

Language Learning Strategies Employed by English-major Pre-service Teachers with Different Levels of Language Proficiency

Chaoying Zhou

School of Foreign Languages, Institute of Social Technology, Suranaree University of Technology, Nakhon Ratchasima 30000, Thailand

Channarong Intaraprasert

School of Foreign Languages, Institute of Social Technology, Suranaree University of Technology, Nakhon Ratchasima 30000, Thailand

Abstract—The study investigated the use of language learning strategies employed by English-major pre-service teachers in Midwest China in terms of language proficiency. The modified SILL was used to collect the data. ANOVA, Chi-square test, and Post Hoc Scheffe Test were performed for data analysis. The results revealed that pre-service teachers with both high and moderate language proficiency reported employing strategies significantly more frequently than those with low language proficiency at the overall strategy level and in the MET, COG and SCI categories. At the individual strategy level, 20 out of the 48 strategies varied significantly according to pre-service teachers' levels of language proficiency. 16 strategies showed positive pattern of variation, with the higher percentage of pre-service teachers with higher language proficiency than those with lower proficiency, and 4 of them showed mixed pattern of variation. The implications of these findings for ESL teaching and learning were discussed.

Index Terms—language learning strategies, levels of language proficiency, English-major pre-service teachers

I. INTRODUCTION

Language learning strategies (LLSs) have been considered to play significant roles in L2/FL learning. According to Oxford (1990, p. 1), they are “tools for active, self-directed involvement, which is essential for developing communicative competence. Appropriate strategies result in improved proficiency and greater self-confidence”. LLSs can also help learners facilitate the acquisition, storage, retrieval or use of information and increase self-confidence (Chang, Liu and Lee, 2007).

Research on LLSs has enriched the L2 acquisition literature since they have provided insights into the metacognitive, cognitive, social and affective processes involved in L2 learning (Chamot, 2005). The studies originated from the research of successful language learners (e.g. Rubin, 1975; Stern 1975; Politzer & McGroarty, 1985; Chamot & Küpper, 1989; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Vann & Abraham, 1990; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995). Then studies have been shown interest in factors affecting learners' strategy choice (e.g. Ehrman, 1990; El-Dib, 2004; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006; Kavasoglu, 2009; Radwan, 2011), and in relationship among LLSs, learning outcomes and other variables of individual differences (e.g. Magogwe & Oliver, 2007; Lee & Oxford, 2008; Wong & Nunan, 2011).

Research on LLSs began in China in the mid 1980s. Some typical studies have emerged. Wen (1995) compared differences of strategy use between 2 third-year successful and unsuccessful English majors, and found that LLSs have direct effect on language achievements. Zhang (2004) examined effects of tolerance of ambiguity on LLS use with 138 second-year English-major postgraduates. The results revealed that students with high level of tolerance of ambiguity tend to select strategies appropriately and use them effectively in tackling language tasks, while students with low level of tolerance of ambiguity would not tolerate any ambiguous language input and use their strategies aimlessly and randomly. Yang (2007) found that Ethnicity plays a significant role in the selection of LLSs, and more proficient students reported using strategies more often than less proficient students by investigating effects of ethnicity and language proficiency on strategy use by junior college students. Wong and Nunan (2011) explored the relationship of learning styles and strategy use between more effective and less effective learners studying at the tertiary level, revealing that, compared with less effective learners, more effective learners have a greater propensity for self-direction, independent learning and autonomy. Chang and Liu (2013) investigated strategy use by 50 freshmen in Hong Kong by learning motivation. The results showed that metacognitive and cognitive strategies have higher correlations with motivation, while compensation strategies have lower correlations.

Although many studies on LLSs have been done and made great achievements in Chinese context, seldom empirical study have been conducted to explore strategy use among English-major pre-service teachers in Midwest China in terms of language proficiency. Therefore, the present study aimed to investigate the language learning strategy use employed

by English-major pre-service teachers in the Midwest of China in terms of different levels of language proficiency, so as to fill in some research gap in the field of LLSs in China, and to offer some insights to help English learners have more knowledge of their use of strategies to improve their efficiency of English learning. The research questions were as follows: (1) What is the frequency of LLS use employed by English-major pre-service teachers in the Midwest of China in terms of levels of language proficiency? (2) Do the choices of LLSs vary significantly according to this variable at different levels, i.e. overall, category and individuals? If they do, what are the main patterns of variation?

