Language Learning Strategies Used by First Year Students at

Thaksin University, Songkhla Campus, Thailand

Orawee Pannak

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master of

Arts Degree in Teaching English as an International Language

Prince of Songkla University

2014

Thesis Title   Language Learning Strategies Used by First Year Students at Thaksin University, Songkhla Campus, Thailand

Author   Miss Orawee Pannak

Major Program   Teaching English as an International Language

---

Major Advisor:

…………………………….............
(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Thanyapa Chiramanee)

Examining Committee:

…………………………..Chairperson
(Dr. Sirirat Sinprajakpol)

……………….……………..................
(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Thanyapa Chiramanee)

……………….……………..................
(Dr. Sita Musigrungsi)

       The Graduate School, Prince of Songkla University, has approved this thesis as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts Degree in Teaching English as an International Language

………………………….………
(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Teerapol Srichana)
Dean of Graduate School

This is to certify that the work here submitted is the result of the candidate's own investigations. Due acknowledgement has been made of any assistance received.

....Signature

(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Thanyapa Chiramanee)

 Major Advisor

....Signature

(Miss Orawee Pannak)

Candidate

I hereby certify that this work has not been accepted in substance for any degree, and is not being currently submitted in candidature for any degree.

....Signature

(Miss Orawee Pannak)

Candidate

ชื่อวิทยานิพนธ์   กลวิธีการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 1 มหาวิทยาลัยทักษิณ
วิทยาเขตสงขลา

ผู้เขียน   นางสาวอรวีร์ ปานนาค

สาขาวิชา   การสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษานานาชาติ

ปีการศึกษา   2556

บทคัดย่อ

การวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อศึกษาการใช้กลวิธีการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษา
ชั้นปีที่1เมื่อเข้าเรียนในมหาวิทยาลัยและเมื่อสิ้นสุดภาคการศึกษาแรก รวมทั้งศึกษาการเปลี่ยนแปลง
ในการใช้กลวิธีการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษในหนึ่งภาคการศึกษา เพื่อดูว่าการเปลี่ยนแปลงการใช้กลวิธี
ในการเรียนมีความสัมพันธ์กับระดับความสามารถด้านภาษาอังกฤษหรือไม่ กลุ่มตัวอย่างในการวิจัย
ครั้งนี้ เป็นนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 1 สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ ในภาคเรียนที่ 1 ปีการศึกษา 2553 มหาวิทยาลัย
ทักษิณ วิทยาเขตสงขลา จำนวน 71 คน เครื่องมือที่ใช้ในการรวบรวมข้อมูลในงานวิจัยคือ
แบบสอบถาม Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) ซึ่งถูกพัฒนาโดย Oxford
(1990) ข้อมูลจากแบบสอบถามได้รับการวิเคราะห์โดยหาค่าสถิติเชิงพรรณนา ANOVA และได้
ใช้ t-test ผลจากการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลแสดงให้เห็นว่าการใช้กลวิธีการเรียนมีความสัมพันธ์กับระดับ
ความสามารถด้านภาษาอังกฤษ ความถี่ของการใช้กลวิธีการเรียนโดยภาพรวมและการใช้กลวิธีทั้ง6
กลุ่มกลวิธีมีความแตกต่างอย่างมีนัยสำคัญกับระดับความสามารถทางด้านภาษา โดยความถี่ในการ
ใช้กลวิธีการเรียนของนักศึกษาที่มีผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางภาษาอังกฤษสูงนั้นสูงกว่าความถี่ในการใช้กลวิธี
ของนักศึกษาที่มีผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางภาษาอังกฤษต่ำอย่างมีนัยสำคัญ นักศึกษามีการใช้กลวิธีการเรียน
เพิ่มขึ้นเมื่อสิ้นสุดภาคการศึกษา ผลการศึกษายังแสดงให้เห็นว่า เมื่อสิ้นสุดภาคการศึกษา นักศึกษาที่
มีผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางภาษาอังกฤษสูงขึ้น มีการใช้กลวิธีการเรียนเพิ่มขึ้นอย่างมีนัยสำคัญ ในขณะที่
นักศึกษาที่มีผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางภาษาคงที่ ใช้กลวิธีการเรียนไม่แตกต่างจากตอนต้นภาคการศึกษา

Thesis Title   Language Learning Strategies Used by First Year Students at
        Thaksin University, Songkhla Campus, Thailand

Author   Miss Orawee Pannak

Major Program Teaching English as an International Language

Academic Year 2013

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to investigate students' report on the use of language learning strategies at the beginning and again at the end of the first semester, and then to look at changes in strategy use to see if they were related to language proficiency levels. The subjects were 71 first year English major students in the first semester of the 2010 academic year at Thaksin University, Songkhla Campus. The instrument used for collecting the data on the use of language learning strategies over the semester in this study was the 50-item Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), developed by Oxford (1990), version 7.0. The data collected were computed and analyzed via descriptive statistics, one-way ANOVA, and t-test. Data analysis revealed that the use of language learning strategies was related to language proficiency levels. There were significant differences in the frequency of overall strategy use and all six categories of strategy use among students with different proficiency levels. The more proficient students reported using overall strategy and all six categories significantly more often than the less proficient ones. The students significantly increased their use of language learning strategies by the end of the semester. Moreover, the results of the study reported that the students who were promoted to higher levels of proficiency at the end of the semester reported using language learning strategies significantly more frequently while the students who were remained at the same proficiency levels over the semester reported no significant differences.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

CONTENTS (Continued)

CONTENTS (Continued)

CONTENTS (Continued)

CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The study aims to investigate language learning strategies used by first year English major students at Thaksin University, Songkhla Campus both at the beginning and at the end of the first semester of the 2010 academic year.

The study has been categorized into five chapters. Chapter one consists of the rationale of the study, statements of purposes, research questions, scope and limitation of the study, significance of the study, and definition of terms. Chapter two reviews related research and literature conducted on language learning strategies both in other countries and in Thailand. Chapter three explains the research methodology and the analysis of data. Chapter four demonstrates the results of the study. Chapter five includes a summary, discussion of the main findings, implications and recommendations for further studies.

1.1 Rationale of the study

It is obvious that the English language has become more dominant around the world. English is the international lingua franca, or 'common language' for billions of people worldwide (Pakir, 2000). It is the primary language that has been widely used in international business, economics, science, aviation, technology, and tourism (Kitao, 1996; Al-Lssa, 2006). Moreover, its world status can be seen through the increasing number of people using English; 329 million people use English as the first language (e.g. in USA, UK, Canada, New Zealand and Australia), 422 million people use it as a second language (e.g. in Singapore, Philippine, India and Malaysia) (Crystal, 2003), and another 100 million people use it as a foreign language in countries such as Thailand, China and Japan (Crystal, 1997). Because of its important role, the number of children using English as a second language is increasing; over 50 million children learn it at primary level while over 80 million students learn it at secondary level (Crystal, 1997).

However, each learner has certain characteristics which contribute to successful language learning (Oxford, 1989; Lightbown & Spada, 1993). For example, it has been believed that the successful learners will find and increase their opportunities to practice language skills. In addition to characteristics, other factors such as attitude, motivation and learning strategies also influence the success of language learning (Lightbown & Spada, 1993; Ellis, 1994; Oxford, 2003).

There has been a considerable number of research on the role of attitudes and motivation in language learning. The overall findings reveal that students' attitudes and motivation are positively correlated with English proficiency (Lightbown & Spada, 1993; Liu, 2007).

Another important factor affecting language learning is language learning strategies—"specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations" (Oxford, 1990, p.8). Learning strategies play an important role in second and foreign language learning because they can help learners develop language competence in many ways (Stern, 1975; Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, & Todesco 1978; Rubin, 1981; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Green & Oxford, 1995; Wharton, 2000). Research on language learning strategies began in the 1960s and has received much attention since the 1970s (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Hismanoglu, 2000; Shamais, 2003). Early research focused on identifying language learning strategies used by good language learners (Rubin, 1987; Nunan, 1989; Oxford, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Hismanoglu, 2000; Shamais, 2003; Lai 2009). Having enough knowledge about good learners' use of learning strategies, teachers can provide poor learners with those strategies and consequently improve their learning (Oxford, 1986; Rubin, 1987; Wenden 1987; Oxford, 1990; Griffiths & Parr, 2001; Chamot, 2005; Lai 2009). Researchers such as Rubin (1975), Stern (1975), Naiman, et al. (1978), Oxford and Nyikos (1989), Oxford (1990), O'Malley and Chamot (1990), Cohen (1998), and Takeuchi (2003) show that effective learners tend to share some behaviors for language learning and use a variety of different strategies to solve problems that they face while acquiring or producing the language. In brief, research has indicated that good language learners tend to use more effective strategies than poorer ones. These early research suggested that successful language

learners use strategies such as taking advantage of practice opportunities, active involvement in the learning process, seeing and developing language as a system, monitoring language production, using various memorization techniques, asking for clarification, willingly and accurately guessing, and handling emotional issues in language learning (Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975; Naiman et al., 1978).

Since the initial attempts at good language learners' strategies, considerable empirical studies have been devoted to investigate factors that affect the use of learning strategies such as language proficiency (Griffiths, 2003a; Oxford, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Green & Oxford, 1995; Wharton, 2000; Lai 2009). In other words, the research on good language learners has been validated by subsequent research that compared learners of different proficiency levels. Those studies have provided evidence that there is a positive relationship between language proficiency and language learning strategies used—high proficiency language learners use learning strategies more frequently than low proficiency ones (e.g. Green & Oxford, 1995; Goh & Foong, 1997; Bremner, 1999; Mochizuki, 1999; Wharton, 2000; Lan & Oxford, 2003; Lee, 2003; Griffihs, 2003b; Khalil, 2005; Magogwe & Oliver, 2007; Yang, 2007; Wu, 2008; Lai, 2009; Radwan, 2012).

In Thailand, where English is a foreign language, students have learned English for at least 12 years starting from primary level to higher education level; however, they differ significantly in their English language learning achievements—some are successful while others are not. One important factor considered to be vital for successful language learning is language learning strategies. A number of studies in Thailand have focused on identifying language learning strategies employed by language learners (Kaotsombat, 2003; Tirabulkul, 2005; Prakongchati, 2007). Other studies investigate the use of language learning strategies by students with different language proficiency levels (Kaotsombat, 2003; Prakongchati, 2007). The majority of those studies clearly show that higher proficient learners use learning strategies more often than less proficient ones (e.g. Dhanarattiganon, 1990; Lappayawichit, 1998; Kaotsombut, 2003; Janphaosaeng, 2006; Intaraprasert, 2007; Prakongchati, 2007).

Although there are a large number of studies on language learning strategies in Thailand, those studies have focused on learners' strategies at a particular point of time. There is no research focusing on learning strategy change over a period of time. Accordingly, it is interesting to investigate language learning strategies employed by language learners at different period of time to see their strategy use, strategy change, and the relationship between language learning strategy and language proficiency.

1.2 Purposes of the study

In this study, three main purposes were involved as follows:

1. To examine language learning strategies employed by first year English major students at Thaksin University at the beginning of the first semester.

2. To investigate language learning strategies used by first year English major students at the end of the first semester to gain an insight into changes of language learning strategy use.

3. To determine language learning strategies used by language learners with different language proficiency.

1.3 Research questions

From the purposes of the study, the following three main questions were answered:

1. What are language learning strategies used by the first year English major students with different proficiency levels at the beginning of the first semester?

2. Do their learning strategies change at the end of the first semester?

3. Do subjects with different language proficiency levels employ different language learning strategies?

1.4 Significance of the study

The results from this study will contribute some useful insights to the learning and teaching in the context of Thailand. The information obtained from the study will enable the students to learn about their strengths and weaknesses in order to improve their language learning. Information on the relationship between learning strategies used and English proficiency will be useful for English teachers to find appropriate teaching methods for students of different language proficiency. Hopefully, the results will be valuable for all concerned personnel or educational organizations to help students improve their language skills and accomplish their learning goals.

1.5 Scope and limitation of the study

1.5.1 Scope

The current study aimed to investigate language learning strategies employed by the first year English major students, Thaksin University at the beginning and the end of the first semester. Moreover, the study investigated the relationship between their use of learning strategies and language proficiency. Specifically, the study aimed to investigate whether their strategies change was related to language proficiency.

1.5.2 Limitation

The study was conducted with the first year English major students at Thaksin University, Songkhla Campus; the generalization might be only for those at the institution.

1.6 Definition of terms

The terms in this research can be defined as follows:

1. **Students** refer to first year English major students who were taking English I Course in the first semester of 2010 academic year at Thaksin University, Songkhla Campus.

2. **English proficiency** refers to students' two types of English scores: English O-NET scores and grades on English I course.

3. **High proficiency students** refer to students in the study with high level of English O-NET scores, and those who got high grades on English I course.

4. **Low proficiency students** refer to students in the study with low level of English O-NET scores, and those who got low grades on English I course.

5. **Language learning strategies (LLS)** are "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations" (Oxford, 1990, p.8).

6. **Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)** is a self-rating questionnaire developed by Rebecca Oxford (1990). The study uses the 50-item version 7.0 of the inventory for assessing the frequency of language learning strategy use by language learners both at the beginning and at the end of the first semester of the 2010 academic year.

CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents literature related to previous investigations of language learning strategies. The following four areas are addressed: theoretical background of language learning strategies, definitions, classifications and previous research on language learning strategies.

2.1 Theoretical background of language learning strategies

Over the last twenty years, there has been a shift within the field of language learning from the emphasis of teachers and teaching to learners and learning (Wenden, 1987; Lessard-Clouston, 1997; Brown, 2000; Hismanoglu, 2000). Along with this new shift, the primary concern of the researchers in foreign language learning has been about how learners process new information and what kinds of strategies they use to learn, understand, or remember the information (Wenden & Rubin, 1987; Oxford, 1990; Hismanoglu, 2000). This shift of interest has been reflected in increasing numbers of studies on the use of language learning strategies (Hismanoglu, 2000; Hsiao & Oxford, 2002).

The investigation of language learning strategies began in the 1960s and has received much attention since the 1970s (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Hismanoglu, 2000; Shamais, 2003). It was influenced by the development of cognitive psychology (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). The first attempt on learner strategies was in 1996 when Aaron Carton published his study entitled *The Method of Inference in Foreign Language Study* (Rubin, 1987; Hismanoglu, 2000). Then, the researchers such as Rubin (1975), Stern, (1975), and Naiman et al. (1978), the pioneer researchers in language learning strategies research, started doing research in an attempt to establish what good language learners might be. The primary concern in conducting language learning strategies research has been on "identifying what good language learners report they do to learn a second or foreign language, or, in some cases, are observed doing while learning a second or foreign language" (Wenden & Rubin, 1987, p.19).

Early studies on good language learners conducted by Rubin (1975), Stern (1975), and Naiman et al. (1978) generally reported good language learners as those who are active learners, take advantage of practice opportunities, see and develop language as a system, mentor their language production, use various memorization techniques, ask questions for clarification, willingly and accurately guess, and handle emotional issues in language learning. It is evident that once the strategies of more successful language learners are identified, these strategies can be transferred to less successful language learners (Oxford, 1986; Rubin, 1987; Wenden 1987; Oxford, 1990; Griffiths & Parr, 2001; Chamot, 2005; Lai 2009). In other words, language learning strategies employed by successful learners can be applied by less successful learners in order to learn a language effectively.

Since then, there has been numerous research on language learning strategies conducted widely such as those by Ehrman and Oxford (1989), Oxford and Nyikos (1989), Oxford (1990), Green & Oxford (1995), Wharton (2000), Kaotsombut (2003), Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006), Satta-Udom (2007), and Tappoon, 2008.

2.2 Definitions of language learning strategies

The terminology is not always consistent. Some researchers use the term "learner strategies" (Wenden & Rubin, 1987), "learning strategies" (Rubin, 1987; Chamot, 1987; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Chamot & O'Malley, 1994), and "language learning strategies" (Oxford, 1990). Language learning strategies as a main factor in facilitating of language learning have been defined in various ways by many educators such as Rubin (1975), O'Malley and Chamot (1990), Oxford (1990), and Cohen (1998). Since the late 1970s, educators have defined and conducted studies in the area of language learning strategies. The following definitions of language learning strategies are presented as examples:

Bialystok (1978) defines language learning strategies as "optional means for exploiting available information to improve competence in a second language" (p.71).

According to Rubin (1987), the term "learning strategies" are defined as "strategies which contribute to the development of the language system which the learner constructs and affect learning directly" (p.23).

Chamot (1987) describes learning strategies as "techniques, approaches or deliberate actions that students take in order to facilitate the learning, recall of both linguistic and content area information" (p.71).

Wenden and Rubin (1987) see learner strategies as "any sets of operations, steps, plans, routines used by the learner to facilitate the obtaining, storage, retrieval, and use of information" (p.19).

Furthermore, O'Malley and Chamot (1990) define learning strategies as "the special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information" (p.1).

Oxford (1990) defines them as " specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations" (p.8).

In addition, Cohen (1998) defines them as "those processes which are consciously selected by learners and which may result in action taken to enhance the learning or use of a second or foreign language, through the storage, retention, recall, and application of information" (p.4).

According to Stern (1992), "the concept of learning strategy is dependent on the assumption that learners consciously engage in activities to achieve certain goal and learning strategies can be regarded as broadly conceived intentional directions and learning techniques" (p.261).

Richards, Platt and Platt (2002) define learning strategies as "intentional behavior and thoughts that learners make use of during learning in order to better help them understand, learn or remember new information" (209).

In this current study, language learning strategies are based on Oxford's (1990) definition mentioned above.

There are a number of basic characteristics among the definitions of language learning strategies noted above. Language learning strategies:

- are approaches / techniques facilitate language learning and help improve language competence in learner's four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing),

- are steps taken by learners to process, store, and retrieve information (learner generated),

- could be transferred from one language skill to another,

- are used either consciously, or unconsciously,

- are seen (behaviors, steps, techniques, etc.) or unseen (thoughts, mental processes),

- allow learners to become self-direct,

- involve information and memory (vocabulary knowledge, grammar rules, etc.).

Oxford (1990, p.9) stated that language learning strategies contain twelve key features. In addition to the characteristics introduced above, language learning strategies:

- expand the role of language teachers,

- are problem-oriented,

- can be taught,

- are flexible,

- are influenced by a variety of factors.

