable component of the language learning process (Fewell, 2010). This has been illustrated as “special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information”. Moreover, LLS is also taken as processes which are consciously selected by learners that may result to activities that enhance students' learning of a foreign language (Zare, 2012). Several past research works have investigated the influence of language learning strategies on the English proficiency of language learners (Kamalizad, & Jalilzadeh, 2011; Han, 2015). The

study conducted by Syaifulloh (2017) reveals that LLS used by the Indonesian EFL College students such as memory, compensation, affective and social strategies have a weak correlation with their English proficiency. On the other hand, English proficiency is highly correlated with cognitive and metacognitive strategies.

Learning strategies are identified and categorized by educators and researchers according to how the learners employ them in the process of language learning. However, many categorizations indicate relatively significant similarities which may be attributed to similar observations and findings but different methods of data gathering (Chamot, 2004; Griffiths, 2004; Zare, 2012). Thus, different taxonomies of LLS are formulated. Some of the widely known and accepted taxonomies are the memory strategies, metacognitive and cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, organizing and evaluating strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies.

Memory strategies are sometimes called mnemonics which are used by learners to make mental connections that will allow new information, most often vocabulary, to enter and remain in long-term memory. Metacognitive strategies reflect those expressions of an executive function, strategies. These involve planning for learning, thinking about the learning process as it is taking place, observing one's production or comprehension, correcting your own mistakes, and evaluating learning after an activity is completed. Furthermore, cognitive strategies are focusing mainly on repetition, resourcing, translation, grouping, note taking, deduction, recombination, imagery, auditory representation, keyword, contextualization, elaboration, transfer, and inferencing. Compensation strategies are used to achieve his intended meaning on becoming aware of the problems arising during the planning phase of an utterance due to the user's linguistic shortcomings (Ljungberg, 2011). On the other hand, socio-affective strategies include cooperation and question for clarification (Chamot, 2004; Fewell, 2010; Ljungberg, 2011; Zare, 2012; Zewdie, 2015).

Since researchers have formulated various LLS, an inventory of strategies has been formulated. The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) has been widely used in eliciting the language learning used. It is a structured questionnaire, aiming to assess how often learners employ specific language learning strategies. Also, SILL equips teachers with the strategy profile of their students and uncovers to learners the kinds of strategies they resort to when learning English as a second or foreign language (Kazamia, 2010).

Furthermore, the use of LLSs is found out to be meaningfully related to language proficiency. Many researchers have already found out a significant relationship with the learners' use of LLS with better performance in second language learning. The correlation they found cannot be neglected as it provides valuable information for teachers to design appropriate teaching methods to students with different language proficiencies (Shek & Cheung, 2013). Hence, the knowledge of LLS for students learning English as a second language, such as the setting in the Philippines, can provide appropriate training which may improve their proficiency.

FRAMEWORK

This study is anchored on the theory developed by Wenden and Rubin (1987) that second (L2) and foreign language (FL) learning strategies are operations, steps, plans, routines used by the learner to reach his learning goal.

This was supported by Griffiths (2004) that language learning strategies as a language teaching and learning tool are highly effective in carrying out overall language learning. In the same view, Liang (2009) that the proper use of learning strategies leads to the overall improvement of overall L2 or FL proficiency as well as specific language skills. Learners must be aware of the different classification of LLS that they may employ that is by their age, gender, and current communication skill.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to describe the extent of learners' use of the LLS and the English proficiency of college students. It also tried to determine the relationship between the use of the given LSS and the students' performance in College English Proficiency Test.

METHODOLOGY

This study used the descriptive-correlational method of research. A total of 82 college students were chosen as the respondents of the study using the stratified random sampling technique. A standardized questionnaire which is the Strategy Inventory Language Learning (SILL) (Oxford, 1989) was used to describe the extent of use of use of language learning strategies. The College

Proficiency Test was used as the research instrument for measuring the students' English proficiency. This was content validated by English language experts and has undergone reliability test. It has a reliability coefficient of Cronbach alpha of 0.92, described as highly reliable. Frequency count, mean and Pearson's r of variance were used as statistical tools for analyzing and interpreting the data gathered in this study.