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Key Terms Used in the Present Study

A. Key Terms of the Present Study

Language Learning Strategies

In the present study, “language learning strategies” have been considered as “some general approaches or specific actions/techniques, whether observable or unobservable, which Chinese English-major pre-service teachers generate and make use of to enhance their English language learning directly or indirectly (Zhou & Intaraprasert, 2015, p. 156)”.

Levels of Language Proficiency

“Levels of language proficiency” in this study has been determined based on the results of Test for English Majors – Grade Four (TEM-4), which is a national proficiency test targeting English majors in China. Three different levels of students’ language proficiency has been defined as high, moderate, and low according to the following criteria: if students get marks under 60, and then they have been classified as low language proficiency; from 60 to 69, moderate proficiency; and 70 and above, they has been classified as high language proficiency, which is the national rating scale for the TEM-4.

English-major pre-service teachers

“English-major pre-service teachers” refer to “students majoring in English in Normal Universities in China, whose career orientation will be primary or middle school English teachers after graduation (Zhou & Intaraprasert, 2015, p. 156)”. Students need to be trained for 4 years in these Normal Universities. Junior English-major pre-service teachers have been selected as the participants, since they have already got the results of the national English proficiency test.

B. Participants

Junior English-major pre-service teachers in the Midwest of China participated in the present study. The researcher used cluster sampling, purposive sampling and convenience sampling methods to select the participants. Three provinces: Hunan, Guizhou and Shanxi were chosen by cluster sampling. Two normal universities in each province were selected purposively. Participants were then chosen from each of the normal universities by convenience sampling. At last, 836 participants from six normal universities took part in the investigation, among which were 80 participants with high language proficiency level, 325 with moderate level, and 431 with low language proficiency level.

C. Instruments

The modified Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) was used to collect the data for the present investigation. It was combined and modified according to the SILL Version 7.0 (Oxford, 1990), adapted SILL Version 7.0 (Yin, 2008), and adapted SILL Version 5.1 (Rao, 2008). A 5-point rating scale was used to value the frequency of participants’ strategy use, 1 representing ‘Never or almost never’, 2 for ‘Usually not’, 3 for ‘Sometimes’, 4 for ‘Usually’ and 5 for ‘Always or Almost always’. The pilot study was done among 90 participants in two intact classes excluded in the main study. After that, 48 strategy items were made sure based on the feedback of the participants. The classification followed the 4-category of LLSs by Oxford (2011), since Oxford (2011, p. 42) admits that “it is a unified, logically coherent system.” Among the 48 items, there are 13 metastrategies (MET), 18 cognitive strategies (COG), 7 affective strategies (AFF), and 10 socio-cultural interactive strategies (SCI). The estimated reliability (α) of the questionnaire in the main study was .92. It was much higher than the acceptable reliability coefficient of .70 (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000).

D. Data Analysis

The data gathered through the questionnaire was analyzed with the assistance of the SPSS program. The statistical method of ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) was employed to determine pre-service teachers’ variations of strategy use at the overall and category level, the Post-hoc Scheffe test examined the variations of LLS use among different language proficiency levels, and the Chi-square test examined the variations of strategy use at the individual level.

III. RESULTS

The results of variations in the frequency of pre-service teachers’ strategy use in relation to language proficiency are presented at the three different levels of data analysis, i.e. the overall LLS use, use of LLSs by the 4 main categories and use of individual LLSs.

A. Variations in Frequency of Pre-service Teachers’ Overall LLS Use

TABLE I
SUMMARY OF VARIATION IN PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' OVERALL LLS USE

Variable		N	Mean	S.D.	Sig. Level	Variation Pattern
Language Proficiency	Low	431	2.95	.48	P < .001	High > Low Moderate > Low
	Moderate	325	3.08	.46		
	High	80	3.16	.43		

As can be seen in Table I above, the results from ANOVA and post hoc Scheffe test reveal that the frequency of pre-service teachers' overall LLS use varies significantly according to language proficiency. Pre-service teachers with higher language proficiency levels reported employing strategies significantly more frequently than those with lower levels, with the mean scores of 3.16, 3.08 and 2.95 respectively. Significant variations were found in the overall strategy use between those with 'high' and 'low' proficiency levels, and those with 'moderate' and 'low' proficiency levels.