2.3 Classifications of language learning strategies

Language learning strategies have been categorized by many scholars in the area of language learning, for instance O'Malley and Chamot (1990), Oxford (1990), and Stern (1992). However, most of the attempts to categorize language learning strategies demonstrate relatively more or less the same classifications with no fundamental changes (Lessard-Clouston, 1997; Hismanoglu, 2000; Zare, 2012). For Ellis (1994), the classifications of language learning strategies have been categorized according to researchers' own experiences—the classifications gained from the

participants that the researchers worked with, the settings, and the researchers' particular interests.

The following section is examples of language learning strategy classifications addressed by Rubin (1987), O'Malley and Chamot (1990), Oxford (1990), Wenden (1991), and Stern (1992).

Table 2.1: Classifications of language learning strategies

Researcher and Year	Classification System

Rubin (1987)	1. Learning strategies
	    a) Cognitive strategies
	    b) Metacognitive strategies
	2. Communication strategies
	    a) Production tricks
	    b) Creates opportunities for practice
	3. Social strategies

O'Malley and Chamot (1990)	1. Metacognitive strategies 2. Cognitive strategies 3. Social-affective strategies

Oxford (1990)	1. Direct strategies
	    a) Memory strategies
	    b) Cognitive strategies
	    c) Compensation strategies
	2. Indirect strategies
	    a) Metacognitive strategies
	    b) Affective strategies
	    c) Social strategies

Wenden (1991)	1. Cognitive strategies
	    a) Selecting input
	    b) Comprehending input
	    c) Storing input
	    d) Retrieving input
	2. Self-management strategies
	    a) Planning
	    b) Monitoring
	    c) Evaluating

Stern (1992)	a) Management and planning strategies b) Cognitive strategies c) Communicative-experiential strategies d) Interpersonal strategies e) Affective strategies

Although the researchers have proposed different classifications of language learning strategies, Oxford (1990) has developed the most detailed, comprehensive and systematic classification to classify learners' learning strategy use (Hsiao & Oxford, 2002). In addition, it is described by Ellis (1994, p.539) as "perhaps the most comprehensive classification of language learning strategies to date". Consequently, the current study follows Oxford's (1990) language learning strategy classification framework.

To better understand, Oxford's (1990) classification of language learning strategies is demonstrated below.

2.3.1 Oxford's (1990) classification of language learning strategies

Oxford (1990, p.16-21) divided strategies into two main groups: *direct* classes and *indirect* classes. *Direct learning strategies* are further subdivided into three subgroups: *memory*, *cognitive*, and *compensation*. *Indirect learning strategies* are also further subdivided into three subgroups: *metacognitive*, *affective*, and *social*. These six broad strategies include nineteen secondary strategies with a further sixty-two specific strategies (see Table 2.2), which Oxford used to develop Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) widely employed around the world to investigate the use of language learning strategies.

Direct strategies involve the strategies used directly in dealing with a new language. The direct strategies are beneficial to the students because they help store and recover information. These strategies help learners to produce language even when there is a gap in knowledge, and to understand and use the language. The direct strategies are further subdivided into three groups: *memory*, *cognitive* and *compensation* strategies.

Memory strategies help learners store important things they hear or read in the new language and these strategies also enable students to retrieve new information from memory when they need to use it for comprehension or production. These strategies consist of four subcategories: creating mental linkages, applying images and sounds, reviewing well, and employing action.

Cognitive strategies enable learners to understand and produce new language and link new information with existing knowledge in order to understand the target language. These strategies consist of four subcategories: practicing, receiving and sending messages, analyzing and summarizing, and creating structure for input and output.

Compensation strategies enable learners to overcome a limitation of knowledge in any of the four skills. They are useful for beginning and intermediate language learners and valuable for an expert language user, who fails to hear something clearly, or who occasionally does not know an expression. The strategies consist of two subcategories: guessing intelligently when listening and reading, and overcoming limitations in speaking and writing.

Indirect strategies are used for general management of learning. They work together with the direct strategies. They help learners organize the learning process. They involve supporting, planning, monitoring, and managing learners' learning process, along with, managing emotion, motivation and attitude without dealing directly with a new language. The indirect strategies are further subdivided into three groups: *metacognitive*, *affective* and *social* strategies.

Metacognitive strategies are techniques help learners to organize, focus and evaluate their own learning and they allow learners to control their own learning. The strategies consist of three subcategories: centering their learning, arranging and planning their learning, and evaluating their learning.

Affective strategies help learners to control their emotions, motivations and attitudes. These strategies help learners to manage and control any feelings that happen while they learn a new language appropriately. The strategies consist of three subcategories: lowering their anxiety, encouraging themselves, and taking their emotional temperature.

Social strategies help learners through interaction with others. Learners are required to communicate with people such as friends, teachers, native speakers to develop their language use. The strategies consist of three subcategories: asking questions, cooperating with others, and empathizing with others.

Table 2.2: Oxford's strategy system showing all strategies (Oxford 1990, p.18-21)

Direct Strategies	Indirect Strategies

1. Memory strategies
   a) Creating mental linkages
      - Grouping
      - Associating / elaborating
      - Placing new words into a context
   b) Applying images and sounds
      - Using imagery
      - Semantic mapping
      - Using keywords
      - Representing sounds in memory
   c) Reviewing well
      - Structured reviewing
   d) Employing action
      - Using physical response or
        sensation
      - Using mechanical technique
	1. Metacognitive strategies
	   a) Centering your learning
	      - Overviewing and linking with
	        already known materials
	      - Paying attention
	      - Delaying speech production to
	        focus on listening
	   b) Arranging and planning your learning
	      - Finding out about language
	        learning
	      - Organizing
	      - Setting goals and objectives
	      - Identifying the purpose of a
	        language task (purposeful listening
	        / reading / speaking / writing)
	      - Planning for a language task
	      - Seeking practice opportunities
	   c) Evaluating your learning
	      - Self-monitoring
	      - Self-evaluating

2. Cognitive strategies
   a) Practicing
      - Repeating
      - Formally practicing with sounds
        and writing systems
      - Recognizing and using formulas
        and patterns
      - Recombining
      - Practicing naturally
   b) Receiving and sending messages
      - Getting the idea quickly
      - Using resources for receiving and
        sending messages
   c) Analyzing and reasoning
      - Reasoning deductively
      - Analyzing expressions
      - Analyzing contrastively
        (across language)
      - Translating
      - Transferring
	2. Affective strategies
	   a) Lower your anxiety
	      - Using progressive relaxation, deep
	        breathing, or mediation
	      - Using music
	      - Using laughter
	   b) Encouraging yourself
	      - Making positive statements
	      - Taking risks wisely
	      - Rewarding yourself
	   c) Taking your emotion temperature
	      - Listening to your body
	      - Using a checklist
	      - Writing a language learning diary
	      - Discussing your feeling with
	        someone else

Direct Strategies	Indirect Strategies

d) Creating structures for input and output
    - Taking notes
    - Summarizing
    - Highlighting	

3. Compensation strategies
  a) Guessing intelligently
    - Using linguistic clues
    - Using other clues
  b) Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing
    - Switching to the mother tongue
    - Getting help
    - Using mime or gestures
    - Avoiding communication partially or totally
    - Selecting the topic
    - Adjusting or approximating the message
    - Coining words
    - Using a circumlocution or synonym
	3. Social strategies
	  a) Asking questions
	    - Asking for clarification or verification
	    - Asking for correction
	  b) Cooperation with others
	    - Cooperating with peers
	    - Cooperating with proficient users of the new language
	  c) Empathizing with others
	    - Developing cultural understanding
	    - Becoming aware of others' thoughts and feelings

Oxford's (1990) classification links strategy categories and individual strategies with language skills, promotes teaching and learning development, and supports learner autonomy (Vidal, 2002). It is evident that Oxford's (1990) classification of language learning strategies is essential for language learners in helping them develop their language abilities especially communicative competence, which is the main purpose in learning a language. Additionally, these strategies help learners use a language more effectively, independently, and confidently—as Oxford (1990) claimed that language learning strategies are "especially important for language learning because they are tools for active, self-directed movement, which is essential for developing communicative competence" (p.1).

Oxford (1990) proposed a self-assessment survey, the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), to gather information about students' use of language learning strategies. The survey has been used to examine students' use of language learning strategies worldwide and has been checked for its reliability and validity in numerous ways (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995). The SILL (version 7.0 for ESL/EFL learners), a survey developed by Oxford (1990), is used as a main instrument in the study for identifying the use of language learning strategies.

The following section presents some related research on language learning strategies.

2.4 Previous research on language learning strategies

Studies assessing language learning strategies have become commonplace around the world (e.g. Sheorey, 1999; Gao, 2004; Goh & Foong, 1997; Wharton, 2000; Hsiao & Oxford, 2002; Peacock & Ho, 2003; Magogwe & Oliver, 2007; Yang, 2007; Satta-Udom, 2007; Ni, 2007; Lee & Oxford, 2008).

Early research on language learning strategies has emphasized strategies that successful language learners used (Rubin, 1987; Nunan, 1989; Oxford, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Hismanoglu, 2000). Rubin (1975), Stern (1975), and Naiman, et al. (1975) were the pioneering researchers who carried out their work to identify learning strategies employed by successful second or foreign language learners. It is believed that strategies used by successful learners can be employed by unsuccessful learners in order to learn a language effectively (Oxford, 1986; Rubin, 1987; Wenden 1987; Oxford, 1990; Griffiths & Parr, 2001; Chamot, 2005; Lai 2009). Since then, the focus of language learning strategy research has been devoted to factors that influence the use of language learning strategies (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Ehrman & Oxford, 1990; Hsiao & Oxford, 2002). The factors are (1) *age* (Green & Oxford, 1995; Sheorey, 1999), (2) *learning style* (Ehrman & Oxford, 1990; Oxford, 2003), (3) *gender* (Goh & Foong, 1997; Lee, 2003; Radwan, 2011), (4) *motivation* (Wharton, 2000; Khamkhien, 2010), (5) *Nationality* (Hashim & Sahil, 1994; Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995; Griffith & Parr, 2001), (6) *field of study* (Mochizuki, 1999; Satta-Udom, 2007; Peacock & Ho, 2003), (7) *beliefs* (Abraham & Vann, 1987; Yang,

1999), (8) *language proficiency* (Green & Oxford, 1995; Janphaosaeng, 2006; Yang, 2007; Wu, 2008; Lai, 2009), and (9) *cultural backgrounds* (Oxford, 1990; Peacock & Ho, 2003; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006). Ellis (1994) described these studies on language learning strategies as "the most fruitful research direction in the area of learning strategies" (p. 171).

Among these factors, the focus of many studies has been on learners' proficiency levels. A review of several research based on language proficiency is presented below.

2.4.1 Proficiency and the use of language learning strategies

The relationship between levels of language proficiency as a factor in language learning strategy use has been commonly found. Many researchers conducted studies investigating whether the students' use of language learning strategies had a relationship with their levels of language proficiency. Most findings indicated that the use of language learning strategies is related to students' language proficiency—higher proficiency students employed language learning strategies more frequently than lower proficiency ones (e.g. Green & Oxford, 1995; Goh & Foong, 1997; Bremner, 1999; Mochizuki, 1999; Wharton, 2000; Lan & Oxford, 2003; Lee, 2003; Griffihs, 2003b; Khalil, 2005; Magogwe & Oliver, 2007; Yang, 2007; Ni, 2007; Wu, 2008; Lai, 2009; Radwan, 2012).

Employing the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), Lai (2009) investigated 418 freshmen at Tunghai University in Taiwan on their use of language learning strategies. The results demonstrated that students reported medium use of SILL learning strategies. The ANOVA results reported statistically significant differences between more proficient students and less proficient students in the use of overall strategy and all six categories of language learning strategy. For all three proficiency groups, the most frequently used strategy category was *compensation*. Radwan (2011) who conducted the study to examine language learning strategies used by 128 students majoring in English in Oman demonstrated that all participants reported medium to high frequency use of strategy on the SILL. The use of language learning strategies was related to proficiency levels; the students with higher

proficiency used overall and 3 out of 6 strategy categories (*cognitive*, *metacognitive* and *affective*) more often than the students with lower proficiency. The most frequently used strategy category among all 3 proficiency groups was *metacognitive* while the least frequently used was *memory*. Furthermore, the study done by Goh and Foong (1997) investigating the use of language learning strategies by 175 Chinese students at Nanyang Technological University in Singapore, indicated that the higher proficiency students used the overall and 2 out of 6 (*cognitive* and *compensation*) categories of language learning strategies significantly more frequently than lower proficiency students. The participants reported that the frequency of overall strategy use was in the medium range. In Wu's (2008) study, 137 students at the National Chin-Yi University of Technology in Taiwan were divided into two groups: high proficiency and low proficiency. The results demonstrated that the proficiency level of the students had a significant influence on the use of 5 out of 6 categories of language learning strategies: *cognitive*, *compensation*, *metacognitive*, *affective* and *social* strategies. The higher proficiency students employed these five strategy categories more frequently than lower proficiency students. Both higher and lower proficiency students used *compensation* strategies most frequently. The study by Ni (2007) conducted with 341 freshmen in China found that the students in the high proficiency group reported using overall strategy and five out of six strategy categories (*memory*, *cognitive*, *metacognitive*, *affective* and *social*) significantly more often than the low proficiency group. The frequency of overall strategy use was in the range of medium use.

The study by Yang (2007) surveyed 451 junior college students studying at Chang Gung Institute of technology in order to examine the kinds of language learning strategies the students reported using. The findings showed there were significant differences in overall strategy use and 4 out of 6 categories of strategy use (*cognitive*, *metacognitive*, *compensation* and *social* categories) among the students with different proficiency levels. The study concluded that language proficiency influenced students' use of English language learning strategies. Wharton (2000) also studied language learning strategies used by 678 undergraduate students with different proficiency level in Singapore. The study showed that students with good and fair proficiency self-ratings reported using learning strategies more

frequently than poor proficiency self-ratings. Moreover, the significant difference was found for only 2 out of 6 strategy categories: *affective* and *compensation* strategies. In 2007, Magogwe and Oliver investigated language learning strategies used by 480 primary, secondary, and tertiary students in Botswana. The participants were divided into three groups: high proficiency, medium proficiency, and low proficiency. The study discovered the relationship between the use of learning strategies and proficiency level—more successful students used learning strategies more frequently than less successful ones. Lan and Oxford (2003) also investigated the relationship between language learning strategies and proficiency with students in Taiwan. The subjects were 379 sixth grade elementary students. The subjects were divided into three groups: good, fair, and poor. The results indicated that good proficiency students used *cognitive*, *compensation*, *metacognitive*, and *affective* strategies more often than fair and poor proficiency students. Likewise, Mochizuki (1999) examined the use of language learning strategies of 157 Japanese upper, intermediate and lower level students learning English as a foreign language. The results showed that the mean scores of 2 out of 6 strategy categories (*cognitive* and *metacognitive*) employed by high level students were significantly higher than the low level students. The results also revealed that the students used *compensation* strategies the most frequently and *affective* strategies the least.

In Lee's study (2003) on the use of language learning strategies by 325 Korean secondary school students in Pusan, the results showed that the more successful students used four out of six strategy categories (*memory, cognitive*, *metacognitive*, and *social strategies*) significantly more often than less successful ones. Moreover, the results showed significantly more frequent overall use among more successful students. Similarly Griffiths (2003) studied language learning strategies used by 348 students in a private language school in New Zealand. The study reported that there was a statistically significant relationship between frequency of language learning strategies used and proficiency level; learning strategies were reportedly used significantly more frequently by advanced students than by elementary students. Green and Oxford (1995) investigated reported frequency of learning strategies used by students at three different course levels (pre-basic, basic and intermediate) at Puerto Rico. The study found the higher proficiency students

reported using overall strategies significantly more often than those with lower proficiency ones. Bremner (1999) did a study on a group of undergraduates in Hong Kong. The results showed that learner proficiency levels had a statistically significant effect on the frequency of overall strategy of language learning strategy use. As for the strategy categories, proficiency levels had a major effect on two categories, namely *cognitive* and *compensation*. The study by Khalil (2005) investigated the strategy use of 378 Palestinian students at the secondary and university levels (194 high school and 184 freshmen), with a focus on the relationship between the subjects' strategy use and their language proficiency. The results showed that more proficient learners reported more frequent use of overall language learning strategies. The results found significant levels of association between *memory*, *cognitive*, *metacognitive*, *compensation* and *social* and proficiency among proficient learners—higher level of proficiency students reported more frequent use of these strategies.

However, some studies by researchers such as Shmais (2003), Nisbet, Tindall and Arroyo (2008), Anugkakul (2011), Abraham and Vann (1987), Van and Abraham (1990), and Porte (1998) found no significant differences between students' use of language learning strategies and their language proficiency. Shmais's study (2003) conducted on a group of 99 English major students in Palestine showed that there were no significant differences on the use of language learning strategies between successful students and unsuccessful ones. The studies concluded that low proficiency students also used strategies considered as useful, and as often as those used by high proficiency students. Anderson (2005) supports that there were no good or bad strategies, but there was a good or bad application of strategies.

The previous studies on the use of language learning strategies and English language achievement conducted in Thailand are shown below.

2.4.2 Research on language learning strategies in Thailand

For studies in the Thai context, several Thai researchers conducted studies to investigate language learning strategies employed by secondary and university students with different proficiency levels and some investigated factors affecting the choice of language learning strategies such as age, gender, learning

styles, language proficiency, and field of study. However, the focus of the studies was on determining language learning strategies used by successful and unsuccessful students, and examining the relationship between strategy use and language proficiency (Prakongchati, 2007). The results of the studies indicated that the use of language learning strategies was related to success in language learning (e.g. Dhanarattiganon, 1990; Lappayawichit, 1998; Kaotsombut, 2003; Janphaosaeng, 2006; Intaraprasert, 2007; Prakongchati, 2007).

The study of Lappayawichit (1998) surveyed language learning strategies employed by 140 first-year Arts students at Chulalongkorn University. The instrument used was Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning. The result indicated that the students reported using the overall strategy at a medium frequency. The high proficiency students used overall language learning strategies significantly more frequently than low proficiency ones. The high proficiency students reported using *compensation* and *metacognitive* strategies at a high level while the low proficiency students reported using all six strategy categories at a medium level. Similar to the study done by Janphaosaeng (2006) on the use of language learning strategies in relation to the achievement of 56 Mattayom three students in Bangkok, the findings indicated that high achieving students used all six categories of language learning strategies more often. The high achieving students reported using *metacognitive* strategies most frequently, while the low achieving students reported using *affective* strategies most frequently. The study of 39 graduate students at Mahidol University by Kaotsombut (2003), using the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning developed by Oxford (1990), showed that good language learners used learning strategies more often than poor language learners. Moreover, the results displayed that *compensation* strategies were rated at a high level, while the others were rated at a medium level.