The study was limited to the use of language learning strategies defined in SILL by Oxford (1989). Other learning strategies for learning English as a foreign language or as a second language were not included in the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Use of Language Learning Strategies

Regarding the use of memory strategies, results showed that respondents use it moderately in language learning as indicated by the overall mean of 3.24. Data further revealed that item number three (rank 1) which states that I connect the sound of a new SL word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word, obtained the highest mean score of 3.57, described as high. On the other hand, item number 6 (rank 9), which states I use flashcards to remember new SL words, gained the lowest mean score of 2.51, described as moderate.

Based on the finding, it can be inferred that students remember SL words they encountered when there are actual preset pictures of the words, and not merely when they are the ones to create a picture or mental image of an SL word heard or read. This may be a result of frequent use of PowerPoint (PPT) presentations in English subjects. In turn, the students ask for the softcopy of the PPT which they print out or open in their electronic gadgets for review and reference. Thus, lessening their opportunities for writing notes based on their memory. This result is consistent with those found by Griffiths (2004) who found out that pictures and other visual materials are efficient aids in language learning. This also conforms to the studies of Chen (2015), Chiu (2014) and Yang (2007) which showed that the learners utilized memory strategies more frequently. Moreover, according to Lee and Heinz (2016), memory strategies can help students remember language elements, but they need to be tied with the meaning, otherwise it may lead to the unsuccessful acquisition of new words.

Table 1.1. Mean Perception on the Level of the Use of Memory Strategies

Items	Mean	Rank	Description
I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in the SL.	3.46	3	Moderate
I use new SL words in a sentence, so I can remember them.	3.45	4	Moderate
I connect the sound of a new SL word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.	3.57	1	High
I remember a new SL word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	3.55	2	High
I use rhymes to remember new SL words.	3.16	6.5	Moderate
I use flashcards to remember new SL words.	2.51	9	Moderate
I physically act out new SL words.	2.99	8	Moderate
I review SL lessons often.	3.16	6.5	Moderate
I remember new SL words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	3.34	5	Moderate

Overall Mean: 3.24

Description: Moderate

Results, tend to show that item number 6 (rank 1) which states, I watch SL language TV shows spoken in SL or go to movies spoken in SL, got the highest mean score of 3.65, described as high. Likewise, item number 13 which states, I try not to translate word for word gained the lowest mean score of 3.27, described as moderate.

Respondents use moderate level of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in language learning as indicated by the overall mean of 3.40. Based on this finding, it implies that respondents enjoy English movies. However, it seems that they do not rely much on the complete dialogue for getting the translation of the conversations in the movie, rather, they find a familiar SL word and relate the actions with it to generalize what is happening in each scene. The findings conform to Liang's (2009) that adults learn grammar better than children and tend to apply it in more sophisticated situations. Moreover, it also conforms Chen's (2015) findings that metacognitive strategies were less frequently used by the learners which indicate that they lack English learning motivation. On the other hand, it contradicts the study conducted by Lee and Heinz (2016) which showed that the metacognitive strategies are frequently used as effective strategies. These strategies help the learners in planning, directing and organizing for their language learning.

Table 1.2. Mean Perception on the Level of Use of Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies

Items	Mean	Rank	Description
I say or write new SL words several times.	3.30	12.5	Moderate
I try to talk like native SL speakers.	3.32	10	Moderate
I practice the sounds of SL.	3.46	4	Moderate
I use the SL words I know in different ways.	3.45	5	Moderate
I start conversations in the SL.	3.30	12.5	Moderate
I watch SL language TV shows spoken in SL or go to movies spoken in SL.	3.65	1	High
I read for pleasure in the SL.	3.37	8	Moderate
I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in the SL.	3.54	2	High
I first skim an SL passage (read the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	3.41	6	Moderate
I look for words in my language that are similar to new words in the SL.	3.39	7	Moderate
I try to find patterns in the SL.	3.38	8	Moderate
I find the meaning of an SL word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	3.34	9	Moderate
I try not to translate word for word.	3.27	14	Moderate
I make summaries of information that I hear or read in the SL.	3.52	3	High

Overall mean: 3.40

Description: Moderate

Among the indicators, item number 6 (rank 1) which states, If I can't think of an SL word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing, obtained the highest mean score of 3.63, described as high. Similarly, item number 4 which states, I read SL without looking up every new word, got the lowest mean score of 2.99, described as moderate.