B. Variations in Frequency of Pre-service Teachers' LLS Use under the Four Categories

The ANOVA and post hoc Scheffe test results of Table II demonstrate the significant variations in frequency of pre-service teachers' strategy use in the 4 categories in terms of the three different levels of language proficiency.

TABLE II
VARIATION IN LLS USE IN CATEGORIES ACCORDING TO LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

Strategy Categories	High (n=80)		Moderate (n=325)		Low (n=431)		Sig. Level	Variation Pattern
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
MET	3.26	.58	3.11	.57	2.98	.57	P<.001	High>Low Moderate>Low
COG	3.13	.40	3.06	.45	2.92	.47	P<.001	High>Low Moderate>Low
AFF	3.29	.55	3.31	.64	3.25	.63	N.S.	—
SCI	3.00	.60	2.90	.55	2.77	.60	P<.001	High>Low Moderate>Low

As seen in Table II above, the results from ANOVA and post hoc Scheffe test show that significant differences were found in the use of LLSs in the MET, COG and SCI categories by language proficiency. Pre-service teachers with both high and moderate language proficiency levels reported employing strategies significantly more frequently than those with low language proficiency level. However, no significant variation was found in strategy use in the AFF category.

C. Variations in Frequency of Pre-service Teachers' Individual LLS Use

The Chi-square test results of Tables III to IV present the significant variations in frequency of pre-service teachers' LLS use at the individual strategy level according to language proficiency.

As suggested by Green and Oxford (1995), the pattern of variation can be classified as 'positive' (high > moderate > low), indicating that strategies are used more by students at the higher language proficiency level than the lower level, or 'negative' (low > moderate > high), with strategies being used more by students at the lower proficiency level than the higher level, or 'mixed', showing that there is a curvilinear relationship between strategy use and language proficiency.

The results shown in Tables III and IV reveal that 20 out of the 48 individual LLSs varied significantly by language proficiency, of which 16 strategies were classified as 'positive' variation pattern, and 4 strategies classified as 'mixed'. No individual strategies showed a negative pattern of variation. Table III below shows the 'positive' variation pattern in students' individual LLS use.

TABLE III
VARIATION IN INDIVIDUAL LLS USE BY LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY CLASSIFIED AS 'POSITIVE'

Individual LLSs High>Moderate>Low – 16 strategies	% of high use (4 and 5)			Observed χ^2 p<.05
	High	Moderate	Low	
MET 9 Watching English- speaking movies or TV programs	68.8	61.2	55.2	$\chi^2 = 14.99^{**}$
COG 14 Trying not to translate verbatim	50.0	41.2	30.9	$\chi^2 = 26.49^{***}$
SCI 43 Participating in English classroom activities	48.8	38.2	27.1	$\chi^2 = 22.20^{***}$
COG 1 Thinking of relationships between what one already knows and new things one learns in English	46.3	28.9	20.2	$\chi^2 = 32.09^{***}$
COG 7 Remembering new English words or phrases by remembering the context in which they appear	45.0	38.5	29.2	$\chi^2 = 19.05^{**}$
MET 25 Having clear goals for improving one's English skills.	43.8	31.1	26.5	$\chi^2 = 13.23^*$
MET 10 Reading newspapers, magazines, and books in English	40.0	27.4	18.1	$\chi^2 = 23.09^{***}$
MET 38 Practicing English reading on the Internet	36.3	30.2	25.5	$\chi^2 = 16.72^{**}$
MET 45 Improving one's English from different websites.	36.3	22.5	16.7	$\chi^2 = 36.37^{***}$
MET 23 Planning one's schedule so one will have enough time to learn English	35.0	22.8	17.9	$\chi^2 = 14.39^{**}$
MET 24 Looking for opportunities/ chances to read as much as possible in English	35.0	30.5	23.2	$\chi^2 = 15.28^{***}$
COG 6 Reviewing English lessons often	30.0	24.6	14.2	$\chi^2 = 21.95^{***}$
COG 2 Using new English words in a sentence so that one can remember them	26.3	19.4	10.2	$\chi^2 = 23.54^{***}$
SCI 39 Getting in touch with one's friends in English, for example, writing e-mails or letters	21.3	13.2	10.4	$\chi^2 = 16.48^{**}$
SCI 46 Participating in extra- curricular activities	18.8	17.8	10.9	$\chi^2 = 25.57^{***}$