Apart from that, Dhanarattiganon (1990) employed Rubin's (1979) classifications of language learning strategies to investigate language learning strategies used by145 good and poor first year students at Silapakorn University. Like the previous findings, the researcher revealed that the high achievers used learning strategies more often than low achievers did. The high achievers used *guessing and monitoring techniques* (*compensation* and *metacognitive* strategies) most often

whereas the low achievers most often used *speaking to their fellow friends in Thai*. An investigation of Intaraprasert (2007) on the use of out of class language learning strategies in relation to language achievement of 488 students at the University of Science and Technology in Northern Thailand, showed that the high-ability students reported employing out of class language learning strategies significantly more frequently than the low-ability ones. The three strategies reported more frequently used by high-ability students included *surfing the internet*, *listening to English songs* and *watching an English-speaking film*. In the study of Prakongchati (2007) examined the relationship between language learning strategies used by 1,134 Thai Public University freshmen and four main learning strategy categories: *classroom preparation*, *lesson comprehension*, *skill improvement* and *general knowledge expansion*. The results showed that the students reported a medium frequency of language learning strategy use. Moreover, the results of the ANOVA revealed that the successful students reported employing overall strategy significantly more often than unsuccessful students. The successful students reported more frequent use of strategies in the four main categories than those with lower language proficiency levels. The successful students reported using the category of *improving their language skills with media utilization* more frequently than other learning strategy categories. The three individual strategies highly reported were *watching English-speaking films*, *watching television program in English* and *imitating a native speaker from media*.

In conclusion, the previous related research on language learning strategies have concluded that more proficient learners generally reported employing learning strategies significantly more frequently than did less proficient ones. Although there are a large number of studies on language learning strategies, there has been limited number of studies conducted over a period of time. Most of the previous studies have been conducted at a particular point of time. Thus, the present study looked at students' reported strategies on entry to the university and again at the end of the first semester, and then looked at changes in language learning strategy use to see if strategy change was related to language proficiency levels.

CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains methodology and procedures used in the study. The chapter is divided into four parts. The first part provides the information about the subjects. The second part describes details on the instruments and their developments. The third part presents data collection procedures. Last, procedures of data analysis are discussed.

3.1 Subjects of the study

The subjects in the study were 71 first year English major students in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Thaksin University, Songkhla Campus, Thailand in academic year 2010. The subjects consisted of 56 females and 15 males whose ages ranged from 17 to 19 with an average of 18. They took the English I Course in the first semester of the 2010 academic year.

3.1.1 Grouping of the subjects

At the beginning of the semester, the subjects were classified and placed into four proficiency groups according to their English scores on the 2009 Ordinary National Educational Test (O-NET). As shown below in Table 3.1, Group 1 consisted of 7 students with scores ranging from 41 to 50 out of the total of 100; Group 2 of 26 students with scores ranging from 31 to 40; Group 3 of 28 students with scores ranging from 21 to 30; and Group 4 of 10 students with scores ranging from 11 to 20.

Table 3.1: Distribution of subjects by proficiency level based on English O-NET scores

Group	Proficiency level	N	Percentage
1	41-50	7	9.9%
2	31-40	26	36.6%
3	21-30	28	39.4%
4	11-20	10	14.1%
		71	100%

At the end of the semester, the subjects were classified and placed into four proficiency groups according to their grades of English I Course. As can be seen in Table 3.2, all subjects in Group 1 got grade "A" on English I; Group 2 got grade "B+" or "B"; Group 3 got grade "C+" or "C"; and Group 4 got grade "D+" or "D".

Table 3.2: Distribution of subjects by proficiency level based on grades of English I Course

Group	Proficiency level	N	Percentage
1	A	13	18.3%
2	B+, B	38	53.5%
3	C+, C	17	23.9%
4	D+, D	3	4.2%
		71	100%

3.2 Research instruments

There were four research instruments in this study: English O-NET scores, grades of English I Course and two questionnaires: language learning strategies questionnaire and English learning environment questionnaire.

3.2.1 English test scores of the Ordinary National Educational Test (O-NET)

The Ordinary National Educational Test (O-NET) is organized by National Institute of Educational Testing Service (Public Organization) (NIETS) for grade 12 students to assess their academic achievement according to the national education curriculum (NIETS, 2010). The subjects' English scores on the test were used as an indicator of the subjects' English proficiency at the beginning of the semester. Information of the subjects' language proficiency was used to establish a relationship with their use of learning strategies.

3.2.2 Grades of English I

The English I Course is required for all of the first year students at Thaksin University in the first semester. It is an integrated skills course designed to develop the students' skills in grammar, writing, reading, speaking and listening. The course lasted for one semester. Each class met for three hours a week. Grades of English I were obtained from the Western Languages Department, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thaksin University at the end of the first semester of the 2010 academic year. The subjects' grades on the course were used as an indicator of subjects' English proficiency, to investigate the relationship between language learning strategy use and language proficiency at the end of the first semester.

3.2.3 Language learning strategy questionnaire

One of the most acceptable ways to assess the frequency of use of language learning strategies is using a questionnaire (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995; Oxford, 1996; Gao, 2004). The research instrument used for collecting data on the use of language learning strategies by the subjects participating in the study was the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) version 7.0 developed by Oxford in 1990. The SILL, a self-rating questionnaire, was designed for students of English as a second or foreign language. The SILL, version 7.0, was translated into more than 20 languages and is broadly used as a research instrument worldwide (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995; Green & Oxford, 1995; Goh & Foong, 1997).

In the study, The SILL was used to determine the subjects' language learning strategies used at the beginning and at the end of the first semester of the 2010 academic year. The inventory required the subjects to answer 50-item questions regarding their frequency of learning strategy use on a five-point Likert Scale, ranging from 1 (*never* or *almost never* use this strategy) to 5 (*always* or *almost always* use). To assess the frequency of learning strategy use of language learners, Oxford (1990) provides three levels of interpretation as follows:

Table 3.3: Criteria for assessing the frequency of strategy use (Oxford, 1990, p.300)

Interpretation	Frequency	Mean Range
Low	Never or almost never used	1.00 to 1.49
	Seldom used	1.50 to 2.49
Medium	Sometimes used	2.50 to 3.49
High	Often used	3.50 to 4.49
	Always or almost always used	4.50 to 5.00

The current study used the SILL which was translated into Thai language by the researcher and checked by the advisor in order that the subjects would clearly understand the content of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was divided into three parts**:**

Part 1 included 6 items eliciting the subjects' general information such as name, student number, gender, age, the time they started learning English, and the opportunities for using English language outside the classroom. The item asking about opportunities in using English was in the form of inventories with a five-point scale, ranking from 5 (*most frequently used*) to 1 (*least frequently used*).

Part 2 consisted of 50 items with five-point Likert scale questionnaire including two main classes: direct class (*memory*, *cognitive* and *compensation* strategies) and indirect class (*metacognitive*, *affective* and *social* strategies) The subjects' were required to rank their frequency of learning strategies used through

6 main categories: (1) *memory* strategies (items 1-9), (2) *cognitive* strategies (items 10-23), (3) *compensation* strategies (items 24-29), (4) *metacognitive* strategies (items 30-38), (5) *affective* strategies (items 39-44), (6) *social* strategies (items 45-50).

Part 3 contained one open-ended question to elicit additional language learning strategies used by the subjects, not included in the questionnaire and others.

3.2.3.1 The pilot of the questionnaire

The 50-item SILL, version 7.0, has been known as the most comprehensive questionnaire in assessing the frequency of language learning strategy use (Oxford, 1990). The SILL is claimed to be "the only language learning strategy instrument that has been checked for its reliability and validity in multiple ways" (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995, p.4). The SILL (version 7.0 for ESL/EFL learners) has been widely used with acceptable reliability and validity, ranged from 0.85 to 0.98, depending on whether the subjects take the SILL in their own language or in L2 (Park, 1997; Green & Oxford, 1995; Sheorey, 1999; Wharton, 2000). For Thai context, the Thai version of the SILL has high degree of Cronbach's alpha and reliability. Thai researchers found the high reliability which was 0.92 (Kaotsombut, 2003) and 0.94 (Satta-Udom, 2007; Tappoon, 2008).

For the study, The Thai version of the questionnaire was checked by the advisor. The questionnaire was piloted to 30 first year students in the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Thaksin University in order to ensure the validity and reliability of the Thai version. To determine the reliability of the questionnaire, the Alpha Reliability Coefficients were calculated, with a reliability of 0.94. After the pilot, the researcher together with the advisor revised and improved the piloted questionnaire. The final versions of the questionnaires are shown in Appendix A (English version) and B (Thai Version). All of these have shown that the SILL questionnaire is a very reliable research instrument.

3.2.4 The questionnaire about English learning environment

A questionnaire on the subjects' English learning environment was used to see the existing differences in learning environment, activities or facilities which might attribute to their language learning strategy use.

3.2.4.1 The development of the questionnaire

Before constructing the questionnaire, 10 first year students, randomly selected, and 2 English teachers of Western Languages Departments, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thaksin University were interviewed informally. They were asked to provide information about facilities and activities available at their former high schools and Thaksin University to improve English language learning. The information obtained from the informal interviews was used as a guideline in writing questionnaire items. The questionnaire was written in Thai to make sure the intended meaning could be conveyed.

The questionnaire contained three parts:

Part 1 consisted of 2 questions eliciting the subjects' general information.

Part 2 included 6 items. The subjects were asked to express their satisfaction on facilities and activities available at their former high school and the university; they were asked to express their opinions according to the rating scale from 5 (*most satisfied*) to 1 (*least satisfied* or *none*).

Part 3 consisted of two open-ended questions to elicit the subjects' opinion on additional facilities or activities provided at their former high school and the University that might affect their language learning strategy use.

3.2.4.2 The pilot of the questionnaire

The drafted questionnaire was checked by the thesis's advisor and two experienced English teachers in the Department of Language and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkhla University, Hat Yai Campus, and revised by the researcher before being piloted. To achieve the reliability of the questionnaire, the drafted questionnaire about English learning environment was piloted to 30 students who have similar background to the subjects. They were the students in the Faculty of Education, majoring in English. They were asked to answer the questionnaire to specify any ambiguities or incomplete items. Then the questionnaires were analyzed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The reliability was within an acceptable range which was 0.89. After that the researcher worked with the advisor to revise and modify the piloted questionnaire. The final versions of the questionnaires are shown in Appendix C (English version) and D (Thai Version).

3.3 Data collection procedure

The data were collected during the first semester of the 2010 academic year. The following procedure stages were adopted.

1. On 3rd June 2010, the first week of the first semester of the 2010 academic year, the researcher informed the subjects the purpose of the study, and introduced the SILL questionnaire on strategy use. Then the questionnaires were distributed to the subjects to complete at home. 75 questionnaires were distributed and 71 were returned.

2. Information about their strategies from the questionnaire were analyzed and established as the subjects' learning strategy pattern. A relationship between learning strategy use and the subjects' English ONET scores were computed.

3. The SILL, a self-reporting questionnaire, was administered to the subjects again in the final week of the first semester. They completed the questionnaire at home and 71 questionnaires were returned.

4. One week later the questionnaire of English learning environment was administered to the subjects. The students took 30 minutes to complete and gave it back to the researcher. Data were then analyzed.

5. A relationship between learning strategy use and the subjects' grades on the English I were established.

6. Information about strategy use from the questionnaires at the beginning and at the end of the semester was analyzed to see changes in strategies use and language proficiency level.

3.5 Data analysis

Percentages, frequency distribution, and means were used to analysis data of the subjects' general information (Part 1 of language learning strategy questionnaire). To answer the three research questions, the analysis procedure was as follows:

Research question 1: What are language learning strategies used by the first year English major students with different proficiency levels at the beginning of the first semester?

To answer this research question, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to find a significant variation in the use of language learning strategies by students with different proficiency levels.

Research question 2: Do their learning strategies change at the end of the first semester?

To answer research question 2, a t-test was utilized to test whether there was a significant difference between language learning strategies used at the beginning and at the end of the first semester.

Research question 3: Do subjects with different language proficiency levels employ different language learning strategies?

To answer research question 3, a t-test was used to determine a significant difference in language learning strategy use at the beginning and at the end of the first semester by the students in each proficiency group.

CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

This chapter reports the findings of the study, which are divided into two parts. The first part presents the subjects' general information, and opportunities for using English language skills outside the classroom. The second part presents the findings according to the main research questions shown in Chapter 1.

Part I: The subjects' general information

The 71 subjects participating in the study were first year English major students studying in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Thaksin University in the 2010 academic year. The following findings obtained from the first part of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) questionnaire concerned several aspects of the subjects' background. The subjects responded to the same questionnaire twice: once at the beginning and again at the end of the semester. All items were analyzed to establish frequency and percentage. The findings are shown below.

Table 4.1: The subjects' general information

General Information		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	15	21.1
	Female	56	78.9
Age	17	2	2.8
	18	42	59.2
	19	27	38.0
When did you start learning English?	Kindergarten	3	4.2
	Primary school	66	93.0
	Secondary school	2	2.8

The findings presented in Table 4.1 indicate the number and percentage of students by background. Most of the students (78.9%) were female. They were between 17 and 19 years old. From the findings, most of them (93%) started studying English when they were in primary school.

Further, the results about the students' opportunities in using English outside the classroom are demonstrated in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Opportunities for using English outside the classroom at the beginning and at the end of the semester

Use of English outside classroom	Beginning of the first semester		End of the first semester	
	Frequency	**Percent**	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Very often	0	0	2	2.8
Often	5	7.0	9	12.7
Occasionally	41	57.7	38	53.5
Rarely	23	32.4	21	29.6
Never	2	2.8	1	1.4

The table shows that at the end of the semester, the students took more opportunities to use their English language skills outside the classroom than they did at the beginning of the semester.

Part II: Research findings

This section reports the findings based on the research questions of the study. These findings were based on the data from the second part of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) questionnaire taken both at the beginning and at the end of the first semester of the 2010 academic year. The subjects were asked to give information on how often they used language learning strategies on a 5-point scale ranging from *always* or *almost always* use to *never* or *almost never* use.

In reporting the frequency of language learning strategies used by the subjects in the study both at the beginning and at the end of the semester, an analysis of strategy use based on Oxford (1990) was used. The interpretations are as follows:

1.00 - 2.49   =   low strategy use

2.50 - 3.49   =   medium strategy use

3.50 - 5.00   =   high strategy use

For the findings, the mean scores of the students' use of language learning strategies are examined at 2 levels: the patterns of variation in overall strategy use and six categories of strategy use, and variation in the individual strategy use. The results in the use of individual strategies are illustrated based on the following categories: *memory* strategies, *cognitive* strategies, *compensation* strategies, *metacognitive* strategies, *affective* strategies, and *social* strategies.

4.1 Research Question 1:   **What are the language learning strategies used by the first year English major students with different proficiency levels at the beginning of the first semester?**

To answer this research question, an analysis of the students' English O-NET scores, reflecting their English proficiency at the beginning of the semester, and their strategy use was conducted. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was administered to examine significant variations in the mean scores of strategy use in relation to proficiency levels.

The students were classified into four proficiency groups: 7 students (Group 1) with scores ranging from 41 to 50 out of the total of 100; 26 students (Group 2) with scores ranging from 31 to 40; 28 students (Group 3) with scores ranging from 21 to 30; and 10 students (Group 4) with scores ranging from 11 to 20.

4.1.1 Variations in students' use of overall strategy and six categories of strategy by proficiency levels

The analysis of the overall language learning strategies used and six strategy categories used by students with different proficiency levels is presented in Table 4.3 below.

Table 4.3: Variations in students' use of overall strategy and six categories of strategy by proficiency levels

Strategy Categories	Proficiency Groups (English O-NET Scores)								F-value	Sig.
	Group 1 (41-50)		Group 2 (31-40)		Group 3 (21-30)		Group 4 (11-20)			
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
Memory	2.79	0.55	2.44	0.30	2.19	0.31	1.94	0.36	10.85	.000**
Cognitive	3.00	0.40	2.45	0.26	2.11	0.27	1.83	0.28	30.18	.000**
Compensation	3.12	0.43	2.72	0.45	2.35	0.43	2.00	0.38	12.63	.000**
Metacognitive	3.73	0.34	2.94	0.33	2.65	0.24	2.58	0.39	26.54	.000**
Affective	2.86	0.49	2.45	0.37	2.30	0.43	2.28	0.30	3.99	.011*
Social	2.93	0.46	2.49	0.44	2.23	0.42	2.07	0.39	7.25	.000**
Overall	**3.08**	**0.22**	**2.57**	**0.17**	**2.29**	**0.11**	**2.09**	**0.14**	**75.45**	**.000**

 Significance: *$p< 0.05$ **$p<0.01$

Table 4.3 displays that the difference in the frequency of overall strategies used by students with different proficiency levels was significant. The mean scores of the overall strategies used by the two higher proficiency groups (Groups 1 and 2) were 3.08 and 2.57 respectively, defined as being within the medium use range, while the mean scores of the other two lower groups (Groups 3 and 4) were 2.29 and 2.09 respectively, defined as within the low use range.

Table 4.3 also reports that there was a significant difference in the frequency of all six categories of language learning strategies used among the students with different proficiency levels. The higher level students reported using all six strategy categories significantly more frequently than the lower level students did.

For all 4 proficiency groups, the most used strategy category was *metacognitive* and the least used by the first two proficiency groups (Groups 1 and 2) was the *memory* category and the *cognitive* category by the third and fourth proficiency groups.

It is interesting to learn that the *metacognitive* strategies were reported at the highest level among all 4 proficiency groups; the highest proficiency group (Group 1) reported high use ($\bar{x}$ =3.73) while others (Groups 2, 3 and 4) reported medium use ($\bar{x}$ =2.94, $\bar{x}$ =2.65, and $\bar{x}$ = 2.58, respectively). The first two proficiency groups reported using the *compensation* strategies at a medium level ($\bar{x}$ =3.12, $\bar{x}$ =2.72) while others (Groups 2, 3 and 4) at a low level ($\bar{x}$ =2.35, $\bar{x}$ =2.00). As for the other four strategy categories, the highest proficiency group used them at a medium level while others used them at a low level.

