A Study of English Language Learning Strategies of 3rd Year
English Major Students at Naresuan University
การศึกษาการใช้กลยุทธ์การเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษของนิสิตชั้นปีที่ 3
สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ มหาวิทยาลัยนเรศวร

Nutcha Kaewcharernnet[1] and Khampee Noonkhan[2]

ณัชชา แก้วเจริญเนตร[3] และคัมภีร์ นูนคาน[4]

Abstract

The objective of this study is to investigate the use of language learning strategies of English major students in the faculty of Humanities, Naresuan University. The participants are 50 third-year English major students in the second semester of the academic year 2020. The strategy inventory for language learning (SILL) Version 7.0 from Oxford (1989) was used as the research instrument. The obtained data were analyzed by using percentages, means, and standard deviations. The findings show that the participants are classified as medium frequency users ($\bar{x}$ = 3.31, S.D. = 0.95). When considering each strategy, cognitive strategies are the most frequently used ($\bar{x}$ = 3.42, S.D. = 0.94), followed by memory strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 3.32, S.D. = 0.92), social strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 3.31, S.D. = 0.95), and effective strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 3.20, S.D. = 0.95).

Keyword: Language Learning Strategies, Tertiary level, English major

Introduction

English is an international language that is very important today because it is widely used in international communication. However, even though Thai English learners have spent years studying English, there are few successful learners. In addition, the English proficiency of Thai learners is still not satisfactory. Many studies aimed to investigate why the level of English language skills of Thai learners is low (Kunasaraphan, 2015). English language ranking of many organizations, such as EF English Language Index (EF EPI) (2019) showed that the ranking of English language skills of Thai people in 2019 continues to fall for the third consecutive year. Thailand ranks 74th out of 100 countries and has a total score of 47.62 which is considered very low proficiency. The ranking has made Thailand the third lowest in Southeast Asia.

In addition, Jindaprasert (1997) found that Thai students are passive They lack enthusiasm and are accustomed to teaching methods that accept knowledge without expressing themselves. Students are only interested in doing good grades. These behaviors make language learning difficult and ineffective. This needs to

---

[1] Undergraduate student, Department of English, Faculty of Humanities, Naresuan University

[2] Lecturer, Department of English, Faculty of Humanities, Naresuan University

[3] นิสิตระดับปริญญาตรี สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ คณะมนุษยศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยนเรศวร

[4] อาจารย์ประจำภาควิชาภาษาอังกฤษ คณะมนุษยศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยนเรศวร

be changed. Moreover, Thailand fully participated in the ASEAN community in 2015, making English more important. Therefore, it is a challenge to push the learning and development of the English language skills of Thai students to be equal to those of English language learners in the ASEAN Member States. (Wutwongsa, 2015)

Oxford (1990) defines learning strategies as steps that students use to promote learning and describes learning strategies are the specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations.

Due to the reasons mentioned above, this study aims to investigate the use of language learning strategies of 3rd-year English major students of Naresuan University and to find out which learning strategies most students use to learn English.

This research will be useful for English teachers. In order to achieve the highest success in learning English, studying learners' language learning strategies is an important way for teachers to know how their students are learning and how teaching should be adapted to the students' learning characteristics.

Research Objective

The objective of this study is to investigate the use of language learning strategies of 3rd year English major students of Naresuan University.

Research Questions

Which language learning strategies are the most and the least used by 3rd year English major students of Naresuan University?

Definition of Language Learning Strategies

Oxford (1990) describes learning strategies as "the specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situation."

According to Oxford (1990), direct learning strategies are a set of mental processes for learning, such as memory, cognitive and compensation strategies, which influenced and were involved in foreign language learning directly.

From Oxford and Crookall (1989), memory strategies are defined as the techniques specifically tailored to help the learner store new information in memory and retrieve it later.