Notes: * P<.05, ** P<.01, *** P<.001

The Chi-square results in Table III above indicate that a significantly greater percentage of pre-service teachers with higher language proficiency than those with lower proficiency reported high use of 16 LLSs, including 7 metastrategies (MET), 5 cognitive strategies (COG) and 4 socio-cultural interactive strategies (SCI). Among the 16 strategies, only 1 strategy was reported high frequency of use by more than 50 percent of the students with either high or moderate or low language proficiency, which is 'Watching English-speaking movies or TV programs' (MET 9).

The second variation pattern is 'mixed', as shown in Table IV below. A significantly greater percentage of students with moderate language proficiency reported high use of 2 strategies than those with high proficiency and then those with low proficiency, which are 'Guessing the meaning of the unfamiliar English words' (COG 15), and 'Encouraging oneself to speak English even when one is afraid of making mistakes' (AFF 28). A significantly higher percentage of students with high proficiency reported high use of 1 strategy than those with low proficiency and then those with moderate proficiency, which is 'I remember new expressions by two-way translation' (COG 40). A significantly higher percentage of students with moderate proficiency reported high use of 1 strategy than those with low proficiency and then those with high proficiency, which is 'I do a lot of exam-oriented exercises before exams' (MET 47).

TABLE IV
VARIATION IN INDIVIDUAL LLS USE BY LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY CLASSIFIED AS 'MIXED'

Individual LLSs Moderate>High>Low – 2 strategies	% of high use (4 and 5)			Observed χ^2 p<.05
	Moderate	High	Low	
COG 15 Guessing the meaning of the unfamiliar English words	53.2	51.3	42.7	$\chi^2 = 10.66^*$
AFF 28 Encouraging oneself to speak English even when one is afraid of making mistakes	46.5	45.0	42.5	$\chi^2 = 14.73^{**}$
High>Low >Moderate – 1 strategy	High	Low	Moderate	
COG 40 I remember new expressions by two-way translation	36.3	30.4	29.2	$\chi^2 = 19.40^{**}$
High>Low >Moderate – 1 strategy	Moderate	Low	High	
MET 47 I do a lot of exam-oriented exercises before exams	52.0	51.0	38.8	$\chi^2 = 11.21^*$

Notes: * P<.05, ** P<.01, *** P<.001

IV. DISCUSSION

Some previous language learning strategy studies have consistently established a positive link between language proficiency and strategy use, suggesting that more proficient learners usually use more strategies than less proficient learners (Radwan, 2011). Examples are Oxford and Nyikos (1989), Intrapasert (2000), Wharton (2000), Griffiths (2003), Wu (2008), Anugakul (2011), Gerami and Baighlou (2011), and Minh (2012). However, Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006) have found a curvilinear relationship between LLS use and language proficiency. Students at the intermediate proficiency level reported more use of strategies than those at the beginning and advanced level, and Magogwe and Oliver (2007) have also claimed that language proficiency influences strategy use at the primary level but not at the secondary or the tertiary level.

Based on the findings of the present investigation, both high and moderate proficiency pre-service teachers reported more frequent overall strategy use than did the low proficiency counterparts, while no significant differences between high and moderate proficiency pre-service teachers were found. This is consistent with Wharton's (2000) study that students with good and fair proficiency use strategies significantly more often than those with poor proficiency. For the

MET, COG and SCI categories, the variation pattern is the same as that of the overall strategy use as above. This is partly consistent with the results of the previous study, which shows the positive variation pattern, that is, the higher proficiency level learners use more strategies than the lower proficiency learners.