There seems to be a relationship between proficiency levels and learning strategies used; the more proficient group reported more frequent use of overall strategy and all strategy categories than the low groups and vice versa.

4.1.2 Variations in students' use of individual strategies by proficiency levels

This section indicates the level of significant differences in the use of individual language learning strategies of the students with different proficiency levels.

4.1.2.1 Variations in the use of *memory* strategies by proficiency levels

The differences between all 9 items of *memory* strategies used by the students with different proficiency levels can be seen clearly in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Variations in the use of *memory* strategies by proficiency levels

Memory Strategies	Proficiency Groups								F-value	Sig.
	Group 1 (41-50)		Group 2 (31-40)		Group 3 (21-30)		Group 4 (11-20)			
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	2.73	0.60	2.71	0.49	2.39	0.50	1.90	0.57	6.21	.001**
2. I use new English words in a sentence so I remember them.	3.14	0.90	2.62	0.75	2.40	0.84	2.14	0.65	4.09	.010*
3. I connect the sound of a new word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.	3.00	0.82	2.50	0.58	2.32	0.82	2.10	0.57	2.54	.063
4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	3.00	1.00	2.69	0.74	2.61	0.79	2.30	0.82	1.14	.399
5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.	3.29	1.11	2.75	0.97	2.15	0.88	2.30	1.34	3.13	.031*
6. I use flash cards to remember new English words.	2.00	1.53	1.85	0.88	1.61	0.79	1.50	0.71	0.74	.533
7. I physically act out new English words.	2.29	0.76	1.81	0.75	1.46	0.64	1.90	0.88	2.90	.041*
8. I review English lessons often.	3.29	0.49	2.88	0.65	2.29	0.71	1.90	0.74	9.37	.000**

Memory Strategies	Proficiency Groups								F-value	Sig.
	Group 1 (41-50)		Group 2 (31-40)		Group 3 (21-30)		Group 4 (11-20)			
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	2.73	0.67	2.43	0.79	2.14	0.85	1.20	0.42	10.95	.000**

Significance: *$p < 0.05$ **$p < 0.01$

Table 4.4 indicates that the use of 6 out of 9 items of *memory* strategies (Items 1, 2, 5, 7, 8 and 9) was significantly different by proficiency levels. The table seems to suggest that the use of these strategies is related to proficiency levels though the differences are significant in some cases and not in others. Group 1, the highest proficiency students, used all *memory* strategies at the highest level while the lower proficiency students used them less frequently. However, there were 2 statistical significant items that were used more frequently by lower proficient students: item 5, Group 4 students reported using the strategy more frequently than Group 3, and item 7, Group 4 students reported using the strategy more often than Groups 2 and 3.

4.1.2.2 Variations in the use of *cognitive* strategies by proficiency levels

Table 4.5 reports the differences in the mean scores of all 14 items of *cognitive* strategies among the students with different proficiency levels.

Table 4.5: Variations in the use of *cognitive* strategies by proficiency levels

Cognitive Strategies	Proficiency Groups								F-value	Sig.
	Group 1 (41-50)		Group 2 (31-40)		Group 3 (21-30)		Group 4 (11-20)			
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
10. I say or write new English words several times.	3.00	0.58	2.58	0.64	2.11	0.63	1.80	0.79	6.96	.000**
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	4.00	0.58	3.42	0.64	2.93	0.72	2.40	0.84	9.58	.000**
12. I practice the sounds of English.	3.86	0.69	3.19	0.57	2.75	0.59	2.40	0.52	11.29	.000**
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	3.14	0.90	2.69	0.62	2.25	0.75	1.90	0.32	6.60	.001**
14. I start conversation in English.	2.71	0.76	2.15	0.73	1.75	0.80	1.60	0.97	3.93	.012*
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	2.71	0.49	2.54	0.95	2.14	0.89	1.40	0.52	5.25	.003**
16. I read for pleasure in English.	2.57	0.54	2.27	0.67	1.64	0.62	1.20	0.42	12.09	.000**
17. I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.	2.43	0.79	1.85	0.73	1.82	0.77	1.30	0.48	3.36	.024*
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	3.57	0.98	2.54	0.65	2.29	0.81	2.10	1.20	5.22	.003**

Cognitive Strategies	Proficiency Groups								F-value	Sig.
	Group 1 (41-50)		Group 2 (31-40)		Group 3 (21-30)		Group 4 (11-20)			
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	3.14	0.69	2.38	0.75	2.36	0.73	2.20	0.79	2.58	.061
20. I try to find patterns in English.	3.29	0.49	2.19	0.69	2.04	0.79	1.70	0.95	6.63	.001**
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	2.43	0.98	2.19	0.90	1.79	0.74	1.50	0.85	2.81	.046*
22. I try not to translate word-for-word.	2.86	1.22	2.27	0.87	1.86	0.89	2.10	1.10	2.33	.082
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	2.29	0.76	2.04	0.60	1.79	0.69	2.00	1.16	1.07	.370

Significance: *$p < 0.05$ **$p < 0.01$

The one-way analysis of variance shows that there were 11 items out of 14 (Items 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, and 21) which the higher proficiency group used significantly more frequently than the lower ones did; Group 1 used them more frequently than the other 3 groups, while Group 2 used more frequently than Group 3 and so on. For non-significant items, Group 1 also used them more frequently than the others 3 groups, except items 22 and 23 which Group 4 students reported using more frequently than Group 3 students. There seems to be the relationship between language proficiency and the use of *cognitive* strategies—more proficient students employed these strategies more frequently, though the significant differences were found in some cases.

4.1.2.3 Variations in the use of *compensation* strategies by proficiency levels

Table 4.6 examines the differences in the frequency of *compensation* strategies used between the students in four different proficiency groups.

Table 4.6: Variations in the use of *compensation* strategies by proficiency levels

Compensation Strategies	Proficiency Groups								F-value	Sig.
	Group 1 (41-50)		Group 2 (31-40)		Group 3 (21-30)		Group 4 (11-20)			
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	3.71	0.76	2.85	0.61	2.57	0.88	2.20	0.79	6.05	.001**
25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gesture.	3.43	0.98	2.85	0.88	2.61	0.99	2.60	0.70	1.68	.180
26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	2.77	0.86	2.71	0.76	2.21	0.83	1.60	0.97	5.26	.003**
27. I read in English without looking up every new word.	2.71	0.76	2.08	0.80	1.86	0.76	1.50	0.53	4.04	.011*
28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	2.86	0.90	2.77	0.77	2.50	0.75	2.30	0.95	1.25	.298
29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or a phrase that means the same thing.	3.29	0.49	3.00	0.69	2.32	0.67	1.80	1.03	10.18	.000**

Significance: $*p< 0.05$ $**p<0.01$

As shown in Table 4.6, significantly more frequent use of 4 out of 6 *compensation* strategies (Items 24, 26, 27 and 29) were reported by higher proficieny students. The students in Group 1 reported using all 6 items of *compensation* strategies more often than their counterparts; Groups 2, 3 and 4 used these strategies less frequently, respectively. The use of *compensation* strategies is related to students' language proficiency—more proficient students employed the *compensation* strategies more frequently.

4.1.2.4 Variations in the use of *metacognitive* strategies by proficiency levels

Table 4.7 below shows the frequency of *metacognitive* strategies used among the students with different proficiency levels.

Table 4.7: Variations in the use of *metacognitive* strategies by proficiency levels

Metacognitive Strategies	Proficiency Groups								F-value	Sig.
	Group 1 (41-50)		Group 2 (31-40)		Group 3 (21-30)		Group 4 (11-20)			
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
30. I try to find as many ways I can use my English.	3.43	0.79	2.69	0.74	2.40	0.52	2.39	0.83	3.86	.031*
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	2.86	0.90	2.81	0.80	2.50	0.69	2.00	0.94	2.89	.042*
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	3.71	0.49	3.31	0.68	2.89	0.63	3.00	0.82	3.73	.015*
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	4.00	0.82	3.27	0.45	2.93	0.66	2.90	0.74	6.41	.001**
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	3.43	0.79	2.58	0.81	2.21	0.57	2.40	0.52	6.14	.001**

Metacognitive Strategies	Proficiency Groups								F-value	Sig.
	Group 1 (41-50)		Group 2 (31-40)		Group 3 (21-30)		Group 4 (11-20)			
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	3.29	0.76	2.81	0.69	2.57	0.84	2.30	0.82	2.63	.057
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	4.14	0.38	2.85	0.73	2.50	0.88	2.00	0.82	11.44	.000**
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	4.14	0.69	2.96	0.83	2.79	0.83	2.60	0.84	5.94	.001**
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	4.57	0.54	3.60	0.70	3.23	0.65	3.11	0.63	10.65	.000**

Significance: *$p< 0.05$ **$p<0.01$

Statistical analysis indicates that there were significant differences between the 4 student groups in the use of *metacognitive* strategies: more successful students employed 8 out of 9 strategies (Items 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37 and 38) significantly more frequently than the less successful ones. Only for item 35 no significant difference was found. For statistical significant difference items, the frequency of 6 items out of 8 (Items 30, 31, 33, 36, 37 and 38) varied according to proficiency levels. That is, the highest group students (Group 1) used these strategies most frequently followed by Groups 2, 3 and 4, while the students varied in their use of the other 2 strategies (Items 32, and 34): Group 4 students used these 2 strategies more often than Group 3, but less frequently than the students in Groups 1 and 2. Interestingly, for both statistical significant difference and non significant difference items, the highest group (Group 1) used these *metacognitive* strategies most frequently.

4.1.2.5 Variations in the use of *affective* strategies by proficiency levels

The findings of the frequency of use of *affective* strategies by the students in 4 proficiency groups are presented in Table 4.8 below.

Table 4.8: Variations in the use of *affective* strategies by proficiency levels

Affective Strategies	Proficiency Groups								F-value	Sig.
	Group 1 (41-50)		Group 2 (31-40)		Group 3 (21-30)		Group 4 (11-20)			
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	3.29	0.76	2.85	0.78	2.75	0.80	3.20	0.79	1.42	.254
40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	3.29	0.95	2.96	0.96	2.71	0.60	3.10	0.57	1.36	.264
41. I gave myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	3.00	1.16	2.42	0.95	2.39	1.03	1.70	0.48	2.69	.053
42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	2.71	0.76	2.50	0.99	2.32	0.98	2.20	1.03	0.53	.661
43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.	1.46	0.65	1.46	0.58	1.29	0.49	1.00	0.00	2.01	.121
44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	3.00	1.41	2.50	0.53	2.46	0.81	2.18	0.86	1.79	.158

Table 4.8 explains that there were no significant differences in the use of all *affective* strategies between the students in each proficiency level. The mean scores of the first proficiency group (Group 1) were reported at the highest level while the mean scores of the other three groups (Groups 2, 3 and 4) varied. However, the mean scores of items 41, 42 and 44 showed a linear increase in frequency across the 4 proficiency groups, with the students in Group 1 reported using the strategies most frequently, followed by Groups 2, 3 and 4, respectively. In sum, the students in Group 1 reported using the *affective* strategies most often, though the significant differences were not found.

4.1.2.6 Variations in the use of *social* strategies by proficiency levels

Table 4.9 below indicates the differences in mean scores of *social* strategies used by the students with different proficiency levels.

Table 4.9: Variations in the use of *social* strategies by proficiency levels

Social Strategies	Proficiency Groups								F-value	Sig.
	Group 1 (41-50)		Group 2 (31-40)		Group 3 (21-30)		Group 4 (11-20)			
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	3.86	0.69	2.68	0.98	2.65	0.98	2.60	1.27	3.04	.035*
46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	2.71	0.76	2.58	0.76	2.25	0.65	2.10	0.57	2.12	.106
47. I practice English with other students.	2.43	0.98	2.42	0.81	1.96	0.75	1.90	0.88	2.06	.114

Social Strategies	Proficiency Groups								F-value	Sig.
	Group 1 (41-50)		Group 2 (31-40)		Group 3 (21-30)		Group 4 (11-20)			
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
48. I ask for help from English speakers.	3.57	0.98	2.58	0.81	2.50	0.71	2.11	0.57	7.91	.000**
49. I ask questions in English.	2.08	0.80	1.89	0.74	1.86	0.90	1.30	0.48	2.61	.059
50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers	3.14	0.90	2.62	0.94	2.50	1.04	2.00	0.94	1.97	.127

Significance: *$p < 0.05$ **$p < 0.01$

Table 4.9 demonstrates that there were only 2 strategies (Items 45 and 48) that more successful students used them significantly more often than less successful ones. Group 1 students reported using all *social* strategies more often than others, while the other 3 proficiency groups used these strategies less frequently, though not significant. The students who were better in their language learning reported using all *social* strategies more often than those with lower language proficiency.

4.1.3 Summary

The results of the differences in the students' use of language learning strategies by proficiency levels reveal some notable points.

Significant differences were found in the overall use of strategies by the students in 4 proficiency level groups. That is, the students in Group 1 reported employing the overall strategy most frequently followed by Groups 2, 3 and 4, respectively. The first two proficiency groups (Groups 1 and 2) used the overall strategies at the medium level while the other two groups (Groups 3 and 4) used them at the low level.

Moreover, the results of the ANOVA show that the differences in the use of all six strategy categories were statistically significant among the students with different proficiency levels. The higher proficiency groups reported more frequent use of all strategy categories than lower groups and vice versa.

The *metacognitive* strategy category was the most frequently used among all 4 proficiency groups, while the *memory* strategy category was the least used among the first two groups (Groups 1 and 2) and the *cognitive* strategy category was the least used among the last two proficiency groups (Groups 3 and 4).

Of all the 50 SILL items used by the students in the 4 groups, 31 items showed the significant differences. Interestingly, the highest proficiency students (Group 1) reported using all 50 items (both significant and non-significant items) most frequently.

It can be concluded that the use of language learning strategies is related to proficiency level—the higher proficiency students used language learning strategies more often than the lower ones.

4.2 Research Question 2:   Do their learning strategies change at the end of the first semester?

To answer this research question, the paired sample t-test was employed to determine whether the students' use of language learning strategies at the beginning and at the end of the first semester of the 2010 academic year was significantly different. The findings of these analyses are presented below.

4.2.1 Variations in students' use of overall strategy and six categories of strategy over the semester

The results for the use of language learning strategies from the beginning to the end of the semester in terms of overall strategy and six strategy categories are demonstrated in Table 4.10 below.

Table 4.10: Variations in students' use of overall strategy and six categories of strategy over the semester

Strategy Categories	N	Beginning of the first semester		End of the first semester		t value	Sig.
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
Memory	71	2.26	0.41	2.57	0.40	-5.68	.000**
Cognitive	71	2.28	0.42	2.61	0.42	-8.16	.000**
Compensation	71	2.51	0.53	2.79	0.48	-4.68	.000**
Metacognitive	71	2.86	0.44	3.09	0.46	-5.53	.000**
Affective	71	2.41	0.42	2.63	0.43	-4.41	.000**
Social	71	2.37	0.48	2.74	0.49	-6.30	.000**
Overall	**71**	**2.44**	**0.31**	**2.73**	**0.30**	**-11.32**	**.000****

Significance: **$p<0.01$

The results show that there was the statistically significant difference in the mean scores of overall strategies used from the beginning to the end of the first semester. The mean scores increased from 2.44 at the beginning, defined as being in the low use range, to 2.73 at the end of the first semester, defined as being in the medium use range.

Table 4.10 also reports the significant differences in the mean scores of the use of all six categories of language learning strategies over the semester. The students increased their categories of strategy use during the semester. In brief, compared with strategies used at the beginning of the semester, the students used all six strategy categories more often by the end of the first semester.

As shown in Table 4.10, the *metacognitive* strategy category was reported to be the most frequently used ($\bar{x} = 2.86$, $\bar{x} = 3.09$) both at the beginning and at the end of the semester while the *memory* strategy category was reported as the least frequently used.

The mean scores for the use of *metacognitive* strategies and *compensation* strategies over the semester were in the medium use range. For the *memory*, *cognitive*, *affective*, and *social* strategies, the level of average mean scores increased from low use to medium use.

4.2.2 Variations in students' use of individual strategies over the semester

This section demonstrates the level of significant differences in the use of individual strategies by the first year English major students from the beginning to the end of the first semester.

4.2.2.1 Variations in the use of *memory* strategies over the semester

Table 4.11 displays the frequency of use of *memory* strategies by the subjects in the study over the first semester of the 2010 academic year.

Table 4.11: Variations in the use of *memory* strategies over the semester

Memory Strategies	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	2.48	0.61	2.76	0.64	-3.60	.001**
2. I use new English words in a sentence so I remember them.	2.45	0.79	2.61	0.77	-1.59	.117
3. I connect the sound of a new word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.	2.42	0.73	2.70	0.78	-2.65	.010*
4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	2.63	0.80	2.94	0.75	-2.79	.007**
5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.	2.52	1.05	2.51	0.88	0.12	.904
6. I use flash cards to remember new English words.	1.72	0.90	1.94	0.84	-2.33	.023*
7. I physically act out new English words.	1.73	0.76	2.25	0.86	-4.84	.000**
8. I review English lessons often.	2.55	0.79	2.63	0.78	0.88	.380
9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	2.25	0.87	2.75	0.84	-4.16	.000**

Significance: *$p< 0.05$ **$p<0.01$

The findings show that there were the statistically significant differences in the mean scores of 6 out of 9 items (Items 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 9) from the beginning to the end of the semester. The students reported using all of *memory* strategies more frequently at the end of the semester, though the differences were significant in some cases and not in others. Only item 5 the students reported a little less frequently than at the beginning of the semester ($\bar{x} = 2.52$ and $\bar{x} = 2.51$, respectively).