Cognitive strategies are the skills that involve manipulation or transformation of the language in some direct way, e.g., through reasoning, analysis, note-taking, functional practice in naturalistic settings, formal practice with structures and sounds, etc. (Oxford & Crookall, 1989).

Indirect learning strategies include metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. Although indirect learning strategies are not directly involved in language learning, they can support direct learning strategies and manipulate language learning (Xiao & Lynch, 2017).

Oxford and Crookall (1989) also defined effective strategies as the techniques like self-reinforcement and positive self-talk which help learners gain better control over their emotions, attitudes, and motivations related to language learning.

Social strategies are the actions involving other people in the language learning process. Examples are questioning, cooperating with peers, and developing empathy (Oxford & Crookall, 1989).

Literature Review

Theoretical Framework of Language Learning Strategies

The term language learning strategy has been defined by many researchers. One of the earliest researchers in this field, Rubin (1975), described learning strategies as "the techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge".

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

Rubin (1987) identified two kinds of learning strategies: those which contribute directly to learning, and those which contribute indirectly to learning. These are:

1. **Learning Strategies** contribute directly to the development of the language system constructed by the learner. They were divided into two main types:

(a)   **Cognitive Learning Strategies** refer to the steps or operations used in learning or problem-solving that require direct analysis, transformation, or synthesis of learning materials. Rubin identified 6 main cognitive learning strategies contributing directly to language learning: Clarification / Verification, Guessing / Inductive Inferencing, Deductive Reasoning, Practice, Memorization, Monitoring.

(b)   **Metacognitive Learning Strategies** are used to oversee, regulate, or self-direct language learning. They involve various processes as planning, prioritizing, setting goals, and self-management.

2. **Communication Strategies** focus on the process of participating in a conversation and getting meaning across or clarifying what the speaker intended. Communication strategies are used by speakers when faced with some difficulty due to the fact that their communication ends outrun their communication means or when confronted with misunderstanding by a co-speaker.

3. **Social Strategies** are those activities learners engage in which afford them opportunities to be exposed to and practice their knowledge. Although these strategies provide exposure to the target language, they contribute indirectly to learning since they do not lead directly to the obtaining, storing, retrieving, and using of language (Wenden and Rubin, 1987).

Oxford (1990) provided a definition of learning strategies as "the specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to a new situation."

Oxford's categorization of language learning strategies included two main types, direct strategies, and indirect strategies. Direct strategies consist of memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies while indirect strategies include metacognitive, affective, and social strategies (Oxford, 1990).

Direct strategies involve working with the language itself in a variety of specific tasks and situations, divided into three categories as follows:

1. **Memory strategies** relate to how students remember the language in order to store and retrieve new information.

(a) Creating mental linkages (grouping, associating/elaborating, placing new words into a context)

(b) Applying images and sound (using imagery, semantics mapping, using keywords, representing sounds in memory)

(c) Reviewing well (structured reviewing)

(d) Employing action (using physical response or sensation, using mechanical techniques)

2. **Cognitive strategies** relate to how students think about their learning and comprehend and perform new language by various methods ranging from repeating to analyzing and summarizing.

(a) Practicing (repeating, formally practicing with sounds and writing systems, recognizing and using formulas and patterns, recombining, practicing naturalistically)

(b) Receiving and sending (getting the idea quickly, using resources for receiving and sending messages)

(c) Analyzing and reasoning (reasoning deductively, analyzing expressions, analyzing contrastively, translating, transferring)

(d) Creating structure for input and output (taking notes, summarizing, highlighting)

3. **Compensation strategies** enable students to make up for their limited knowledge and overcome limitations in target language skills.

(a) Guessing intelligently (using linguistics clues, using other clues)

(b) Overcoming limitation in speaking and writing (switching to the mother tongue, getting help, using mime or gesture, avoiding communication partially or totally, selecting the topic, adjusting or approximating the message, coining words, using a circumlocution or synonym)

Indirect strategies are used for general management of learning, including three categories as follows:

1. **Metacognitive strategies** involve the ways students manage their learning, establish their cognition, arrange plans and evaluate their progress.