One possible explanation for the findings above is the pre-service teachers' capability of English learning, as Chamot (1987) suggests that effective learners are able to use strategies appropriately, while ineffective learners use a number of strategies as well but inappropriately, and Vann and Abraham (1990) report that unsuccessful language learners appeared to be active strategy users, but sometimes they applied strategies inappropriately. According to Prakongchati (2007), strategy use and learners' language proficiency are causes and outcomes of each other; active use of some strategies help students attain high proficiency, which in turn makes it likely that students may actively use these strategies. On the other hand, the reason for no significant variation for the high and moderate language proficiency pre-service teachers may be that both of these groups of learners have some capability of language learning, except for the low proficiency learners.

In the level of individual LLS use, 16 out of 48 individual strategies were found with variously significant variation with positive pattern of variation (high>moderate>low), among which there are 6 out of 13 metastrategies, 4 out of 10 sociocultural interactive strategies, and 5 out of 18 cognitive strategies, without any affective strategies. The possible factor for explaining this is also due to the pre-service teachers' capability of English learning, as Gerami and Baighlou (2011) indicate that successful EFL students use a wider range of metacognitive strategies, while unsuccessful peers tend to use surface level cognitive strategies. As can be seen above, the higher language proficiency learners use more metastrategies in the present study, which provide general management/control of metacognitive, meta-affective and meta-social strategies, aiming to understand one's own needs, using and adjusting the other strategies to meet those needs. Examples are: '*Watching English-speaking movies or TV programs*' (MET 9), '*Having clear goals for improving one's English skills*' (MET 25), '*Reading newspapers, magazines, and books in English*' (MET 10), '*Practicing English reading on the Internet*' (MET 38), '*Improving one's English from different websites*' (MET 45), '*Planning one's schedule so one will have enough time to learn English*' (MET 23), '*Looking for opportunities/chances to read as much as possible in English*' (MET 24).

Another possible factor hypothesized by the researcher to explain the positive pattern of variation is due to the pre-service teachers' motivation. Ellis (1994, p. 715) defines 'motivation' as 'the effort which learners put into learning an L2 as a result of their need or desire to learn it'. Motivation is considered one of the essential variables on which good language learning depends (Rubin, 1975). According to Yule (1996, p. 195), "students who experience success in language learning are among the highest motivated to learn and motivation may be as much a result of success as a cause". Wharton (2000) claims that successful language learners who are more motivated tend to use more strategies than unsuccessful students. Ushioda (2008) also puts forward that good language learners are motivated. In the present investigation, personal motivation is assumed to be one of the factors that drive pre-service teachers with both high and moderate language proficiency employ a more variety and a greater frequency of LLSs than the counterparts with low proficiency at the overall and category LLS levels, and higher language proficiency to employ significantly more strategies than the counterparts with lower proficiency at the individual LLS level.

One more possible factor which could explain the higher use of LLSs reported by pre-service teachers with higher language proficiency is the high awareness of LLS items. According to Lee and Oxford (2008), strategy awareness is the best predictor of strategy use. Chamot (1998) has found that more successful learners have more and better metacognitive awareness. When taking a closer look at the individual LLS level, it is found that a significantly greater percentage of pre-service teachers with higher proficiency than those with lower proficiency levels try to obtain and use resources, such as '*Watching English-speaking movies or TV programs*' (MET 9), '*Reading newspapers, magazines, and books in English*' (MET 10), '*Practicing English reading on the Internet*' (MET 38), '*Improving one's English from different websites*' (MET 45); or try to create good English learning environments for themselves, such as '*Participating in English classroom activities*' (SCI 43), '*Getting in touch with one's friends in English, for example, writing e-mails or letters*' (SCI 39), and '*Participating in extra-curricular activities*' (SCI 46); or try to use the senses to understand and remember, such as '*Trying not to translate verbatim*' (COG 14), '*Thinking of relationships between what one already knows and new things one learns in English*' (COG 1), and '*Remembering new English words or phrases by remembering the context in which they appear*' (COG 7).

In sum, language proficiency has strong effect on the choice of pre-service teachers' language learning strategies, with the main positive variation patterns. The possible reasons for this may be due to the pre-service teachers' capability of English learning, their motivation, and their high awareness of LLS items.