4.2.2.2 Variations in the use of *cognitive* strategies over the semester

The comparisons between the students' use of *cognitive* strategies from the beginning to the end of the semester are shown in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12: Variations in the use of *cognitive* strategies over the semester

Cognitive Strategies	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
10. I say or write new English words several times.	2.32	0.73	2.55	0.73	-2.33	.023*
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	3.14	0.82	3.21	0.83	.76	.450
12. I practice the sounds of English.	2.97	0.70	3.11	0.79	-2.00	.049*
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	2.45	0.75	2.77	0.80	-3.38	.001**
14. I start conversation in English.	1.97	0.85	2.31	0.77	-3.98	.000**
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	2.24	0.92	2.62	0.82	-3.02	.004**
16. I read for pleasure in English.	1.90	0.74	2.15	0.82	-2.45	.017*
17. I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.	1.82	0.76	2.30	0.87	-4.44	.000**
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	2.48	0.91	2.96	0.73	-4.89	.000**
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	2.42	0.77	2.82	0.80	-3.21	.002**

Cognitive Strategies	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
20. I try to find patterns in English.	2.17	0.85	2.58	0.69	-3.95	.000**
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	1.96	0.87	2.32	0.81	-3.56	.001**
22. I try not to translate word-for-word.	2.14	0.98	2.62	0.90	-4.44	.000**
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	1.96	0.75	2.23	0.85	-2.17	.034*

Significance: *$p< 0.05$ **$p<0.01$

The findings from a t-test show the significant differences of the mean scores in the use of *cognitive* strategies from the beginning to the end of the first semester except item 11. However, the mean scores of all items increased at the end. In other words, the students used all *cognitive* strategies more frequently at the end of the semester.

4.2.2.3 Variations in the use of *compensation* strategies over the semester

Table 4.13 below demonstrates the differences in the mean scores of the students' *compensation* category of language learning strategy use over the semester.

Table 4.13: Variations in the use of *compensation* strategies over the semester

Compensation Strategies	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	2.73	0.84	2.96	0.82	-2.01	.048*
25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gesture.	2.77	0.93	2.92	0.82	-1.26	.214
26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	2.38	0.93	2.79	0.79	-3.41	.001**

Compensation Strategies	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
27. I read in English without looking up every new word.	1.97	0.79	2.32	0.91	-2.96	.004**
28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	2.61	0.80	2.73	0.77	-1.10	.275
29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or a phrase that means the same thing.	2.59	0.86	3.01	0.80	-3.43	.001**

Significance: *$p< 0.05$ **$p<0.01$

Statistically significant differences were found among the mean scores in the use of 4 out of 6 *compensation* strategies (Items 24, 26, 27 and 29) over the semester. The students reported using both significant and non-significant items more frequently at the end of the semester.

4.2.2.4 Variations in the use of *metacognitive* strategies over the semester

Table 4.14 presents the significant differences in the use of *metacognitive* strategies from the beginning to the end of the semester.

Table 4.14: Variations in the use of *metacognitive* strategies over the semester

Metacognitive Strategies	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
30. I try to find as many ways I can use my English.	2.61	0.80	2.93	0.64	-3.01	.004**
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	2.58	0.82	2.83	0.74	-2.45	.017*
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	3.14	0.70	3.34	0.77	-2.02	.047*
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	3.15	0.69	3.38	0.66	-2.50	.015*

Metacognitive Strategies	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	2.49	0.75	2.73	0.68	-2.52	.014*
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	2.69	0.80	2.83	0.86	-1.05	.295
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	2.72	0.94	3.06	0.83	-2.81	.006**
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	2.96	0.90	3.15	0.87	-1.70	.094
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	3.37	0.76	3.59	0.62	-2.33	.023*

Significance: *$p< 0.05$ **$p<0.01$

As displayed in Table 4.14, there were the significant differences in the use of *metacognitive* strategies over the semester in all items except items 35 and 37. The students increased their use of *metacognitive* strategies at the end of the semester, though the differences were significant in some cases and not in others.

4.2.2.5 Variations in the use of *affective* strategies over the semester

The significant differences in the frequency of use of *affective* strategies over the semester are presented in Table 4.15 below.

Table 4.15: Variations in the use of *affective* strategies over the semester

Affective Strategies	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	2.93	0.80	3.08	0.75	-1.35	.181
40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	2.94	0.79	3.32	0.67	-3.84	.000**
41. I gave myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	2.37	0.99	2.65	0.88	-2.69	.009**
42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	2.41	0.97	2.46	0.86	0.47	.641

Affective Strategies	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.	1.38	0.57	1.61	0.77	-2.71	.008**
44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	2.41	0.89	2.63	0.87	-2.20	.031*

Significance: *p< 0.05   **p<0.01

The results show that there were 4 out of 6 items (Items 40, 41, 43 and 44) showing significant differences. The students used these strategies significantly more often at the end of the semester. However, the students also reported using items 39 and 42 more frequently at the end of the first semester, though not significant. Briefly, the mean scores of all *affective* strategies increased by the end of the semester.

4.2.2.6 Variations in the use of *social* strategies over the semester

The results of the t-test in the use of *social* strategies from the beginning to the end of the semester are shown below.

Table 4.16: Variations in the use of *social* strategies over the semester

Social Strategies	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	2.77	1.05	3.11	0.92	-2.98	.004**
46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	2.39	0.71	2.56	0.79	-1.65	.103
47. I practice English with other students.	2.17	0.83	2.62	0.87	-4.42	.000**
48. I ask for help from English speakers.	2.48	0.83	2.90	0.80	-3.12	.003**
49. I ask questions in English.	1.87	0.77	2.28	0.74	-3.57	.001**
50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	2.54	0.99	2.94	0.84	-3.51	.001**

**Significant at p<0.01

Table 4.16 shows that the differences in the frequency of *social* strategies used by students from the beginning to the end of the semester were significant, except for item 46 where no difference was found. However, all *social* strategies were used more frequently at the end of the semester, though some were not significant.

4.2.3 Summary

The analysis results of the differences in the frequency of strategy use between the beginning and the end of the semester by the subjects of the study show some important points.

Statistically significant differences were found in the overall strategy use over the semester. In other words, the students reported using the overall strategy significantly more frequently at the end of the semester. The average mean scores of the overall strategy use increased from the range of low use to medium use.

The results from the t-test show statistically significant differences in the use of all six strategy categories (*memory*, *cognitive*, *compensation*, *metacognitive*, *affective* and *social*) from the beginning to the end of the semester. The students reported using these six strategy categories significantly more often at the end of the semester.

The *metacognitive* strategy category was reported to be the most frequently used while the *memory* strategy category was the least used over the semester.

Interestingly, in terms of individual strategy use, the students reported using all 50 individual items of language learning strategies more frequently at the end of the semester, though the significance was found in the use of 39 out of 50 items and not in others. Only item 5 (*I use rhymes to remember new English words.*), the students reported employing a little less frequently at the end of the semester.

In summary, the students in the study increased their use of language learning strategies over time.

4.3 Research Question 3: **Do subjects with different language proficiency levels employ different language learning strategies?**

To answer research question 3, the paired sample t-test was employed to determine the significant differences in language learning strategies used at the beginning and at the end of the first semester by the subjects in each proficiency level.

The English O-NET scores represented the students' English ability when they first started studying at Thaksin University, while the grades of the English I Course represented the subjects' English proficiency at the end of the semester. The scores were used to group the students into four proficiency groups.

The information on the subjects' English proficiency at the beginning and at the end of the semester in Table 4.17 was compared through a crosstabulation to see whether the subjects had changed their proficiency levels at the end of the semester. The result of the crosstabulation is summarized below.

Table 4.17: Proficiency level groups based on English O-NET scores and Grades of English I Course

		Proficiency groups (English O-NET Scores)				Total
		Group 1 (41-50)	Group 2 (31-40)	Group 3 (21-30)	Group 4 (11-20)	
Proficiency groups (English I Grade)	Group 1 (A)	7	6	0	0	**13**
	Group 2 (B+, B)	0	20	15	3	**38**
	Group 3 (C+, C)	0	0	13	4	**17**
	Group 4 (D+, D)	0	0	0	3	**3**
Total		**7**	**26**	**28**	**10**	**71**

The total number of the subjects in the study was 71. Based on their English proficiency levels at the end of the semester, the students were placed and classified into 4 proficiency groups: Group 1 consisted of 13 students (7 students were originally classified as Group 1 while another 6 moved up from Group 2), 38 students in Group 2 (20 were originally in Group 2, 15 moved up from Group 3, and 3 moved up from Group 4), 17 students in Group 3 (13 were originally in Group 3 while 4 moved up from Group 4), and 3 students in Group 4 (they were placed as the lowest proficiency group both at the beginning and at the end of the semester).

To answer research question number 3, the results are presented in 4 sections as follows:

4.3.1 The results of language learning strategies used by Group 1 students

4.3.2 The results of language learning strategies used by Group 2 students

4.3.3 The results of language learning strategies used by Group 3 students

4.3.4 The results of language learning strategies used by Group 4 students

4.3.1 The results of language learning strategies used by Group 1 students (the highest proficiency group)

The analysis of results in this part is divided into 2 sections: language learning strategies used by 7 students who were placed as the highest proficiency group both at the beginning and at the end of the semester, and learning strategies used by 6 students, originally classified as Group 2, placed in the highest proficiency group at the end of the semester (moving from Group 2 to Group 1). The results are presented below in order.

4.3.1.1 Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 7 students (originally classified as Group 1)

The number of students in this group was 7. They were ranked in the highest proficiency group both at the beginning and at end of the first semester, in the 2010 academic year.

The results of the students' use of overall language learning strategies and six strategy categories are demonstrated in Table 4.18 below.

Table 4.18: Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 7 students (originally classified as Group 1)

Strategy Categories	N	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
Memory	7	2.79	0.55	2.95	0.44	-1.10	.310
Cognitive	7	3.00	0.40	3.13	0.32	-1.83	.116
Compensation	7	3.12	0.43	3.47	0.36	-3.60	.011*
Metacognitive	7	3.73	0.34	3.84	0.36	-1.73	.134
Affective	7	2.86	0.49	3.02	0.26	-1.23	.267
Social	7	2.93	0.46	3.00	0.62	-0.37	.727
Overall	**7**	**3.11**	**0.21**	**3.21**	**0.23**	**-1.50**	**.185**

Significance: *$p< 0.05$

The information in the table indicates that there was no statistically significant difference in the overall learning strategies used by the highest proficiency students between the beginning and the end of the semester, though the mean scores of their use increased ($\bar{x} = 3.11$, and $\bar{x} = 3.21$). The mean scores were in the range of medium use.

Table 4.18 displays that there was a statistical difference in the mean scores of the students' use of *compensation* strategies only. However, the mean scores of use increased in every category, though not significantly. The category of *metacognitive* strategies was ranked as the most frequently used both the beginning and the end of the semester ($\bar{x} = 3.73$, and $\bar{x} = 3.84$) while the category of *memory* strategies was ranked as the least frequently used ($\bar{x} = 2.79$, and $\bar{x} = 2.95$).

4.3.1.2 Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 6 students (newly classified as Group 1)

This group consisted of 6 students classified as the second proficiency group at the beginning of the semester and as the highest proficiency group at the end of the semester. That is, this group of students made progress in their English language learning.

The results of their overall language learning strategy use and strategy categories used over the first semester are in Table 4.19.

Table 4.19: Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 6 students (newly classified as Group 1)

Strategy Categories	N	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
Memory	6	2.43	0.35	2.96	0.15	-3.58	.016*
Cognitive	6	2.35	0.27	3.06	0.21	-4.47	.007**
Compensation	6	2.69	0.31	3.03	0.44	-1.52	.189
Metacognitive	6	2.85	0.23	3.22	0.33	-5.98	.002**
Affective	6	2.31	0.29	2.81	0.46	-5.81	.002**
Social	6	2.28	0.25	2.80	0.27	-3.48	.018*
Overall	**6**	**2.48**	**0.13**	**3.01**	**0.11**	**-6.91**	**.001****

Significance: *$p < 0.05$ **$p < 0.01$

As seen in Table 4.19, there was the statistical difference in the overall language learning strategy use. That is, these 6 students increased their overall strategy use at the end of the semester. The mean scores were 2.48 and 3.01, a range defined as low use and medium use, respectively.

Based on Table 4.19, the results from the t-test showed the statistical significant differences in all categories of strategy use except the *compensation* category. However, the mean scores increased in every category. Interestingly, the students reported employing all categories of language learning strategy more frequently at the end of the semester, though not significant. The most frequent use of strategy category over the semester was *metacognitive* and the least frequent use was *social*.

4.3.2 The results of language learning strategies used by Group 2 students (the second proficiency group)

The total number of Group 2 students was 38. The results of their use of language learning strategies are shown in 3 sections: learning strategies used by 20 students who were ranked in the second proficiency group over the semester, 15 students who were originally in Group 3 and promoted to Group 2 at the end of the semester, and 3 students who were originally in Group 4 and promoted to Group 2 at the end of the semester. The results of their language learning strategies used are demonstrated below in order.

4.3.2.1 Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 20 students (originally classified as Group 2)

This group consisted of 20 students; they were classified as the second proficiency group both at the beginning and at the end of the semester.

A summary of the t-test results for the students' use of language learning strategies in terms of overall strategies and six strategy categories is displayed in Table 4.20 below.

Table 4.20: Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 20 students (originally classified as Group 2)

Strategy Categories	N	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
Memory	20	2.44	0.29	2.62	0.28	-2.19	.041*
Cognitive	20	2.47	0.26	2.79	0.25	-5.67	.000**
Compensation	20	2.73	0.49	2.86	0.37	-1.07	.299
Metacognitive	20	2.97	0.35	3.23	0.31	-4.35	.000**
Affective	20	2.51	0.40	2.67	0.30	-1.74	.099
Social	20	2.55	0.47	2.83	0.34	-3.79	.001**
Overall	**20**	**2.60**	**0.18**	**2.84**	**0.34**	**-7.45**	**.000****

Significance: *$p< 0.05$ **$p<0.01$

The t-test revealed the significant difference in the overall use of language learning strategies over the semester. The students reported employing the overall strategy significantly more often than at the beginning of the semester. The average mean scores were in the medium use range ($\bar{x} = 2.60$, and $\bar{x} = 2.84$).

For the use of six language learning strategy categories, the statistically significant differences were found among the use of *memory* strategies, *cognitive* strategies, *metacognitive* strategies and *social* strategies. In short, the student used these 4 strategy categories significantly more often at the end of the semester. Although the differences were not found in *compensation* and *affective* strategies, the students also reported using these 2 strategy categories more frequently at the end. As also shown in the table, both at the beginning and the end of the first semester, the most frequently used category was *metacognitive*, and the least frequently used was *memory*.

4.3.2.2 Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 15 students (newly classified as Group 2)

The number of students in this group was 15; they were placed in the third proficiency group, classified by English O-NET scores, at the beginning of the semester and they were promoted to the second proficiency group, classified by Grades on English I Course, at the end of the semester.

The mean values of the students' overall strategy use and six categories of strategy use were statistically calculated to examine whether there existed statistically significant differences. The results are reported in Table 4.21.

Table 4.21: Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 15 students (newly classified as Group 2)

Strategy Categories	N	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
Memory	15	2.21	0.36	2.54	0.37	-3.97	.001**
Cognitive	15	2.03	0.25	2.50	0.31	-5.43	.000**
Compensation	15	2.31	0.52	2.63	0.44	-2.53	.024*
Metacognitive	15	2.65	0.22	2.91	0.24	-3.70	.002**
Affective	15	2.24	0.38	2.51	0.37	-2.83	.009**
Social	15	2.19	0.36	2.78	0.27	-4.88	.000**
Overall	**15**	**2.25**	**0.09**	**2.63**	**0.11**	**-15.41**	**.000**

Significance: *$p < 0.05$ **$p < 0.01$

The results in the table above indicate that there was the statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the overall strategy use from the beginning to the end of the semester. The students increased their overall language learning strategy use at the end of the semester. The mean scores increased from the low use range to the medium use range ($\bar{x} = 2.25$, and $\bar{x} = 2.63$).

Regarding the use of strategy categories, Table 4.21 reveals the significant differences in all six categories of language learning strategies used over the semester by these 15 students who were promoted to the second proficiency group at the end of the semester. The students reported using all six strategy categories significantly more frequently at the end of the semester. Table 4.21 displays that the students employed the *metacognitive* strategies the most frequently and they employed the *cognitive* strategies the least frequently.

4.3.2.3 Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 3 students (newly classified as Group 2)

The 3 students in this group were placed in the lowest proficiency group, determined by English O-NET scores, at the beginning of the semester and they moved up to the second proficiency group, determined by Grades on English I course, at the end of the first semester. They were promoted 2 levels higher in the proficiency groups.

The results concerning the significant differences in the use of overall strategy and six strategy categories are provided in Table 4.22.

Table 4.22: Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 3 students (newly classified as Group 2)

Strategy Categories	N	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
Memory	3	1.85	0.46	2.62	0.27	-7.00	.020*
Cognitive	3	1.79	0.45	2.64	0.14	-4.77	.041*
Compensation	3	1.78	0.09	2.83	0.44	-4.36	.049*
Metacognitive	3	2.70	0.28	3.48	0.65	-4.54	.045*
Affective	3	2.22	0.09	2.89	0.67	-1.73	.225
Social	3	1.67	0.16	2.94	0.42	-6.38	.024*
Overall	**3**	**2.00**	**0.15**	**2.90**	**0.04**	**-8.17**	**.015***

Significance: *$p < 0.05$

The mean scores of the overall strategy use, according to the t-test results, showed the significant difference. The students increased their overall strategy use over the semester. The mean score at the beginning of the semester was 2.00, a range defined as low use and the mean score at the end of the semester was 2.90, within a range defined as medium use.

As can be seen in Table 4.22, there were the significant differences in the frequency of the use of strategies in six categories over the semester except for the *affective* strategies, though the significance was not found, the students reported using them more frequently at the end of the semester. In other words, the students reported more frequent use of all strategy categories than at the beginning of the semester, though the differences were found in some cases and not in others. According to the table, the *metacogitive* category was reported to be the most frequently used over the semester. The least frequently used category at the beginning of the semester was *social* and the end of the semester was *memory*.

4.3.3 The results of language learning strategies used by Group 3 students (the third proficiency group)

This group consisted of 17 students. The results of their use of language learning strategies are shown in 2 sections: learning strategies used by 13 students who were classified as the third proficiency group over the semester, and 4 students who were originally in Group 4 and were promoted to Group 3 at the end of the first semester.

4.3.3.1 Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 13 students (originally classified as Group 3)

The 13 students in this group were categorized as the third proficiency group of the study both at the beginning and at the end of the semester.

The analysis of the overall language learning strategy use and six categories of strategy use by these 13 students in Group 3 is examined in Table 4.23 below.