(a) Centering your learning (overviewing and linking with already known material)

(b) Arranging and planning your learning (finding out about language learning, organizing, setting goals and objectives, identifying the purpose of a language task, planning for a language task, seeking practice opportunities)

(c) Evaluating your learning (self-monitoring, self-evaluating)

2. **Affective strategies** relate to students' feelings, emotional reactions, and anxiety.

(a) Lowering your anxiety (using progressive relaxation, deep breathing, or meditation, using music, using laughter)

(b) Encouraging yourself (making positive statements, taking risks wisely, rewarding yourself)

(c) Taking your emotional temperature (listening to your body, using a checklist, writing a language learning diary, discussing your feelings with someone else)

3. **Social strategies** involve learning interaction with others.

(a) Asking questions (asking for clarification or verification, asking for correction)

(b) Cooperating with others (cooperating with peers, cooperating with proficient users)

(c) Empathizing with others (developing cultural understanding, becoming aware of others' thoughts and feelings)

This study is based on the concept of Oxford (1990) by using a questionnaire designed by Oxford (1989), the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL) version 7.0. Shmais (2003) stated that it is one of the most useful instruments for measuring language learners' learning strategies. There are 40-50 studies using SILL for studying language learning. Moreover, The SILL appears to be the only language learning strategy instrument that has been checked for reliability and validated in multiple ways (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995 as cited in Shmais, 2003). Many previous measures were not adopted for many studies because they lacked reliability and validity data (Shmais, 2003). For this reason, the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL) version 7.0 was used in this study to investigate English language learning strategies.

Related Literature

Thai research

Foster, Sriphrom and Nampanya (2012) investigated language learning strategies (LLSs) used by 357 first year students at Rajamangala University of Technology Isan Surin Campus to study the role of the variables genders and English language proficiency levels on students' language learning strategies used by using Oxford's strategy inventory for language learning (SILL) questionnaire. The findings of the study revealed that all participants reported a medium frequent use strategy on the SILL.

Arunreung, Wichiranon, Oonwattana (2017) studied the English language learning strategies of 215 second-year students in the faculty of Liberal Arts, Rajamangala University of Technology Phra Nakhon to compare the learning strategies among gender, three fields of study, and English language achievement. The study findings revealed that the overall use of English language learning strategies was at the medium level.

Ninpanit (2017) studied the use of LLS among 75 first-year undergraduate students at Valaya Alongkorn Rajabhat University under the Royal Patronage to compare and contrast the use of LLS between Thai students of English and English learners from other ASEAN member countries, namely Cambodian and Vietnamese university

students. The results indicated that the Thai learners' use of LLS was moderate and that the most preferred strategies were metacognitive strategies and the least preferred was cognitive strategies.

Nitiwatthana (2016) studied the use of the English language learning strategies of 172 second-year students of the faculty of Education, Chaiyaphum Rajabhat University to examine the relationships between the strategies and their genders, programs, and levels of English proficiency. The findings show that these learners, as a whole, reported medium frequency of use of language learning strategies, regarding their programs and students' level of English proficiency.

Sukkrong and Yordchim (2014) explored strategies in learning English of 256 students at Nakhon Si Thammarat Rajabhat University. The results indicated that all three groups of these students "always" to "usually" used the strategy of metacognitive. Cognitive strategies and compensation strategies were found that the high and medium ability groups from "always" to "usually" used these two strategies whereas the low ability group "usually did not" to "almost never" used them.

Kunasaraphan (2015) identified whether English language learning strategies are commonly used by the first-year students at International College, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, and explored whether there was a difference in these students' use of six direct and indirect English learning strategies between the different levels of their English proficiency. The questionnaire used as a research instrument was comprised of two parts: General information of participants and the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). The results of the analysis revealed that English learning strategies commonly used by the first-year students include six direct and indirect strategies, including differences in strategy use of the students with different levels of English proficiency.