V. CONCLUSION

This study investigated the use of LLSs employed by English-major pre-service teachers in the Midwest of China in terms of language proficiency. The results demonstrated that pre-service teachers with both high and moderate language proficiency levels show significantly higher frequency of overall strategy use, and use of strategies in MET, COG and SCI categories than those with low language proficiency level; while no significant variation was found in the AFF category. For the individual strategy use, 16 strategies were classified as a 'positive' variation pattern, 4 strategies classified as 'mixed', and no strategies classified as a 'negative' pattern of variation. The results can give us the

following implications: Firstly, it is better for the English teachers of the pre-service teachers to encourage them to employ a wide range of LLSs for the purpose of learning English better; Secondly, it is recommended that pre-service teachers with low language proficiency level need to be guided or trained for language learning strategy use, especially use of metastrategies, so as to become more familiar with and get used to various strategies and to apply strategies appropriately and effectively.

APPENDIX. STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING (SILL)

This questionnaire is to investigate the language learning strategy use by English-major pre-service teachers. I would like to ask you to do me a favor by making the choice of the frequency of your strategy use. There are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers. Your answers will be used for academic research only and will be treated with the utmost confidentiality. Thank you for your kindly participation and cooperation!

Instructions: This questionnaire consists two parts:

Part 1 Personal information

Part 2 Language Learning Strategy Questionnaire

Part 1 Personal information

Please provide your personal information by putting a tick () in the box of the choices given or write the response where necessary.

Your university: _____

Your age: _____

Your gender: Male Female

Do you enjoy learning English?

Not at all Not very much Somewhat A lot Extremely

How long have you learned English outside of class everyday in general?

Less than 1 hour 1 to 2 hours More than 2 hours

Your score of TEM-4 is:

Under 50 50-59 60-69 70-79 Over 80

Part 2 Language Learning Strategy Questionnaire

Instructions: *The Language Learning Strategy Questionnaire is designed to gather information about the use of strategies in English. In the statements below, you will find various language learning strategy items. Please read each statement carefully and consider how frequently you employ the given strategies. '1' stands for 'Never or almost never used'; '2' for 'Generally not used'; '3' for 'Sometimes used'; '4' for 'Generally used'; and '5' for 'Always or almost always used'. There are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers. Please mark your response with a '√' in the corresponding spaces according to what you really think. Thank you for your cooperation!*

Language Learning Strategies	Frequency of Strategy Use				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I use new English words in a sentence so that I can remember them.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I use vocabulary books or electronic dictionaries to remember new English words.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I say or write new English words several times to remember them.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I review English lessons often.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering the contexts in which they appear.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I try to talk like native speakers.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I watch English-speaking movies or TV programs.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I read newspapers, magazines, and books in English.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I write diaries or short articles in English.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I listen to English radio programs, news or English songs on Internet, by MP3/4, or by mobile phone.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I get the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand, such as roots, prefixes, and suffixes.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I try not to translate word-for-word.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I guess the meaning of the unfamiliar English words.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I use gestures to convey my meaning during a conversation in English.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I make up new words if I do not know the precise ones in English.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I read English without looking up every new word.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I try to predict what the other person will say next in English.	1	2	3	4	5
20. If I cannot think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I improve my English from my own mistakes.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I try to find out how to learn English well.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I plan my schedule so that I will have enough time to learn English.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I look for opportunities/chances to read as much as possible in English.	1	2	3	4	5

25. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I think about my progress in learning English.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making mistakes.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I tell myself that there is always more to learn when learning English.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I notice whether I am nervous or not when I am reading or using English.	1	2	3	4	5
32. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	1	2	3	4	5
33. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I ask my English teacher or fluent speakers of English to correct me when I talk.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I practice speaking English with other students.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I ask for help from my English teacher or my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
37. I try to learn about the culture of English-speaking countries.	1	2	3	4	5
38. I practice English reading on the Internet.	1	2	3	4	5
39. I get touch with my friends in English, for example, writing e-mails or letters.	1	2	3	4	5
40. I remember new expressions by two-way translation.	1	2	3	4	5
41. I try to understand the complex English sentences by analyzing their grammatical structures.	1	2	3	4	5
42. I systematically review vocabulary, texts and notes before exams.	1	2	3	4	5
43. I participate in classroom activities in English classes.	1	2	3	4	5
44. I attend extra classes at a language school.	1	2	3	4	5
45. I improve my English from different websites.	1	2	3	4	5
46. I participate in extra-curricular activities.	1	2	3	4	5
47. I do a lot of exam-oriented exercises before exams.	1	2	3	4	5
48. I always encourage myself not to be discouraged by poor exam results.	1	2	3	4	5