Respondents employ moderate level of compensation strategies as indicated by the overall mean score of 3.67. The finding implies that the students do not see a need for using reference materials to find the meaning of the new words they encounter. This may also imply that the interest of the respondents in developing their vocabulary is low. This can be attributed to the study of Song and Cheng (2009) which showed that compensation strategies were the most frequently used by the learners.

Table 1.3. Mean Perception on the Level of Use of Compensation Strategies

Items	Mean	Rank	Description
To understand unfamiliar SL words, I make guesses.	3.45	3	Moderate
When I can't think of a word during a conversation in the SL, I use gestures.	3.59	2	High
I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in the SL.	3.24	5	Moderate
I read SL without looking up every new word.	2.99	6	Moderate
I try to guess what the other person will say next in the SL.	3.34	4	Moderate
If I can't think of an SL word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	3.63	1	High

Overall Mean: 3.37

Description: Moderate

The results showed that item number 4 (rank 1) which states, I try to find out how to be a better learner of SL, gained the highest mean score of 3.93, described as high. On the other hand, item number 5 (rank 9) which states, I plan my schedule, so I will have enough time to study SL, got the lowest mean score of 3.05, described as moderate.

The respondents use a high level of organization and evaluation strategies to learn the language as indicated by the overall mean of 3.54. The finding implies that respondents are aware that they can become a better user of SL through on their own. However, the interest in making the enhancement and corrective measures on their learning is gleaned to do not equal their awareness of methods they know. This finding agrees with Rao's (2012) which posited that these learning strategies are the foundation for self-monitoring and self-direction of the learners.

Table 1.4. Mean Perception on the Level of Use of Organizing and Evaluation Strategies

Items	Mean	Rank	Description
I try to find as many ways as I can to use my SL.	3.55	6	High
I notice my SL mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	3.80	2	High
I pay attention when someone is speaking SL.	3.79	3	High

I try to find out how to be a better learner of SL.	3.93	1	High
I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study SL.	3.05	9	Moderate
I look for people I can talk to in SL.	3.17	8	Moderate
I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in SL.	3.39	7	Moderate
I have clear goals for improving my SL skills.	3.59	4.5	High
I think about my progress in learning SL.	3.59	4.5	High

Overall Mean: 3.54

Description: High

From the findings, item number 2 (rank 1) which states, I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake, obtained the highest mean score of 3.84, described as high. However, item number 5 which states, I write down my feelings in a language learning diary, got the lowest mean score of 2.76, described as moderate.

Respondents use moderate level of affective strategy to learn language as indicated by the overall mean of 3.34. This is maybe because there is the existence of high tolerance of communication mistakes given to them by instructors. The finding moreover implies that the respondents got a high level of confidence in speaking SL that they do not see a need for additional outlet for their feelings and emotion regarding the development in the use of language. In the study conducted by Chu (2012), results showed that the second most frequently used strategy is the Affective Strategy. Moreover, this contradicts the result of the study conducted by Chen (2015) which reveals that the least strategy used by students was affective strategy because many students are worried that people may correct the mistakes they made in learning English.

Table 1.5. Mean Perception on the Level of Use of Affective Strategies

Items	Mean	Rank	Description
I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using SL.	3.40	3	Moderate
I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	3.84	1	High
I reward myself or treat when I do well in English.	3.33	4	Moderate
I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	3.56	2	High
I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.	2.76	6	Moderate
I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	3.13	5	Moderate

Overall Mean: 3.34

Description: Moderate

Results showed that item number 1 (rank 1) which states, If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again, obtained the highest mean score of 3.73, described as high. Likewise, item number 4 which states, I practice English with other students, got the lowest mean score of 3.41, described as moderate.

Data revealed that respondents employ a high level of social learning strategy in language learning as indicated by the overall mean of 3.57. Based on this finding, it can be inferred that students are comfortable with the only people requiring them to use SL in communicating, who are their instructors. Active participation in classrooms enable the students to learn through interaction with others. This finding coincides to the study of Rao (2012) which states that the students can learn directly from each other during negotiation. This also conforms to the studies conducted by Green and Oxford (1995), Politzer and McGroarty (1985), Rao (2002) and Wharton (2000).