Khamkhien (2011) reported the results of an investigation into language learning strategies commonly used by Thai and Vietnamese university students, using the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) developed by Oxford (1990) and semi-structured interviews. The finding showed a comparison of the patterns of language learning strategies used by the two student groups revealed some resemblances and differences, illustrating what teachers and students should know to successfully teach and learn English, respectively.

Gomaratut (2016) studied the use of foreign language learning strategies of under-graduate students in Bangkok and surroundings and compare the differences in using the foreign language learning strategies of undergraduate students. The sample used in the study was 455 fourth-year students studying English, Chinese, and Japanese majors in the undergraduate level of universities in Bangkok and surroundings. The research instruments consisted of rating scale questionnaires adapted from Oxford's Strategy Inventory for Language Learning Version 7.0 with reliability at 9425 and interviews. The results of the study found that the use of foreign language learning strategies of undergraduate students in English, Chinese, and Japanese majors was at a moderate level overall and the students in different majors used language learning strategies indifferently.

Foreign research

Mandasari and Oktaviani (2018) used semi-structured interviews to explore the English language learning strategies used by management and engineering students of Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia (UTI). They found that English language learning strategies used by Management and Engineering students are not significantly different. The result showed that both groups almost use the same strategy in learning English, affective strategy is the strategy that is mostly used followed by memory strategy.

Other studies related to English language learning strategies were studied by Tam (2013). He investigated the relationship between gender, second language proficiency, socioeconomic status, and language learning strategies (LLSs) with 50 first-year university students from the Hong Kong Polytechnic University by using Oxford's strategy inventory for language learning (SILL) questionnaire. The major finding was that males and females had a significant difference in using memory, compensation, cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategies to learn English, with females using all of these strategies more frequently than males. It was also found that socioeconomic status would greatly influence local university students' use of Social Strategies.

Nguyen and Terry (2017) found that there is a larger-scale study on English LLSs among tertiary students in the context of Vietnam. The findings are of a textual and interpretative nature with emerging themes and issues related to the attitudes towards and actual use of LLSs among the target learners. The findings provide practical implications for practitioners, researchers, and educational policymakers alike.

Mega, Santihastuti, and Wahjuningsih (2019) focused on the most frequently used strategy by the successful and unsuccessful senior high school students and describe the difference of strategy used by them by using Oxford's strategy inventory for language learning (SILL) questionnaire. The statistical analysis showed that metacognitive became the most frequently learning strategy used by successful students on the scale of high use, while the unsuccessful students were medium users of cognitive strategy. It also indicated successful learners employed all six categories of strategies in a high frequency than the unsuccessful ones. This makes the assumption that successful students have the ability to plan clear goals, control, review, and evaluate their learning rather than unsuccessful students who focus more on the way they think, memorize, summarize, and repeat the learning.

Fewell (2010) used Oxford's strategy inventory for language learning (SILL) questionnaire to study language learning strategy (LLS) utilization by Japanese college EFL students. A comparison of differences in LLS utilization and English language proficiency levels revealed that the selection of LLS chosen may have been a critical source in determining language learning success or failure. In most studies comparing English proficiency and the SILL, a correlation has been found between increased English proficiency and increased LLS utilization. In this study, the English major group indicated just the opposite. As English proficiency level increased, LLS utilization decreased. The SILL results of the top 25% of English proficient learners had an average score of 2.9 while the bottom 25% had an average score of 3.5. In each separate category, the SILL score of the bottom group was higher than the top group.