REFERENCES

- [1] Abraham, R. G. and Vann, R. J. (1987). Strategies of two language learners: a case study. In Wenden, A. and Rubin, J. (eds.) *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs NJ, pp. 85-102.
- [2] Anugakul, G. (2011). A Comparative Study in Language Learning Strategies of Chinese and Thai Students: A Case Study of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 19 (2), pp. 163-174.
- [3] Chamot, A. U. (1987). The learning strategies of ESL students. In Wenden, A. and Rubin, J. (eds.). *Learner Strategies In Language Learning*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, pp. 71-84.
- [4] Chamot, A. U. (1998). Effective instruction for high school English language learners. In Russell M. Gersten and Robert T. Jiménez (eds.), *Promoting Learning for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students: Classroom Applications from Contemporary Research*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, pp. 187-209.
- [5] Chamot, A. U. and Küpper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22, pp. 13-24.
- [6] Chamot, A.U. and O'Malley, J.M. (1987). A cognitive academic language learning approach: A bridge to the mainstream. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 227-49.
- [7] Chang, C. H. and Liu, H. J. (2013). Language Learning Strategy Use and Language Learning Motivation of Taiwanese EFL University Students. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 10 (2), pp. 196-209.
- [8] Chang, C. Y., Liu, S. C. and Lee, Y. N. (2007). A Study of Language Learning Strategies Used by College EFL Learners in Taiwan. *Mingdao Journal of General Education*, 3, pp. 235-261.
- [9] Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [10] Ehrman, M. (1990). The role of personality type in adult language learning: An ongoing investigation. In T. Parry and C. Stansfield (eds.): *Language Aptitude Reconsidered*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- [11] El-Dib, M. A. B. (2004). Language learning strategies in Kuwait: links to gender, language level, and culture in a hybrid context. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37 (1), pp. 85-95.
- [12] Ellis R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- [13] Fraenkel, J.R and Wallen, N.E. (2000). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*, New York, NY: Mc Grawhill Companies Inc.
- [14] Gerami, M. H., and Baighlou, S. M. G. (2011). Language Learning Strategies Used by Successful and Unsuccessful Iranian EFL Students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, pp. 1567-1576.
- [15] Green, J. M. and Oxford, R. (1995). A Close Look at Learning Strategies, L2 Proficiency, and Gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29 (2), pp. 261-297.
- [16] Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language learning strategy use. *System* 31, pp. 367-383.
- [17] Hong-Nam K. and Leavell, A. G. (2006). Language Learning Strategy Use of ESL students in an Intensive English Learning Context. *System* 34, pp. 399-415.
- [18] Intaraprasert, C. (2000). *Language Learning Strategies Employed by Engineering Students Learning English at the Tertiary Level in Thailand*. Doctoral dissertation. School of Education. University of Leeds, the United Kingdom.
- [19] Kavasoglu, M. (2009). Learning strategy use of pre-service teachers of English language at Mersin University. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1, pp. 993-997.
- [20] Lee, K. R., and Oxford, R. (2008). Understanding EFL Learners' Strategy Use and Strategy Awareness. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 10 (1), pp. 7-32.
- [21] Magogwe J. M. and Oliver, R. (2007). The relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age and self-efficacy beliefs: A study of language learners in Botswana. *System* 35, pp. 338-352.