Table 1.6. Mean Perception on the Level of Use of Social Learning Strategies

Items	Mean	Rank	Description
If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	3.73	1	High
I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	3.46	5	Moderate
I practice English with other students.	3.41	6	Moderate
I ask for help from English speakers.	3.55	4	High
I ask questions in English.	3.57	3	High
I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	3.67	2	High

Overall Mean: 3.57

Description: High

Level of English Proficiency

As reflected from the results, there were 39 (47.6%) who obtained grades of 74 and below. Thirty-one (37.8%) of the students got grades of 75 – 79 while ten (12.2%) obtained 80 – 84, and two (2.4%) got 85 – 89 marks. None of the students got a grade of 90 and above.

Students achieved low performance in English as borne out of the mean grade of 75.00. Moreover, results showed that the students need remediation in the use of appropriate verb tenses and subject and verb agreement. Thus, this means that the respondents are not proficient in English. This conforms to the study of Nayan and Jusoff (2009) which showed that some of the students

still possess problems in the usage of subject-verb agreement. With this, it is recommended that remedial actions should be taken to help them to function well in English.

Table 2. Respondents' Level of Proficiency in English

Performance	Frequency	Percentage
90 and above	0	0.0
85 - 89	2	2.4
80 - 84	10	12.2
75 - 79	31	37.8
74 and below	39	47.6

Mean: 75.00

Description: Low

Relationship between Language Learning Strategies and English Proficiency

Among the language learning strategies, only social learning strategy (p -value=0.024) has a significant relationship with the students' proficiency test. This means that communicating with peers and classmates help the students considerably in becoming proficient in English. Moreover, the coefficient of determination (r^2) indicates that 69.39% of the variance in the students' English proficiency test performance is attributed to the extent of use of social learning strategy of the students.

On the other hand, memory, cognitive and metacognitive, compensation, organizing and evaluation, and affective strategies were deemed to be not significant in the students' English proficiency test performance. This contradicts the study conducted by Chu (2012) which showed that there was a high correlation between the five learning strategies (Memory, Compensation, Cognitive, Metacognitive and Social) and student's English Academic achievement. Affective strategies showed moderate correlation but it was the second most frequently used strategy by the learners. Moreover, in the study of Song and Cheng (2009), memory and retrieval strategies showed a significant effect on language test performance which also conforms to the study of Purpura's (1999).

Table 3. Correlational Analysis of Language Learning Strategies and Students' English Proficiency Test Performance

IV: Language Learning Strategies	DV: English Proficiency Test Performance			
	r - value	r ²	P-value	Result
Memory Strategy	0.127	0.0161	0.257	Not Significant
Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategy	0.175	0.0306	0.115	Not Significant
Compensation Strategy	-0.30	0.09	0.79	Not Significant
Organizing and Evaluation Strategy	0.137	0.0188	0.221	Not Significant
Affective Strategy	0.117	0.0137	0.295	Not Significant
Social Learning Strategy	0.833	0.6939	0.024	Significant

CONCLUSIONS

College students practice a high level of social learning strategy. However, their feedback on the use of memory, cognitive and metacognitive, compensation, organizing and evaluation, and affective strategies, respectively, suggest reluctance on the use of these strategies. Regarding the English proficiency test, respondents have shown a low level of performance. Moreover, it can be seen that social learning strategy is significantly related to the students' English proficiency.

TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH

A self-learning instructional material (SIM) emphasizing on social learning strategy was developed and has been initially utilized by the first year students of the college.