In summary, the language learning strategies have been studied by many researchers, but in several previous studies, it did not seem to be conclusive that the varieties of language learning strategies (such as participants' differences in gender, education, faculty, and age, etc.) were significant in their use of language learning strategies. However, it can be said that each learner used different English learning strategies, which means that learners with a high level of English ability can use language-learning strategies more often and more efficiently than those who have a low level of English ability. The researcher aims to study the use of English learning strategies of the 3rd year students of Naresuan University, which is the language learning strategy most students use in learning English. This study should help English language teachers understand their students' language learning strategies and help them develop English language skills more efficiently.

Research Methodology

Participants

Purposive sampling was used to recruit the participants of the study. The participants were 50 third-year English major students of the faculty of Humanities at Naresuan University.

Research Instrument

The instrument used to explore language learning strategies was the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) Version 7.0 (Oxford, 1989), which was a 50-item questionnaire. In this study, the researcher selected to study 4 strategies, which were *memory strategies, cognitive strategies, effective strategies,* and *social strategies* with a total of 35 items out of 50. The 35 items were divided as follows:

Part A = Memory strategies (9 items)

Part B = Cognitive strategies (14 items)

Part C = Affective strategies (6 items)

Part D = Social strategies (6 items)

The question form was open-ended and contained explanations for answering questions. Frequency rates for using various strategies were divided into 5 levels as follows:

1. Never or almost never true of me

2. Usually not true of me

3. Somewhat true of me

4. Usually true of me

5. Always or almost always true of me

Data Collection and Analysis

The data were collected in (205354) Trends and Topics in English Literature classes on August 10, 2020. As coordinating with the instructor, the questionnaires were distributed to 50 third-year English major students in the class. The obtained data were analyzed to find percentages, mean, and standard deviation. Determining the

frequency of the strategies by using the mean scores in each group strategy, the ranges of the frequency of the strategy used (Oxford, R., 1990) as follows:

       1.0 - 2.49 = Low Strategy Use

       2.50 - 3.49 = Medium Strategy Use

       3.50 - 5.00 = High Strategy Use

Research Findings

Symbols used in data analysis and data analysis

Symbols and characters used in the analysis of the data for convenience and understanding in the interpretation are as follows:

       N   = Number of participants

       $\bar{x}$ = Mean score

       S.D.   = Standard deviation

The frequency of the strategies was determined by using the mean scores in each group strategy, the ranges of the frequency of the strategy use (Oxford, R., 1990) as follows:

       1.0 - 2.49 = Low Strategy Use

       2.50 - 3.49 = Medium Strategy Use

       3.50 - 5.00 = High Strategy Use

Research Findings

Oxford's categorization of language learning strategies included two main types: direct strategies and indirect strategies. In this study, the language learning strategies were selected to study related to 4 strategies, which are memory strategies (9 items), cognitive strategies (14 items), affective strategies (6 items), and social strategies (6 items) with a total of 35 items out of 50. The results of the analysis are presented as follows.

Table 1: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL): Memory strategies

Items	Statements	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Ranges of the frequency
1	I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	3.62	0.90	High
2	I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.	3.62	0.92	High
3	I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.	3.52	1.01	High

Items	Statements	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Ranges of the frequency
4	I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	3.64	0.85	High
5	I use rhymes to remember new English words.	2.98	0.96	Medium
6	I use flashcards to remember new English words.	2.96	1.12	Medium
7	I physically act out new English words.	3.06	0.71	Medium
8	I review English lessons often.	3.06	0.91	Medium
9	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	3.42	0.91	Medium
Total		3.32	0.92	Medium

Table 1 shows that the use of memory strategies is medium (considering the total mean score) ($\bar{x}$ = 3.32). The top 3 memory strategies were "I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used." ($\bar{x}$ = 3.64, S.D. = 0.85), "I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English." ($\bar{x}$ = 3.62, S.D. = 0.90), and "I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them." ($\bar{x}$ = 3.62, S.D. = 0.92).