- [22] Minh, D. D. (2012). *Language Learning Strategies Used by Vietnamese EFL Science-oriented University Students*. Doctoral dissertation, Suranaree University of Technology, Thailand.
- [23] Naiman, N., Fröhlich M., Stern H. H., and Todesco, A. (1978). *The Good Language Learner Research in Education Series 7*. Toronto, ON: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- [24] Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher should Know*. Newbury House / Harper Collins, NY. pp. 1-22.
- [25] Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Language Learning Strategies*. Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.
- [26] Oxford, R. and Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables Affecting Choice of Language Learning Strategies by University Students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, iii, pp: 291-300.
- [27] Politzer, R. L., and McGroarty, M. (1985). An exploratory study of learning behaviours and their relationship to gains in linguistic and communicative competence. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, pp. 103-123.
- [28] Radwan, A. A. (2011). Effects of L2 proficiency and gender on choice of language learning strategies by university students majoring in English. *Asian EFL Journal*, 13 (1), pp. 114-162.
- [29] Rao, Z. H. (2008). *Individual Differences and Cultural Factors in English Learning Strategies*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- [30] Reiss, M. (1983). Helping the unsuccessful language learner. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 39, pp. 257-66.
- [31] Rubin, J. (1975). What the 'good language learner' can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9 (1), pp. 41-51.
- [32] Stern, H.H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 34, pp. 304-318.
- [33] O'Malley, J. M. and Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [34] Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher should Know*. Newbury House / Harper Collins, NY. pp. 1-22.
- [35] Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Language Learning Strategies*. Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.
- [36] Oxford, R. L., and Ehrman, M. (1995). Adult's language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *System*, 23 (3), pp. 359-86.
- [37] Prakongchati, N. (2007). *Factors Related to the Use of Language Learning Strategies by Thai Public University Freshmen*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Suranaree University of Technology, Nakornsrihammarat, Thailand. University students majoring in English. *Asian EFL Journal*, 13 (1), pp. 114-162.
- [38] Rao, Z. H. (2008). *Individual Differences and Cultural Factors in English Learning Strategies*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- [39] Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual Differences in Second Language Learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- [40] Ushioda, E. (2008). Motivation and good language learners. In Griffiths C. (Eds.) *Lessons from Good Language Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 19-34.
- [41] Vann, R.J. and Abraham, R.G. (1990). Strategies of Unsuccessful Language Learners, *TESOL Quarterly* 24 (2), pp. 177-198.
- [42] Wen, Q. F. (1995). Differences of strategy use among successful and unsuccessful EFL learners. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 103 (3), pp. 61-66.
- [43] Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning*, 50 (2), pp. 203-243.
- [44] Wong, L. L. C. and Nunan, D. (2011). The learning styles and strategies of effective language learners. *System*, 39 (2), pp. 144-163.
- [45] Wu, Y. L. (2008). Language learning strategies used by students at different proficiency levels. *Asian EFL Journal*, 10 (4), pp. 75-95.
- [46] Yang, N. D. (1999). The relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategy use. *System*, 27, pp. 515-535.
- [47] Yang, M. N. 2007. Language learning strategies for junior college students in Taiwan: investigating ethnicity and proficiency. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 9 (2), pp. 35-57.
- [48] Yin, C. (2008). *Language learning strategies in relation to attitudes, motivations, and learner beliefs: investigating learner variables in the context of English as a foreign language in China*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- [49] Yule, G. (1996). *The Study of Language* (2nd ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [50] Zhang, Q. Z. (2004). Effects of tolerance of ambiguity on the selection of language learning strategies. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 36 (6), pp. 457-461.
- [51] Zhou, C. Y. & Intaraprasert, C. (2015). Language learning strategies employed by Chinese English-major pre-service teachers in relation to gender and personality types. *English Language Teaching*, 8 (1), pp. 155-169.

Chaoying Zhou was born in Hunan Province, China in 1974. She is currently a Ph.D. candidate in School of Foreign Languages, Institute of Social Technology, Suranaree University of Technology, Thailand, and an English teacher in Department of Foreign Languages, Hunan First Normal University, China. Her research interest is second language acquisition and English teaching methods.

Channarong Intaraprasert was born in Thailand in 1963. He has been a Ph.D. advisor at the School of Foreign Languages, Suranaree University of Technology, Thailand for about a decade. He got his doctoral degree in University of Leeds, England, in 2002. His interested is applied linguistics, focusing on learner beliefs about language learning and language learning strategies.