Table 4.23: Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 13 students (originally classified as Group 3)

Strategy Categories	N	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
Memory	13	2.17	0.25	2.37	0.32	-2.06	.062
Cognitive	13	2.19	0.27	2.30	0.18	-1.57	.142
Compensation	13	2.38	0.31	2.58	0.48	-1.35	.201
Metacognitive	13	2.66	0.27	2.77	0.36	-0.75	.468
Affective	13	2.37	0.48	2.54	0.37	-1.41	.183
Social	13	2.28	0.49	2.49	0.68	-1.57	.143
Overall	**13**	**2.35**	**0.15**	**2.44**	**0.10**	**-1.86**	**.087**

The differences in the frequency of overall strategy use over the semester were not significant. The mean scores of the overall strategy were 2.35 and 2.44, defined as being within the range of low strategy use.

According to Table 4.23, from the results of the t-test, there were no significant differences in the mean scores of all six categories of language learning strategy; however, the students employed every category a little more frequently at the end of the semester. The *metacognitive* strategies were the most often used over the semester. The category of *memory* strategies was reported as the least frequently used at the beginning of the semester and the category of *cognitive* strategies was reported as the least used at the end of the semester.

4.3.3.2 Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 4 students (newly classified as Group 3)

The number of students in this group was 4. At the beginning of the semester, they were classified as the lowest proficiency group whereas at the end of the semester, they were promoted to Group 3.

This section discusses the results regarding the students' overall language learning strategy use and six categories of strategy use over the semester by the 4 students in this group.

Table 4.24: Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 4 students (newly classified as Group 3)

Strategy Categories	N	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
Memory	4	1.97	0.29	2.00	0.41	-0.09	.934
Cognitive	4	1.71	0.05	1.93	0.31	-1.24	.302
Compensation	4	1.96	0.25	2.50	0.24	-3.81	.032*
Metacognitive	4	2.42	0.42	2.78	0.39	-1.82	.167
Affective	4	2.00	0.19	2.66	0.19	-4.87	.017*
Social	4	2.29	0.16	2.71	0.34	-3.86	.031*
Overall	**4**	**2.17**	**0.21**	**2.35**	**0.26**	**-5.60**	**.030***

Significance: *$p< 0.05$

Regarding the use of overall strategy, Table 4.24 shows that there were the statistically significant differences in the overall learning strategy use over the semester by the students in this group. The mean scores were 2.17 and 2.35, defined as being within the low use range.

The comparison in the use of six strategy categories between the beginning and the end of the semester also showed the significant differences, the students reported using 3 out of six categories (*compensation*, *affective*, and *social*) significantly more often than at the beginning of the semester. Although the differences were not found in *memory*, *cognitive*, and *metacognitive* strategies, the students also reported using them more frequently at the end of the semester. The most frequently used category both at the beginning and at the end of the semester was *metacognitive* while the least frequently used was *cognitive*.

4.3.4 The results of language learning strategies used by Group 4 students (the fourth proficiency group)

The number of the students in this group was 3; they were classified and placed as the lowest proficiency group both at the beginning and at the end of the semester.

4.3.4.1 Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 3 students (originally classified as Group 4)

The mean values of the use of overall language learning strategy and six categories of language learning strategy gained by these 3 students in group 4 are identified in Table 4.25 below.

Table 4.25: Variations in the frequency of overall strategy and six categories of strategy used by 3 students (originally classified as Group 4)

Strategy Categories	N	Beginning of the semester		End of the semester		t value	Sig.
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
Memory	3	1.96	0.45	2.11	0.40	-1.97	.188
Cognitive	3	2.04	0.22	2.09	0.23	-2.57	.124
Compensation	3	2.11	0.51	2.28	0.35	-1.00	.423
Metacognitive	3	2.37	0.13	2.49	0.12	-1.01	.419
Affective	3	2.22	0.25	1.78	0.51	3.02	.094
Social	3	2.00	0.28	1.87	0.26	4.00	057
Overall	**3**	**2.10**	**0.04**	**2.16**	**0.04**	**-3.02**	**.094**

Table 4.25 shows that the frequency of the overall strategy use over the semester fell into the range of low use without the significant difference ($\bar{x}$ = 2.10, and $\bar{x}$ = 2.16); however, the students reported using the overall strategies a little more frequently than at the beginning of the semester.

As noted in the table, there were no statistically significant differences in the use of strategy categories over the semester. The students reported using 4 out of 6 strategies (*memory*, *cognitive*, *compensation* and *metacognitive*) slightly more often than at the beginning of the semester, and they employed other strategies (*affective* and *social*) less frequently. The *metacognitive* strategies were the most frequently used over the semester. The *memory* strategies were rated as the least frequently used at the beginning of the semester while the *affective* strategies were rated as the least frequently used at the end of the semester.

4.3.5 Summary

The results of the use of language learning strategies by the students with different proficiency levels from the beginning to the end of the first semester of the 2010 academic year present some interesting points. Their use of language learning strategies over the semester is demonstrated in Table 4.26 below:

Table 4.26: Summary of variations in students' use of overall strategy and six categories of strategy over the semester by proficiency levels

Proficiency groups	N	Language learning strategies use over the semester
Group 1 (the highest proficiency group)		
Originally classified as Group 1	7	• The overall language learning strategy use was not significantly different. • The differences in the use of strategy categories were found in only *compensation* strategy category.
Newly classified as Group 1	6	• The overall strategy use significantly increased. • The students employed 5 out of 6 strategies (*memory*, *cognitive*, *metacognitive*, *affective* and *social*) significantly more often at the end of the semester.
Group 2 (the second proficiency group)		
Originally classified as Group 2	20	• There was a significant difference in the overall strategy use from the beginning to the end of the semester. • The students employed 4 out of 6 strategy categories (*memory*, *cognitive*, *metacognitive*, and *social*) significantly more often at end of the semester.
Newly classified as Group 2	15	• There was a significant increase of the overall strategy use over the semester. • The students reported employing all 6 categories significantly more frequently at end of the semester.
Newly classified as Group 2	3	• There was a significant difference in the overall strategy use from the beginning to the end of the semester. • The students employed 5 out of 6 strategy categories (*memory*, *cognitive*, *compensation*, *metacognitive*, and *social*) significantly more often.

Proficiency groups	N	Language learning strategies use over the semester
Group 3 (the third proficiency group)		
Originally classified as Group 3	13	• The difference in the overall strategy use over the semester was not significant. • There were no significant differences in the use of all six strategy categories.
Newly classified as Group 3	4	• There was a significant difference in the use of the overall strategy over the semester. • The students employed 3 out of 6 strategies (*compensation*, *affective*, *social*) significantly more frequently at the end of the semester.
Group 4 (the fourth proficiency group)		
Originally classified as Group 4	3	• No significant differences were found in the overall strategy use over the semester. • From the beginning to the end of the semester, statistical analysis shows that the use of all six categories of strategy was not significantly different.

CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a summary, a discussion of the findings, implications for teaching and learning, and recommendations for further studies. These are presented in the following sections.

5.1 Summary of the study

5.1.1 Objectives of the study

The study aimed at investigating the use of language learning strategies over the first semester of the 2010 academic year by English major students, studying at Thaksin University, with different proficiency levels to see strategy use, strategy change and to look into whether strategy change is related to language proficiency.

5.1.2 Background of the participating students

The 71 first year students majoring in English from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, at Thaksin University, Songkhla Campus, in the 2010 academic year were the subjects in this study. They were 56 females (78.9%) and 15 males (21.1%) whose ages ranged from 17 to 19 years. Most of the students had started learning English in the first grade at primary school while a few had started at kindergarten school.

The subjects were classified into four proficiency groups from—Group 1(the highest proficiency group) – to Group 4 (the lowest proficiency group). The proficiency level of the subjects at the beginning of the semester was identified by their English O-NET scores and the proficiency level of the subjects at the end of the semester was identified by their grades on English I Course.

5.1.3 Research methodology

At the beginning of the semester, the students were assigned into four proficiency groups, in order to see the relationship between the use of language learning strategies and English proficiency. The subjects' use of language learning strategies at the beginning and at the end of the semester were compared to see whether there were changes in their use of language learning strategies. Finally, the use of language learning strategies over the semester by the subjects in each proficiency group was compared to see whether learning strategy change was related to proficiency levels.

The instrument used for collecting the data on the use of language learning strategies over the semester in this study was the 50-item Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), developed by Oxford (1990), version 7.0, which required the students to answer questions on a five-point Likert scale ranging from "*never* or *almost never* use" to "*always* or *almost always* use".

5.2 Discussion of the main findings

5.2.1 Discussion on research question 1

In relation to research question one, *"What are the language learning strategies used by the first year English major students with different proficiency levels at the beginning of the first semester?"*, the results of this present study revealed that there were significant differences in the overall and in the six categories of language learning strategies used by students in the 4 proficiency groups. The students in all 4 proficiency groups employed the *metacognitive* strategy category the most frequently. It can be concluded that the use of language learning strategies was related to proficiency levels: the higher proficiency students used language learning strategies significantly more often than the lower ones.

The current study found the differences in the use of overall strategies among the students with different proficiency levels. This finding is consistent with the previous research findings. The studies by Lappayawichit (1998), Bremner (1999), Green and Oxford (1995), Kaotsombut (2003), Lee (2003), Khalil (2005), Yang (2007), Ni (2007), Wu (2008), Lai (2009), and Radwan (2011) for example, demonstrated that the successful students used overall strategies significantly more often than the unsuccessful ones. Green and Oxford (1995) proposed that students with higher English proficiency reported more frequent use of overall strategies than those with lower English proficiency. Ni (2007) claimed in his study that the higher proficiency students were more aware of the importance of language learning strategies in English language learning and their learning process than the lower proficiency ones so the use of strategies is related to proficiency level.

In addition, the results of the present study also indicated that higher proficiency students reported employing all six categories of language learning strategies (*memory*, *cognitive*, *compensation*, *metacognitive*, *affective* and *social*) significantly more often than lower-proficiency ones. Group 1 (the highest proficiency group) used all six strategy categories more frequently than the other 3 groups, while Group 2 used them more frequently than Group 3 and so on. This present study produced similar results to previous studies (e.g. Goh & Foong, 1997; Bremner, 1999; Mochizuki, 1999; Wharton, 2000; Lan & Oxford, 2003; Lee, 2003; Khalil, 2005; Yang, 2007; Wu, 2008; Lai, 2009; Radwan, 2011), which have concluded that more proficient students used learning strategy categories more frequently than less proficient ones. However, those studies found the relationship in only some strategy categories. For instance, the study done by Goh and Foong (1997) surveyed 175 Chinese students. The results showed that the proficiency level of the students was related to English proficiency especially in the use of two out of six categories of language learning strategies: *cognitive* and *compensation*.

When comparing the results in the use of the six categories of learning strategies with other studies using Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) questionnaire and similar statistical analysis, the present study demonstrated similar results to Lai's study (2009) which examined language learning strategies used by first year students in Taiwan. The results indicated that the

proficiency level of the students had a significant influence on the use of all six categories of language learning strategies. The successful students used all six strategy categories significantly more often than unsuccessful ones did.

Concerning the most preferred strategy categories, all 4 proficiency groups identified the *metacognitive* strategy category as the most frequently used. The results of this current study corresponded to the results of the study of 128 English major students in Oman done by Radwan (2011). The study indicated that all 3 proficiency groups used the *metacognitive* strategies most often. The possible reason for the *metacognitive* strategies, were reported as being used the most frequently, was that the subjects in the study were majoring in English; they were more concerned about their grades in the English course and they had clear goals in their English language learning. In addition, they wanted to do well in English and were also aware of the importance of focusing on learning strategies (Peacock & Ho, 2003). The students made use of the *metacognitive* strategies to plan, monitor and evaluate their language learning process (Ellis, 1994).

5.2.2 Discussion on research question 2

For research question two, *"Do their learning strategies change at the end of the semester?"*, the results of this current study reported that there were significant differences in the use of overall strategy and the six categories of language learning strategies from the beginning to the end of the semester. The mean scores of overall strategy use increased from a low level to a medium level. In conclusion, the students increased their use of language learning strategies over time.

The subjects of the present study were low to medium strategy users; the results were in line with most studies employing Oxford's Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (version 7.0) conducted in EFL settings (Goh & Foong ,1997; Lee, 2003; Wharton, 2000; Ni, 2007; Lai, 2009) where the overall strategy use was reported in the low to medium range.

The possible explanation for changes in the students' use of language learning strategies over the semester could be that when freshman students just entered Thaksin University, they adjusted themselves to the new learning environment. As seen from Table 5.1 below, the students were more satisfied with the learning environment, and with activities and facilities available at Thaksin University. They had more opportunities to use English, so they used language learning strategies more often by the end of the semester. This is supported by Dornyei (1995) who stated that the students reported more frequent use of language learning strategies when they were exposed to certain L2 input more frequently.

Table 5.1: The subjects' satisfaction on English learning facilities and activities available at their high school and at Thaksin University

English Learning Facilities and Activities	N	Opinion for high school		Opinion for Thaksin University		t value	Sig.
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
1. Classroom Condition	71	2.90	0.66	3.72	0.83	-8.01	.000**
2. Language Laboratory	71	2.80	0.95	3.69	0.90	-8.13	.000**
3. Self-study Center	71	2.39	1.09	3.54	0.79	-8.27	.000**
4. Library	71	2.79	0.94	3.79	0.75	-8.68	.000**
5. Computer Center	71	2.45	0.98	2.61	0.89	-7.94	.000**
6. English Learning Activities	71	2.66	1.07	3.45	0.91	-4.81	.000**

Significance: **$p<0.01$

5.2.3 Discussion on research question 3

According to the findings for research question three, *"Do subjects with different language proficiency levels employ different language learning strategies?"*, the results of the current study showed that, the students who were promoted to higher levels of proficiency reported using language learning strategies significantly more frequently at the end of the semester. In contrast, the students who were placed in the same proficiency groups over the semester reported the same or similar frequency of language learning strategy use with no significant difference.

Consequently, it can be concluded that the use of language learning strategies was directly related to progress in language learning.

For example, the results of 6 students who were originally in Group 2 and were then promoted to Group 1 (the highest proficiency group) at the end of the semester demonstrated that they employed the overall strategy and 5 out of 6 strategy categories (*memory*, *cognitive*, *metacognitive*, *affective* and *social*) more often at the end of the semester. This group of students increased their language learning strategy use over the semester. It is likely that the significantly more frequent use of language learning strategies had contributed to their success in language learning. The students gained more opportunities to use English at Thaksin University. Moreover, they were more exposure to authentic, real-life communication activities which seemed to support their opportunities to use a variety of language learning strategies. As shown in Table 5.2, the students were more satisfied with activities and facilities available at Thaksin University than at their previous high schools.

Table 5.2: The satisfaction on English learning facilities and activities of 6 students (promoted from Group 2 to Group1)

English Learning Facilities and Activities	N	Opinion for high school		Opinion for Thaksin University		t value	Sig.
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
1. Classroom Condition	6	2.33	1.03	4.00	0.63	-7.91	.001**
2. Language Laboratory	6	2.00	0.89	3.00	1.26	-2.74	.041*
3. Self-study Center	6	1.83	0.98	3.17	1.47	-4.00	.010*
4. Library	6	1.33	0.82	2.83	0.75	-3.50	.017*
5. Computer Center	6	2.17	0.75	3.50	0.55	-4.00	.010*
6. English Learning Activities	6	2.00	0.89	3.33	0.82	-3.16	.025*

Significance: *$p < 0.05$ **$p < 0.01$

Another example given was the results of the frequency of strategy use by the 3 students who ranked as the lowest proficiency group both at the beginning and at the end of the semester. There were no significant differences in the use of overall strategy and all six categories over the semester. The mean scores of the overall strategy use were in the low level range. The students in this group might not

have been aware of the significance of language learning strategies for the development of their English language proficiency, so that their learning strategy use and their proficiency level did not increase by the end of the semester.

Moreover, as shown in Table 5.3 below, the levels of satisfactions in the activities and facilities available at the students' previous high schools and at Thaksin University were not significantly different. It might be that the students did not participate or make use of those facilities available at the university. The students might have lacked confidence in using the language. This made them choose not to take opportunities they had to use English. This accords with Dhanarattigannon (1990) who stated that the unsuccessful language learners were embarrassed when they used English and made mistakes.

Table 5.3: The satisfaction on English learning facilities and activities of 3 students (classified as Group 4 over the semester)

English Learning Facilities and Activities	N	Opinion for high school		Opinion for Thaksin University		t value	Sig.
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		
1. Classroom Condition	3	3.33	0.58	4.00	0.00	-2.00	.184
2. Language Laboratory	3	3.00	0.00	3.33	0.58	-1.00	.423
3. Self-study Center	3	3.00	1.00	3.67	0.58	-1.00	.423
4. Library	3	2.67	1.53	3.00	1.00	-0.50	.667
5. Computer Center	3	2.33	0.58	3.33	0.58	-1.73	.225
6. English Learning Activities	3	3.33	1.53	2.67	0.58	1.00	.423

5.3 Conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn from the discussion above.

1. The results of the study showed that there was the relationship between the use of language learning strategies and proficiency in English. The higher proficiency students reported employing the overall strategy and all categories of language learning strategies significantly more frequently than lower proficiency ones.

2. The students increased their language learning strategies used at the end of the first semester of the 2010 academic year. The frequency of overall strategy use increased from the range of low use to medium use.

3. The students promoted to higher levels of proficiency reported employing language learning strategies significantly more frequently at the end of the semester whereas the students placed in the same proficiency groups over the semester reported the same or similar frequency of language learning strategy use with no significant difference.

5.4 Pedagogical implications

The findings gained from the current study suggested a number of useful implications for teaching and learning in the Thai context, particularly at Thaksin University. It is very essential for students to know the importance of using language learning strategies in their language learning process.

1. It is necessary for teachers to know what language learning strategies their students use so that they can provide suitable strategy instructions. In addition, teachers should increase their students' current language learning strategy use because students may not be aware that there are many strategies which can facilitate and enhance their English learning. Once students are aware of advantages of learning strategies used, they will use these strategies appropriately.

2. Various kinds of materials and activities should be designed to support students' language learning strategy use. Teachers should integrate the use of language learning strategies with classroom instructions; students can learn how to use new strategies and try to use old strategies effectively.