Table 2: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL): Cognitive strategies

Items	Statements	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Ranges of the frequency
10	I say or write new English words several times.	3.22	0.97	Medium
11	I try to talk like native English speakers.	3.62	1.12	High
12	I practice the sounds of English.	3.88	0.96	High
13	I use the English words I know in different ways.	3.34	0.89	Medium
14	I start conversations in English.	3.06	0.82	Medium
15	I watch SL language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	3.54	0.95	High
16	I read for pleasure in English.	3.50	0.79	High
17	I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.	3.36	0.88	Medium
18	I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	3.46	0.95	Medium
19	I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	3.46	0.91	Medium
20	I try to find patterns in the English.	3.48	0.89	Medium

Items	Statements	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Ranges of the frequency
21	I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	3.58	0.93	High
22	I try not to translate word for word.	3.18	1.06	Medium
23	I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	3.18	1.02	Medium
Total		3.42	0.94	Medium

Table 2 shows that the use of cognitive strategies is medium (considering the total mean score) ($\bar{x}$ = 3.42). The top 3 cognitive strategies were "I practice the sounds of English." ($\bar{x}$ = 3.88, S.D. = 0.96), "I try to talk like native English speakers." ($\bar{x}$ = 3.62, S.D. = 1.12), and "I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand." ($\bar{x}$ = 3.58, S.D. = 0.93).

Table 3: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL): Affective strategies

Items	Statements	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Ranges of the frequency
24	I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	3.60	0.76	High
25	I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	3.52	0.84	High
26	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	3.14	1.05	Medium
27	I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	3.32	0.84	Medium
28	I write down my feelings in a language learning dairy.	2.54	1.13	Medium
29	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	3.10	1.05	Medium
Total		3.20	0.95	Medium

Table 3 shows that the use of affective strategies is medium (considering the total mean score) ($\bar{x}$ = 3.20). The top 3 affective strategies were "I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English." ($\bar{x}$ = 3.60, S.D. = 0.76), "I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake." ($\bar{x}$ = 3.52, S.D. = 0.84), and "I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English." ($\bar{x}$ = 3.32, S.D. = 0.84).

Table 4: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL): Social strategies

Items	Statements	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Ranges of the frequency
30	If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	3.44	0.99	Medium
31	I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	3.28	0.95	Medium
32	I practice English with other students.	3.30	0.97	Medium
33	I ask for help from English speakers.	3.22	1.06	Medium
34	I ask questions in English.	3.10	0.86	Medium
35	I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	3.52	1.05	High
Total		3.31	0.98	Medium

Table 4 shows that the use of social strategies is medium (considering the total mean score) ($\bar{x}$ = 3.31). The top 3 social strategies were "I try to learn about the culture of English speakers." ($\bar{x}$ = 3.52, S.D. = 1.05), "If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again." ($\bar{x}$ = 3.44, S.D. = 0.99), and "I practice English with other students." ($\bar{x}$ = 3.30, S.D. = 0.97).

Table 5: Overall Statistics for Students' Strategy Use (N = 50)

Strategies	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Rank	Ranges of the frequency
Cognitive strategies	3.42	0.94	1	Medium
Memory strategies	3.32	0.92	2	Medium
Social strategies	3.31	0.98	3	Medium
Affective strategies	3.20	0.95	4	Medium
Overall strategies	3.31	0.95	-	Medium

Table 5 presents the rank ordering of the strategy according to frequency use. The descriptive statistics for the overall strategy use ($\bar{x}$ = 3.31, S.D. = 0.95) show that the participants are considered as medium strategy users. The data show that the participants are classified as medium frequency users of each of the four-categories of strategy with mean strategy with mean statistics ranging between = 2.50 - 3.49. Cognitive strategies are the most frequently used ($\bar{x}$ = 3.42, S.D. = 0.94), followed by memory strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 3.32, S.D. = 0.92), social strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 3.31, S.D. = 0.95) and affective strategies are the least frequently used ($\bar{x}$ = 3.20, S.D. = 0.95).