LITERATURE CITED

- Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in Language Learning Strategy Research and Teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 1(1), 14–26. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444808005612>
- Chen, H. (2015). Learner autonomy and the use of language learning strategies in a Taiwanese Junior High School. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 5(1), 52–64. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5296/jse.v5i1.6972>

- Chiu, M. K. (2014). A Study on Language Learning Strategy Use: A Case Study of Elementary School Students in Taiwan. Unpublished Master's thesis, Dayeh University, Taiwan. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/Nqbdqg>
- Chu, Y. (2012). A Look at EFL Technical Students' Use of Learning Strategies in Taiwan. *World Journal of Education*, 2(3), 16–24. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v2n3p16>
- Fewell, N. (2010). Language learning strategies and English language proficiency: an investigation of Japanese EFL university students. *TESOL Journal*, 2(June), 159–174. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/CaJPEy>
- Green, J.M. & Oxford, R. L. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 261–96. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587625>
- Griffiths, C. (2004). Language Learning Strategies: Theory and Research. *Research Paper Series*, 1(1), 1–25. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/ofwhB3>
- Han, T. (2015). Foreign Language Learning: Strategies in the Context of STEM Education (Estrategias de Aprendizaje de Lenguas Extranjeras en el Contexto de la Educación STEM). *GIST Education and Learning Research Journal*, 11, 79-102. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/7mNMfg>
- Kamalizad, J. and Jalilzadeh, K. (2011). The Strategy Use Frequency of Unsuccessful Malaysian Language Learners and the Effect of Gender on it. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 57(2), 198-205. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/f5RvYm>
- Kazamia, V. (2010). Using the SILL to record the language learning strategy use : Suggestions for the Greek EFL population. *Advances in Research on Language Acquisition and Teaching: Selected Papers*. <https://goo.gl/JRZR1p>
- Lee, J., & Heinz, M. (2016). English Language Learning Strategies Reported By Advanced Language Learners. *Journal of International Education REsearch*, 12(2), 67–76. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/scaH77>

- Ljungberg, A. (2011). Faculty of Arts and Education Compensation Strategies in English as a Foreign Language A study of strategy use in immediate receptive situations Degree Project 15 credits Teacher Education Program. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/CyN9kw>
- Liang, T. (2009). Language Learning Strategies - The Theoretical Framework and Some Suggestions for Learner Training Practice. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(4), 199 - 206. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/aaHBdq>
- Nayan, S., & Jusoff, K. (2009). A Study of Subject-Verb Agreement : From Novice Writers to Expert Writers. *International Education Studies*, 2(3), 190–194. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/FE5riK>
- Oxford, R. L. (1989). Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *English*, 1(1), 4–6. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/rbcvBU>
- Politzer, R. & McGroarty, M. (1985). An exploratory study of learning behaviors and their relationship to gains in linguistic and communicative competence. *TESOL Quarterly* 19(1), 103–24. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/8RKRlK>
- Purpura, J. M. (1999). Learner strategy use and performance on language tests: A structural equation modeling approach. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/E6PwyX>
- Rao, Z. (2002). Chinese students' perceptions of communicative and non-communicative activities in the EFL classroom. *System*, 30(1), 85–105. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(01\)00050-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00050-1)
- Rao, Z. (2012). Language learning strategies and english proficiency : interpretations from information-processing theory. *The Language Learning Journal*, 1(17), 1–17. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2012.733886>
- Shek, D. T., & Cheung, B. P. (2013). Developmental issues of university students in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health*, 25(4), 345–351. Retrieved from <http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=psyc10&AN=2013-42929-003>

- Song, X., & Cheng, L. (2009). Language Learner Strategy Use and Test Performance of Chinese Learners of English. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 3(3), 243–266. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1207/s15434311laq0303_2
- Syaifulloh, B. (2017). Language learning strategy use and english proficiency of Indonesian EFL College. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7, 63–71. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/35604388/2017_Aasian_EFL_Journal.pdf
- Toomnan, P. (2015). The language learning strategies of Thai students: a case study of Nong Khai, northeast of Thailand. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 4–13. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/ju3C3Z>
- Wenden, A. & J. Rubin, (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/rvFFBG>
- Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign languagelearners in Singapore. *Language Learning*, 50(2), 203–43. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00117>
- Yang, M. N. (2007). Language learning strategies for junior college students in Taiwan: Investigating ethnicity and proficiency. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(2), 35-57. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/YgFXNt>
- Zare, P. (2012). Language learning strategies among EFL ESL learners a review of literature. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(5), 162–169. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/6mnn4y>
- Zewdie, A. (2015). An Investigation of Language Learning Strategy Use in an ESP Context: *Hotel Management Students in Focus*, 47. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/L6SZQ9>