3. Language learning strategies should be taught to students directly and explicitly. Teachers should introduce various kinds of language learning strategies to their students so that they can find the most appropriate language learning strategies for their needs.

5.5   Recommendations for further studies

Based on the findings of the present study, suggestions for further studies are presented as follows:

1. More research should be conducted to better understand language learning strategy use and the connection between learning strategy use and language proficiency. The following studies need to be done with different groups of language learners with an emphasis on analyzing learners' use of individual learning strategies.

2. It would be interesting to conduct further research to investigate the relationship between the use of language learning strategies and other factors such as age, gender, learning style, nationality, cultural background, motivation, or attitude.

3. Further investigations of language learning strategies should use multiple data collection procedures by combining the use of questionnaires with the use of other research techniques, for example interviews, diary, journal writing, and classroom observation, which will be useful ways of gaining more insights into learners' learning strategy use.

REFERENCES

Abraham, R. G., & Vann, R. J. (1987). Strategies of two language learners: a case study. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.). *Learners strategies in language learning* (pp. 85- 102). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Al-Issa, A. (2006). The cultural and economics politics of English language teaching in Sultanate of Oman. *Asian EFL Journal 8* (1), 194-218.

Anderson, N. J. (2005). L2 learning strategies. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp.757-772). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Anugkakul, G. (2011). A comparative study in language learning strategy of Chinese and Thai students: a case study of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat university. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 19* (2), 163-174.

Bialystok, E. (1978). A theoretical model of second language learning. *Language learning, 28* (1), 69-83.

Bremner, S. (1999). Language learning strategies and language proficiency: Investigating the relationship in Hong Kong. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 55*(4), 490-514.

Brown, D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* NY: Longman.

Chamot, A. U. (1987). The learning strategies of ESL students. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.). *Learners strategies in language learning* (pp. 71-83). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Chamot, A. U. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: Current issues and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 25*, 112-130.

Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). Language learner and learning strategies. In N. C. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp.371-388). UK: Academic Press Ltd.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London: Longman.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Dhanarattiganon, J. (1990). *An investigation on English language learning strategies of the good and poor first year students at Silapakorn University at Sanamchan Palace campus*. Unpublished master's thesis, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Dornyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly, 29* (1), 55-85.

Ehrman, M. E., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). Adults' language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *System, 23* (3), 359-386.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

Gao, X. (2004). A critical review of questionnaire use in learner strategy research. *Prospect, 19* (3), 3-14.

Goh, C., & Foong, K. P. (1997). Chinese ESL students' learning strategies: A look at frequency, proficiency and gender. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics, 2*, 39-53.

Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly, 29* (2), 261-297.

Griffiths, C., & Parr, J. (2001). Language-learning strategies: Theory and perception. *ELT Journal, 53* (3), 247-254.

Griffiths, C. (2003a). *Language learning strategy use and proficiency: The relationship between patterns of reported language learning strategy (LLS) use by speakers of other languages (SOL) and proficiency with implications for the teaching/learning situation.* Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Auckland.

Griffiths, C. (2003b). Patterns of language learning strategy use. *System, 31*, 367-383.

Hashim, R. A., & Sahil, S. A. (1994). Examining learners' language learning strategies. *RELC Journal, 25* (2), pp. 1-20.

Hismanoglu, M. (2000). Language learning strategies in foreign language learning and teaching. *The internet TESL Journal, 6* (8). Retrieved February 27, 2010, from http://iteslj.org.

Hong-Nang, K., & Leavell, A. G. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System, 34* (3), 399-415.

Hsiao, T., & Oxford, R. L. (2002). Comparing theories of language learning strategies: a confirmatory factor analysis. *The Modern Language Journal, 86* (3), 368-383.

Intaraprasert, C. (2007). *Out-of-class language learning strategies and Thai university students learning English for science and technology.* Unpublished thesis, Suranaree University of Technology, Nakhoratchasima, Thailand.

Janphaosaeng, L. (2006). *A study of language learning strategies used by the Matthayom three students at Streeprompanvidhaya School.* Unpublished master's thesis, Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Kaotsombut, N. (2003). *A study of language learning strategies of graduate science students at Mahodol university.* Unpublished master's thesis, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Khalil, A. (2005). Assessment of language learning strategies used by Palestinian EFL learners. *Foreign Language Annals, 38* (1), 108-119.

Khamkhien, A. (2010). Factor affecting language learning strategy reported usage by Thai and Vietnamese EFL learners. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 7* (1), 66-85.

Kitao, K. (1996). Why do we teach English? *The Internet TESL Journal, 2* (4). Retrieved February 27, 2010, from http://iteslj.org.

Lai, Y-C. (2009). Language learning strategy use and English proficiency of university freshmen in Taiwan. *TESOL Quarterly, 43* (2), 255-280.

Lan, R., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). Language learning strategy profiles of elementary school students in Taiwan. *IRAL*, *41*, 339–379.

Lee, K. O. (2003). The relationship of school year, sex and proficiency on the use of learning strategies in learning English of Korean junior high school students. *Asian EFL Journal, 5* (3), 1-36.

Lee, K. R., & Oxford, R. L. (2008). Understanding EFL learners' strategy use and strategy awareness. *The Asian EFL Journal, 10* (2), 7-32.

Lessard-Clouston, M. (1997). Language learning strategies: An overview for L2 teachers. *The Internet TESL Journal, 3* (12). Retrieved February 27, 2010, from http://iteslj.org.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1993). *How language are learned*. Oxford University Press.

Liu, M. (2007). Chinese students' motivation to learn English at the tertiary level. *Asian EFL Journal, 9* (1), 126-146.

Magogwe, J. M., & Oliver, R. (2007). The relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age, self-efficacy beliefs: a study of language learners in Botswana. *System, 35*, 338-352.

Mochizuki, A. (1999). Language learning strategies used Japanese university students. *RELC Journal, 30* (2), 101-113.

Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H. H., & Todesco, A. (1978). *The good language learner*. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

National Institute of Educational Testing Service (NIETS). (2010). *English O-NET test result*. Retrieved February 27, 2010, from http://www.niets.or.th/

Ni, Q. (2007). *The use of language learning strategies by the first year students of Southwest University of Political Science and Law in China*. Unpublished master's thesis, Prince of Songkla University, Songkhla, Thailand.

Nisbet, D., Tindall, E., & Arroyo, A. (2005). Language learning strategies and English proficiency of Chinese university students. *Foreign Language Annals, 38* (1), 100-107.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Understanding language classrooms: A guide for teacher-initiated action*. London: Prentice Hall.

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

Oxford, R. L. (1986). *Second language learning strategies: Current research and implications for practice*. Retrieved February 2010, from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDOS/data/ericdocs2aql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/34/92/c9.pdf.

Oxford, R. L. (1989). Use of language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. *System, 17* (2), 235–247.

Oxford, R. L., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The Modern Language Learning Journal, 73* (3), 291-300.

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

Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL). *System, 23* (1), 1-23.

Oxford, R. L. (1996). Employing a questionnaire to assess the use of language learning strategies. *Applied Language Learning, 7* (1 & 2), 24-45.

Oxford, R.L. (2003). Language learning styles and strategies: Concepts and relationships. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 41* (4), 271-278.

Pakir, A. (2000). The development of English as a glocal language: New concerns in the old saga of language teaching. In H. W. Kam & C. Ward (Eds), *Language in the Global Context: Implications for the Language Classroom* (pp.14-31). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Park, G-P. (1997). Language learning strategies and English proficiency in Korean university students. *Foreign Language Annals, 30* (2), 211–221.

Peacock, M., & Ho, B. (2003). Students language learning strategies across eight disciplines. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13* (2), 179-200.

Porte, G. (1988). Poor Language Learners and their Strategies for Dealing with New Vocabulary. *ELT Journal, 42* (3), 167-172.

Prakongchati, N. (2007). *Factors related to the use of language learning strategies by Thai public university freshmen*. Unpublished Ph.D., Suranaree University of Technology, Nakhoratchasima, Thailand.

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) 115-163.

Richards, J. C., Platt, J. & Platt, H. (1992). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. England: Pearson Education.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly, 9* (1), 41-51.

Rubin, J. (1981). Study of cognitive processes in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 117-131.

Rubin, J. (1987). Learner strategies: Theoretical assumptions, Research history and typology. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp.15-30). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Satta-Udom, S. (2007). *A survey of Language Learning Strategies used by first year students at Mahidol University: the impact of field of study*. Unpublished Master's Degree Dissertation, Mahidol University, Bangkok.

Sheorey, R. (1999). An examination of language learning strategy use in the setting of an indigenized variety of English. *System, 27* (2), 173-190.

Shmais, W. A. (2003). Language learning strategy use in Palestine. *TESL-EJ, 7* (2), 1-13.

Stern, H. H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review, 31*, 304-318.

Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Takeuchi, O. (2003). What can we learn from good foreign language learners. A qualitative study in the Japanese foreign language context. *System, 31*, 385-392.

Tappoon, A. (2008). *Relationship between language learning strategies and cognitive domain of life skills among first-year students at Mahodol university*. Unpublished master's thesis, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Tirabulkul, N. (2005). *A study of language learning strategies of students in the MA program for the TEFL program, Thammasat University*. Unpublished master's thesis, Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Wenden, A. L. (1987). Conceptual background and unity. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp.3-13). London: Prentice Hall International.

Wenden, A. L. & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall International.

Wenden, A. L. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning, 50* (2), 203–243.

Wu, Y-L. (2008). Language learning strategies used by students at different proficiency levels. *Asian EFL Journal, 10* (4), 75-95.

Vann, R. J. & Abraham, R. G. (1990). Strategies of unsuccessful language learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 24* (2), 177–198.

Vidal, R. J. (2002). Is there a correlation between reported language learning strategy use, actual strategy use and achievement? *Linguagem and Ensino, 5* (1), 43–73.

Yang, N. (1999). The relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategy use. *System, 27*, 515-535.

Yang, M-N. (2007). Language learning strategies for junior college students in Taiwan: Investigating ethnicity and proficiency. *The Asian EFL Journal, 9* (2), 35-57.

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.

APPENDIX A

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (English version)

Questionnaire

Language Learning Strategies Used by First Year English Major Students at Thaksin University, Songkhla Campus, Thailand

<u>**Directions**</u>

This form of the **Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) version 7.0** is designed to gather information about how you, as a student of English as a foreign language, do during learning English.

The questionnaire consists of 3 parts:

Part 1: General Information

Part 2: Language Learning Strategies

Part 3: Others

The information you provide will be kept strictly confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Moreover, it will have no effect on your grade.

Thank you very much for your participation

Orawee Pannak

M.A. in Teaching English as an International Language

Department of Language and Linguistics,

Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University,

Hat Yai Campus.

Part 1: General Information

<u>**Direction**</u>

Please fill in the blank and tick $(\sqrt{})$ in the columns that represent your fact

1. Name: _____

2. Student Number: _____

3. Gender: [ ] Male   [ ] Female

4. Age: _____

5. When did you start learning English?

    [ ] Kindergarten   [ ] Primary School

    [ ] Secondary School   [ ] Others (please specify)_____

6. How often do you use English outside classroom?

    [ ] Very often   [ ] Often   [ ] Occasional

    [ ] Rarely   [ ] Never

Part 2: Language Learning Strategies

Directions

      There are 50 statements. Please read each statement carefully, answer in terms of how often you use the strategy by putting a tick (√) on the response number (5, 4, 3, 2, or 1). Do not answer how often how often you think you should be, or how often other people do. There is no right or wrong answer to these statements.

           5 means I always or almost always use this strategy.

           4 means I often use this strategy.

           3 means I sometimes use this strategy.

           2 means I seldom use this strategy.

           1 means I never or almost never use this strategy.

No.	Language Learning Strategies	Frequency of strategy use				
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.					
2.	I use new English words in a sentence so I remember them.					
3.	I connect the sound of a new word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.					
4.	I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.					
5.	I use rhymes to remember new English words.					
6.	I use flash cards to remember new English words.					
7.	I physically act out new English words.					
8.	I review English lessons often.					
9.	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.					
10.	I say or write new English words several times.					

No.	Language Learning Strategies	Frequency of strategy use				
		5	4	3	2	1
11.	I try to talk like native English speakers.					
12.	I practice the sounds of English.					
13.	I use the English words I know in different ways.					
14.	I start conversation in English.					
15.	I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.					
16.	I read for pleasure in English.					
17.	I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.					
18.	I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.					
19.	I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.					
20.	I try to find patterns in English.					
21.	I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.					
22.	I try not to translate word-for-word.					
23.	I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.					
24.	To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.					
25.	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gesture.					
26.	I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.					
27.	I read in English without looking up every new word.					
28.	I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.					

No.	Language Learning Strategies	Frequency of strategy use				
		5	4	3	2	1
29.	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or a phrase that means the same thing.					
30.	I try to find as many ways I can use my English.					
31.	I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.					
32.	I pay attention when someone is speaking English.					
33.	I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.					
34.	I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.					
35.	I look for people I can talk to in English.					
36.	I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.					
37.	I have clear goals for improving my English skills.					
38.	I think about my progress in learning English.					
39.	I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.					
40.	I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.					
41.	I gave myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.					
42.	I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.					
43.	I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.					
44.	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.					
45.	If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.					
46.	I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.					

No.	Language Learning Strategies	Frequency of strategy use				
		5	4	3	2	1
47.	I practice English with other students.					
48.	I ask for help from English speakers.					
49.	I ask questions in English.					
50.	I try to learn about the culture of English speakers					

Part 3: Others

Besides these techniques or behaviors, do you have other language learning strategies?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

APPENDIX B

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (Thai version)

แบบสอบถาม

เรื่อง กลวิธีการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 1 คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์

วิชาเอกภาษาอังกฤษ มหาวิทยาลัยทักษิณ วิทยาเขตสงขลา

คำชี้แจง

        แบบสอบถามฉบับนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อรวบรวมรายละเอียดเกี่ยวกับกลวิธี หรือเทคนิค ในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 1 คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ วิชาเอกภาษาอังกฤษ มหาวิทยาลัยทักษิณ

        แบบสอบถามนี้แบ่งออกเป็น 3 ตอน โปรดตอบทุกตอนและทุกข้อ

ตอนที่ 1 คำถามเกี่ยวกับข้อมูลพื้นฐานของผู้ตอบแบบสอบถาม

ตอนที่ 2 คำถามเกี่ยวกับกลวิธี หรือเทคนิคที่ผู้ตอบแบบสอบถามใช้ในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ
            ตั้งแต่อดีตจนถึงปัจจุบัน จำนวน 50 ข้อ

ตอนที่ 3 ความคิดเห็นเพิ่มเติมเกี่ยวกับกลวิธี หรือเทคนิคการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ

        ผู้วิจัยใคร่ขอความกรุณาให้ท่านตอบแบบสอบถามให้ตรงกับความจริงที่สุด และหวังเป็นอย่างยิ่งที่จะได้รับความร่วมมือจากท่าน ข้อมูลที่ได้จะใช้เพื่อวัตถุประสงค์การวิจัยเท่านั้น และจะเก็บเป็นความลับ ซึ่งจะไม่มีผลกระทบใดๆต่อตัวท่าน

        ขอขอบคุณที่ได้ให้ความร่วมมือในการตอบแบบสอบถามฉบับนี้มา ณ ที่นี้ด้วย

นางสาวอรวีร์ ปานนาค

นักศึกษาปริญญาโท สาขาวิชาการสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษานานาชาติ

คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่

ผู้วิจัย

ตอนที่ 1 ข้อมูลส่วนตัว

โปรดกรอกข้อมูลของท่านลงในช่องว่างที่กำหนด หรือทำเครื่องหมาย (√) หน้าข้อความที่ตรงกับตัวท่านมากที่สุด

1. ชื่อ _____ นามสกุล _____

2. รหัสนักศึกษา _____

3. เพศ   [ ] ชาย   [ ] หญิง

4. อายุ _____ ปี

5. ท่านเริ่มเรียนภาษาอังกฤษตั้งแต่ชั้น
       [ ] อนุบาล   [ ] ประถมศึกษา
       [ ] มัธยมศึกษา   [ ] อื่นๆ (ระบุ) _____

6. ตั้งแต่อดีตจนถึงปัจจุบัน โอกาสของท่านในการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษนอกห้องเรียนอยู่ในระดับใด
       [ ] มากที่สุด   [ ] มาก   [ ] ปานกลาง   [ ] น้อย   [ ] น้อยที่สุด

ตอนที่ 2 กลวิธีการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ

แบบสอบถามชุดนี้มีทั้งหมด 50 ข้อ ขอให้ท่านอ่านข้อความ แต่ละข้ออย่างละเอียดแล้วทำ
เครื่องหมาย (√) ลงในช่องตัวเลข (5, 4, 3, 2, หรือ 1) ที่ตรงกับระดับการปฏิบัติจริงของท่านในการเรียน
ภาษาอังกฤษ

5 หมายถึง ปฏิบัติเป็นประจำ

4 หมายถึง ปฏิบัติค่อนข้างบ่อย

3 หมายถึง ปฏิบัติบางครั้ง

2 หมายถึง ปฏิบัตินานๆ ครั้ง

1 หมายถึง แทบจะไม่ถึงไม่เคยปฏิบัติเลย

ที่	**Language Learning Strategies**	ระดับความเห็น				
		5	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
1.	ในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ ข้าพเจ้าคิดเชื่อมโยงความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างสิ่งที่เรียนรู้มาแล้วกับสิ่งที่ได้เรียนรู้ใหม่					
2.	ข้าพเจ้านำคำใหม่ที่ได้เรียน ไปใช้ในประโยค เพื่อให้จำได้ดียิ่งขึ้น					
3.	ข้าพเจ้าเชื่อมโยงเสียงของคำใหม่ในภาษาอังกฤษกับภาพของคำนั้นเพื่อช่วยให้จำได้ดีขึ้น					
4.	ข้าพเจ้าจดจำคำใหม่ในภาษาอังกฤษ โดยนึกถึงภาพของเหตุการณ์ซึ่งคำเหล่านั้นอาจจะถูกใช้					
5.	ข้าพเจ้าใช้คำพ้องเสียงเพื่อช่วยให้จดจำคำใหม่ในภาษาอังกฤษ					
6.	ข้าพเจ้าใช้ flashcard (บัตรคำซึ่งด้านหนึ่งของบัตรเป็นคำศัพท์ส่วนอีกด้านหนึ่งเป็นคำแปล) เพื่อช่วยในการจำคำใหม่ในภาษาอังกฤษ					
7.	ข้าพเจ้าแสดงท่าทางประกอบ เพื่อช่วยในการจำคำใหม่ ในภาษาอังกฤษ เช่น walk = เดิน ข้าพเจ้าจึงทำท่าทางเดินไปด้วย					
8.	ข้าพเจ้าทบทวนบทเรียนภาษาอังกฤษสม่ำเสมอ					
9.	ข้าพเจ้าจำคำหรือวลีใหม่ในภาษาอังกฤษ โดยการจดจำว่าคำเหล่านั้นอยู่หน้าใดในหนังสือ, ส่วนใดในกระดาษ หรือป้ายใดบนท้องถนน					
10.	ข้าพเจ้าพูดหรือเขียนคำใหม่ในภาษาอังกฤษซ้ำๆหลายๆ ครั้ง					