Conclusion and Discussion

According to the research findings, it can be concluded that the participants are classified as medium-frequency users of each strategy. The results of this study are similar to previous studies: Nitiwattana (2016); Ninpanit (2017); Arunreung, Wichiranon & Oonwattana (2017); Gomaratut (2016); and Foster, Sriphrom & Nampanya (2016); Phonhan (2016); Khamkhien (2011). However, when considering each strategy, there are differences in the ranks of the learning strategies.

The research findings show that the majority of the questionnaire participants used cognitive strategies, and they are considered medium strategy users. The results of the study are similar to Gomaratut (2016). This study investigated the use of foreign language learning strategies of 455 undergraduate students from eight universities. From all the items in the SILL under memory strategies, "I practice the sounds of English." was the most frequently used, and followed by "I try to talk like native English speakers." It seems that cognitive strategies were more related to students' language learning than other strategies. Moreover, Gomaratut (2016) discussed the relationship between academic performance and the use of learning strategies, and she stated that the use of cognitive strategies of students in the English major was more associated with academic performance than other strategies. On the other hand, the findings of this research were different from Nitiwattana (2016) and Arunreung, Wichiranon & Oonwattana (2017). When considering each strategy, the cognitive strategies were the least frequently used and ranked last.

In terms of memory strategies, participants are also considered medium strategy users. The results are similar to the findings of Nitiwattana (2016), Ninpanit (2017), and Gomaratut (2016). Gomaratut reported that the ranking order of memory strategies came after cognitive strategies. From all the items in the SILL under memory strategies, "I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used." was the most frequently used. She pointed out that learners of language that require a lot of memorization, such as Japanese major students, use more memory strategies than those of English major students. (Gomaratut, 2016). However, in the Khamkhien (2011) and Phonhan (2016) study results, the memory strategies were last ranked.

For social strategies, participants were classified as medium-frequency users. This finding has a similar aspect to Foster, Sriphrom & Nampanya (2016), Ninpanit (2017), and Gomaratut (2016). As can be seen from Gomaratut's (2016) study, "I try to learn about the culture of English speakers." was the most frequently used item in the SILL under social strategies. However, In Khamkhien's study reported the different usage between Thai and Vietnamese students. For Thai students, this category ranked fourth, while it was second for Vietnamese students. He pointed out that Thai students lack the opportunity to use or interact in English outside the classroom or attend events in which English is primarily used as a means of communication. In addition, it may be said that a majority of Thai students are shy to speak English with other people (Khamkhien, 2011).

According to the research results, it can be seen that effective strategies were the least frequently used. The results were similar to the findings of Gomaratut (2016) and Tam (2013). From this result, Gomaratut (2016) assumed that it may cause those affective strategies to be less related to students' English learning than other strategies. In contrast, the findings of this study were different from Mandasari & Oktaviani (2018) and Phonhan

(2016). Phonhan (2016) reported that this category ranked second out of 6-category. It can be said that the learning strategies employed by the students are different because of several characteristics of participants.

In short, this study can be concluded that the participants are classified as medium frequency users of each strategy. The overall findings of the study are similar to the many previous studies (Nitiwattana, 2016; Ninpanit, 2017; Arunreung, Wichiranon & Oonwattana, 2017; Gomaratut,2016; and Foster, Sriphrom & Nampanya, 2016; Phonhan, 2016; Khamkhien, 2011). However, when considering each strategy, there are differences in the ranks of the learning strategies. As can be seen from the findings of this study, cognitive strategies were the most frequently used, followed by memory strategies, social strategies, and effective strategies are the least frequently used. Phonhan (2016) stated that the learning strategies employed by the students are different because of several characteristics of participants.

Further Research

1. Researchers should collaborate with teachers from other courses or universities to collect data for a larger population.
2. The data of different genders, language proficiency, field of study, etc. should be compared to find the differences in using language learning strategies for future study.
3. Interview should be used to collect research data to understand more about language learning strategies.