ที่	Language Learning Strategies	ระดับความเห็น				
		5	4	3	2	1
11.	ข้าพเจ้าพยายามพูดให้มีสำเนียงใกล้เคียงกับเจ้าของภาษา					
12.	ข้าพเจ้าฝึกฝนการออกเสียงภาษาอังกฤษ					
13.	ข้าพเจ้านำคำศัพท์ในภาษาอังกฤษที่ข้าพเจ้ารู้ไปใช้ในสถานการณ์ต่างๆ					
14.	ในการสนทนาภาษาอังกฤษ ข้าพเจ้าเป็นฝ่ายเริ่มบทสนทนา					
15.	ข้าพเจ้าดูรายการโทรทัศน์หรือภาพยนตร์ที่พากย์ภาษาอังกฤษ					
16.	ข้าพเจ้าอ่านสิ่งพิมพ์ภาษาอังกฤษ เพื่อความเพลิดเพลิน					
17.	ข้าพเจ้าจดโน้ต, ข้อความ หรือเขียนจดหมาย, รายงานเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ					
18.	ในการอ่านบทความภาษาอังกฤษ ข้าพเจ้าอ่านผ่านๆ ให้ได้ใจความ ก่อนที่จะกลับมาอ่านโดยละเอียดอีกครั้ง					
19.	ข้าพเจ้าคิดถึงคำในภาษาไทยที่มีความหมายใกล้เคียงกับคำศัพท์ใหม่ในภาษาอังกฤษ					
20.	ข้าพเจ้าศึกษารูปแบบการเรียงประโยคในภาษาอังกฤษ					
21.	ข้าพเจ้าหาความหมายของคำในภาษาอังกฤษโดยการแบ่งคำนั้นๆ ออกเป็นส่วนๆ เช่น แบ่งตามรากศัพท์					
22.	ข้าพเจ้าพยายามไม่แปลภาษาอังกฤษแบบคำต่อคำ					
23.	เมื่อฟังหรืออ่านภาษาอังกฤษ ข้าพเจ้าจะสรุปข้อมูล ที่ได้ฟังหรืออ่านเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ					
24.	ข้าพเจ้าใช้วิธีการเดา เพื่อให้เข้าใจคำในภาษาอังกฤษที่ไม่คุ้นเคย					
25.	ข้าพเจ้าใช้ท่าทางประกอบระหว่างการสนทนาภาษาอังกฤษเมื่อข้าพเจ้า นึกคำภาษาอังกฤษไม่ออก					
26.	ข้าพเจ้าใช้คำอื่นแทน เมื่อข้าพเจ้าไม่รู้คำที่ถูกต้องในภาษาอังกฤษ เช่น ใช้คำว่า the head of the school แทนคำว่า the principal					
27.	ข้าพเจ้าอ่านภาษาอังกฤษ โดยไม่ต้องค้นหาความหมายของคำใหม่ทุกคำ					

ที่	Language Learning Strategies	ระดับความเห็น				
		5	4	3	2	1
28.	ในการสนทนาภาษาอังกฤษ ข้าพเจ้าพยายามเดาว่าคู่สนทนาจะพูด อะไรต่อไป					
29.	ถ้าข้าพเจ้าคิดคำในภาษาอังกฤษไม่ออก ข้าพเจ้าจะใช้คำหรือวลีที่มี ความหมายเหมือนหรือใกล้เคียงกันแทน					
30.	ข้าพเจ้าพยายามหาโอกาสที่จะได้ใช้ในภาษาอังกฤษเท่าที่จะทำได้					
31.	ข้าพเจ้าสังเกตข้อผิดพลาดในการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษของตนเอง และใช้ ข้อผิดพลาดเหล่านั้น เพื่อช่วยให้ ข้าพเจ้าเรียนได้ดีขึ้น					
32.	ข้าพเจ้าตั้งใจฟัง เมื่อได้ยินคนพูดภาษาอังกฤษ					
33.	ข้าพเจ้าพยายามหาวิธีการที่จะทำให้เรียนภาษาอังกฤษได้ดีขึ้น					
34.	ข้าพเจ้าจัดตารางเวลา เพื่อให้มีเวลาเพียงพอที่จะเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ					
35.	ข้าพเจ้ามองหาคนที่ข้าพเจ้าสามารถพูดคุยเป็นภาษาอังกฤษกับเขาได้					
36.	ข้าพเจ้าหาโอกาสที่จะอ่านภาษาอังกฤษให้ได้มากที่สุดเท่าที่จะเป็นไป ได้					
37.	ข้าพเจ้ามีเป้าหมายชัดเจนในการปรับปรุง/พัฒนาทักษะภาษาอังกฤษ ของข้าพเจ้า					
38.	ข้าพเจ้าคาดหวังในความก้าวหน้า/การพัฒนาในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ ของข้าพเจ้า					
39.	ข้าพเจ้าพยายามผ่อนคลาย เมื่อรู้สึกกลัวที่จะต้องใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ					
40.	ข้าพเจ้าให้กำลังใจตนเองเมื่อต้องพูดภาษาอังกฤษ แม้ว่าจะกลัวความ ผิดพลาด					
41.	ข้าพเจ้าให้รางวัลกับตนเองเมื่อใช้ภาษาอังกฤษได้ดี					
42.	ข้าพเจ้ารู้สึกกังวลหรือเครียดในขณะที่กำลังเรียน หรือใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ					
43.	ข้าพเจ้าเขียนบรรยายความรู้สึกในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ ในสมุด บันทึกประจำวัน					
44.	ข้าพเจ้าเล่าถึงความรู้สึกขณะเรียนภาษาอังกฤษให้ผู้อื่นฟัง					

ที่	Language Learning Strategies	ระดับความเห็น				
		5	4	3	2	1
45.	ในการสนทนาภาษาอังกฤษ ถ้าข้าพเจ้าไม่เข้าใจสิ่งที่ผู้พูดพูด ข้าพเจ้า จะขอให้ผู้พูด พูดช้าลง หรือพูดซ้ำ					
46.	ในระหว่างที่ข้าพเจ้าสนทนาเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ ข้าพเจ้าขอให้ผู้ที่ใช้ ภาษาอังกฤษคนอื่นๆ (อาจารย์/เพื่อนนักศึกษา) แก้ไขการใช้ ภาษาอังกฤษของข้าพเจ้า					
47.	ข้าพเจ้าฝึกฝนภาษาอังกฤษกับเพื่อนนักศึกษา					
48.	ข้าพเจ้าขอความช่วยเหลือเกี่ยวกับการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษจากผู้ใช้ ภาษาอังกฤษคนอื่นๆ (อาจารย์/เพื่อนนักศึกษา)					
49.	ข้าพเจ้ามักจะถามคำถามเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ					
50.	ข้าพเจ้าพยายามเรียนรู้เกี่ยวกับวัฒนธรรมของผู้ที่เป็นเจ้าของภาษา					

ตอนที่ 3 อื่นๆ

นอกจากกลวิธี หรือพฤติกรรมการเรียนที่ระบุข้างต้น ท่านมีวิธีในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษทั้งใน และนอกห้องเรียนอื่นๆ อีกหรือไม่ โปรดระบุ

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

APPENDIX C

The questionnaire about English learning environment (English version)

Questionnaire

Language Learning Strategies Used by First Year English Major Students at Thaksin University, Songkhla Campus, Thailand

---

<u>Directions</u>

This questionnaire aims to gather information on the first year English major students' levels of satisfaction on English learning environment available at their previous high schools and at Thaksin University.

The questionnaire is divided into of 3 parts:

Part 1: General Information

Part 2: English learning facilities and activities

Part 3: Others

Please response all items with your fact. The information you provide will be kept strictly confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Moreover, it will have no effect on your grade.

Thank you very much for your participation

Orawee Pannak

M.A. in Teaching English as an International Language

Department of Language and Linguistics,

Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University,

Hat Yai Campus.

Part 1: General Information of Students

1. Students Number: _____

2. Name of your high school: _____

    Province: _____

Part 2: **English Learning Facilities and Activities**

1. How satisfied are you with English learning facilities and activities available at your previous high school and Thaksin University? If any facilities or activities are not available at your high school please tick (√) 1.

Level of satisfaction: 5 = Most satisfied
                            4 = Very satisfied
                            3 = Moderately satisfied
                            2 = Slightly satisfied
                            1 = Least satisfied or none

English Learning Facilities and Activities	Level of opinion for your high school					Level of opinion for Thaksin University				
	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
1. Classroom Condition										
1.1 Class size										
1.2 Classroom comfort										
1.3 Other materials (computer, blackboard, projector and over-head projector)										
2. Language Laboratory										
3. Self-study Center										
4. Library										
4.1 Additional English textbooks and exercise books										

English Learning Facilities and Activities	Level of opinion for your high school					Level of opinion for Thaksin University				
	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4.2 English newspaper and magazines										
4.3 Other materials (audio taps CDs, DVDs) for self-learning										
4.4 Borrowing English soundtrack movies										
5. Computer Center										
5.1 Numbers of computers compared with the number of students										
6. English Learning Activities										
6.1 English camp										
6.2 English seminars										
6.3 Special English course										
6.4 Field trip										
6.5 English singing contest										

Part 3: Others

1. Besides English learning facilities and activities mentioned above, do your high school provide any other facilities or activities to promote your English language learning?
    1) _____
    2) _____

2. Besides English learning facilities and activities mentioned above, do Thaksin University offer any other facilities or activities to support your English language learning?
    1) _____
    2) _____

APPENDIX D

The questionnaire about English learning environment (Thai version)

แบบสอบถาม

เรื่อง กลวิธีการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 1 คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์

วิชาเอกภาษาอังกฤษ มหาวิทยาลัยทักษิณ วิทยาเขตสงขลา

___

คำชี้แจง

    แบบสอบถามฉบับนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อรวบรวมความคิดเห็นเกี่ยวกับสิ่งอำนวยความสะดวกหรือ
กิจกรรมต่างๆที่มีผลต่อการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 1 คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์
วิชาเอกภาษาอังกฤษ มหาวิทยาลัยทักษิณ

    แบบสอบถามนี้แบ่งออกเป็น 2 ตอน โปรดตอบทุกตอนและทุกข้อ

ตอนที่ 1 คำถามเกี่ยวกับข้อมูลพื้นฐานของผู้ตอบแบบสอบถาม

ตอนที่ 2 คำถามเกี่ยวกับสิ่งอำนวยความสะดวกหรือกิจกรรมต่างๆที่ส่งผลต่อการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษของผู้ตอบ
       แบบสอบถาม จำนวน 6 ประเด็น

ตอนที่ 3 ความคิดเห็นเพิ่มเติมเกี่ยวกับสิ่งอำนวยความสะดวกหรือกิจกรรมต่างๆ

    ผู้วิจัยใคร่ขอความกรุณาให้ท่านตอบแบบสอบถามให้ตรงกับความจริงที่สุด ข้อมูลที่ได้จะนำไปใช้เพื่อ
วัตถุประสงค์การวิจัยเท่านั้น และจะเก็บเป็นความลับ ซึ่งจะไม่มีผลกระทบใดๆต่อตัวท่าน

    ผู้วิจัยขอขอบคุณสำหรับความร่วมมือในการตอบแบบสอบถามฉบับนี้มา ณ ที่นี้ด้วย

<div align="right">

นางสาวอรวีร์ ปานนาค

นักศึกษาปริญญาโท สาขาวิชาการสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษานานาชาติ

คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่

ผู้วิจัย

</div>

ตอนที่ 1 ข้อมูลส่วนตัว

1. รหัสนักศึกษา _____

2. สำเร็จการศึกษาชั้นมัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 6 จากโรงเรียน _____

    จังหวัด _____

ตอนที่ 1: สิ่งแวดล้อมและสิ่งอำนวยความสะดวกต่างๆ

1. คุณพึงพอใจกับสิ่งอำนวยความสะดวก หรือกิจกรรมต่างๆต่อไปนี้ของโรงเรียนมัธยมปลายของคุณ
   และมหาวิทยาลัยทักษิณในระดับใด (หากโรงเรียนมัธยมของคุณ หรือมหาวิทยาลัยทักษิณไม่มีสิ่งใด
   ต่อไปนี้ โปรดทำเครื่องหมาย (√) ในช่อง 1)

ระดับความเห็น: 5 หมายถึง มากที่สุด

                        4 หมายถึง มาก

                        3 หมายถึง ปานกลาง

                        2 หมายถึง น้อย

                        1 หมายถึง น้อยที่สุด หรือ ไม่มี

สิ่งอำนวยความสะดวก หรือกิจกรรมต่างๆ	ระดับความเห็นที่มีต่อร.ร.มัธยมปลาย					ระดับความเห็นที่มีต่อมหาวิทยาลัย				
	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
1. สภาพห้องเรียนและอุปกรณ์										
1.1 ขนาดชั้นเรียน										
1.2 ความสะดวกสบายของห้องเรียน										
1.3 สื่อการเรียน										
2. ห้องปฏิบัติการทางภาษา										
3. ศูนย์การเรียนรู้ด้วยตนเอง										

สิ่งอำนวยความสะดวก หรือกิจกรรมต่างๆ	ระดับความเห็นที่มีต่อร.ร.มัธยมปลาย					ระดับความเห็นที่มีต่อมหาวิทยาลัย				
	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
4. สำนักห้องสมุด										
4.1 หนังสือและแบบฝึกหัดเสริมบทเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ										
4.2 นิตยสารและหนังสือพิมพ์ภาษาอังกฤษ										
4.3 สื่ออื่นๆ เช่น ม้วนเทป หรือ ซีดี เพื่อใช้ฝึกภาษาด้วยตนเอง										
4.4 บริการยืมภาพยนตร์พากย์ภาษาอังกฤษ										
5. สำนักคอมพิวเตอร์										
5.1 จำนวนอุปกรณ์ในห้องปฏิบัติการต่อจำนวนนักศึกษา										
5.2 คุณภาพและความทันสมัยของอุปกรณ์ในห้องปฏิบัติการ										
6. กิจกรรมเสริมการเรียนรู้										
6.1 ค่ายภาษาอังกฤษ										
6.2 การอบรม หรือสัมมนาทางภาษา										
6.3 การสอนเสริมภาษาอังกฤษ										
6.4 การทัศนศึกษานอกสถานที่										
6.5 การประกวดร้องเพลงภาษาอังกฤษ										

ตอนที่ 2: อื่นๆ

1. นอกเหนือจากสิ่งต่างๆที่ระบุข้างต้น โรงเรียนมัธยมปลายของคุณมีสิ่งอำนวยความสะดวกอื่นๆอีก หรือไม่ โปรดระบุ

    1) _____

    2) _____

2. นอกเหนือจากสิ่งต่างๆที่ระบุข้างต้น มหาวิทยาลัยทักษิณของคุณมีสิ่งอำนวยความสะดวกอื่นๆอีก หรือไม่ โปรดระบุ

    1) _____

    2) _____

APPENDIX E

LETTER OF CONSENT FOR SILL

--Original Message--

From: อรวีร์ ปานนาค <orrawe@hotmail.com>
To: rebecca_oxford@yahoo.com
Sent: Sun, May 23, 2010 10:17:56 PM
Subject: Asking for permission to use SILL version 7.0 (ESL/EFL)

Dear Professor,

My name is Orawee Pannak. A master's students in Teaching English as an International Language Program, Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Thailand. I am conducting a study on the topic of "Language Learning Strategies Used by First Year Students at Thaksin University, Songkhla Campus, Thailand."

The study aims to investigate language learning strategies used by language learners at the beginning and at the end of the first semester, 2010 academic year focusing the use of strategies, the changes of strategies used by the students in the study, and the relationship between learning strategies used and language proficiency.

To accomplish the aim of the study, it is essential to use the appropriate instrument to collect data. Consequently, I would like to ask for your permission to use the ESL/EFL SILL version 7.0 that you have developed in my study.

Looking forward to your reply and thank you very much for your kindness.

Yours faithfully,

Orawee Pannak

Subjects: Re: Asking for permission to use SILL version 7.0 (ESL/EFL)
From: ▢ **Rebecca Oxford** (rebecca_oxford@yahoo.com)
Date: 24 พฤษภาคม 2553 12:52:49
To: อรวีร์ ปานนาค (orrawe@hotmail.com)

Dear Friend,

You have my permission to use the SILL in your research.
 I wish you all the best.

Sincerely,
 Dr. Oxford

Rebecca L. Oxford, Ph.D.
Professor of Language Education and Research
Language Department
U.S. Air Force Culture and Language Center
60 West Maxwell Blvd., Building 835
Air University
Maxwell Air Force Base, AL 36112
Office phone: 334/953-8034

Formerly:
Professor of Second Language Education and Culture
University Distinguished Scholar-Teacher
College of Education
2311 Benjamin Building
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Active e-mail addresses:
Professional: rebecca.oxford@maxwell.af.mil; roxford@umd.edu
Personal: rebeccaoxford@gmail.com, rebecca_oxford@yahoo.com

VITAE

Name   Miss Orawee Pannak

Students ID   5211120015

Education Attainment

Degree	Name of Institution	Year of Graduation
Bachelor of Arts (English)	Thaksin University	2007

List of Publication and Proceeding

Pannak, O., & Chiramanee, T. (2011). Language Learning Strategies Used by First Year Students at Thaksin University, Songkhla Campus, Thailand [Abstract]. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Humanities and Social Sciences*, Thailand: Prince of Songkla University (p.18).