References

Arunreung, A., Wichiranon, S., & Oonwattana, P. (2017). *The Study of English Learning Strategies of Liberal Arts Students, Rajamangala University of Technology Phra Nakhon.* Doctoral dissertation, Rajamangala University of Technology Phra Nakhon. Retrieved from https://repository.rmutp.ac.th/bitstream/handle/123456789/2588/LARTS_61_17.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

EF English Proficiency Index. (2019). *The world's largest ranking of countries and regions by English skills.* Retrieved September 21, 2019, from https://www.ef.co.th/epi/

Fewell, N. (2010). Language learning strategies and English language proficiency: an investigation of Japanese EFL university students. *TESOL Journal*, 2, 159-174.

Foster, T. S., Sriphrom, C., & Nampanya, R. (2012). An Investigation of Language Learning Strategies Used, Gender and Language Proficiency Among First-Year Students at Rajamangala University of Technology Isan. *RMUTI JOURNAL Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 92-102.

Gomaratut, S. (2016). *The Study of Foreign Language Learning Strategies of Under-graduate Students in Bangkok and Surroundings*. Doctoral dissertation, Dhurakij Pundit University. Retrieved from https://www.dpu.ac.th/dpurc/assets/uploads/public/1agepzvdihj4w4c8s4.pdf

Hismanoglu, M. (2000), Language Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching, *The Internet TESL Journal*, 6(8). Retrieved from http://iteslj.org/Articles/Hismanoglu-Strategies.html

Khamkhien, A. (2011). Language Learning Strategies Used by Thai and Vietnamese University Students. *MANUSYA: Journal of Humanities Regular*, 14(2), 1-23.

Kunasaraphan, K. (2015). English Learning Strategy and Proficiency Level of the First Year Students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 1853-1858.

Mandasari, B. & Oktaviani, L. (2018). English Language Learning Strategies: An Exploratory Study of Management and Engineering Students. *Premise: Journal of English Education*, 7(2), 61-78.

Mega, D., Santihastuti, A. and Wahjuningsih, E. (2019). The Learning Strategies Used by EFL Students in Learning English. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 6(1), 10-20.

Nguyen, H. and Terry, R. D. (2017). English Learning Strategies among EFL Learners: A Narrative Approach. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*, 3(1), 4-19.

Ninpanit, S. (2017). Language Learning Strategies of First-year Undergraduate Students. *Valaya Alongkorn Review (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, 7(2), 1-12.

Nitiwatthana, K. (2016). The study of English Language Learning Strategies Used by Second-year Students of the Faculty of Education, Chaiyaphum Rajabhat University. *Online Journal for Graduate Study, Faculty of Education (JGED),* 105-123.

Oxford, R. L. (1989). *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL).* Retrieved from https://richarddpetty.files.wordpress.com/2010/03/sill-english.pdf

Oxford, R. L., & Crookall, D. (1989). Research on language learning strategies: Methods, findings, and instructional issues. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 404–419.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know.* New York: Newbury House.

Phonhan, P. (2016). Language Learning Strategies of EFL Education Students: A Case Study of Thai Undergraduate Students. *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences*, *Humanities, and Arts,* 16(2), 115-135.

Shmais, A. W. (2003). Language Learning Strategy Use in Palestine. *TESL-EJ*, 7(2), 1-13.

Sukkrong, J. and Yordchim, S. (2014). English Learning Strategies of Students at Nakhon Si Thammarat Rajabhat University. *Research and Development Journal Suan Sunamdha Rajabhat University*, 9(2), 90-99.

Tam, C. H. K. (2013). A Study on Language Learning Strategies (LLSs) Of University Students in Hong Kong. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics*, 11(2), 1-42.

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

Wutwongsa, N. (2015). Motivational Strategies: Enhancing English Language Skills. *Excutive Journal*, 34(1), 89-97.