

The Use of Good and Poor Language Learner Strategies and of the Cognitive, Meta-cognitive, Social and Affective Strategies by English Language Students in the Hashemite University

Dr. Mohammed M. Obeidat
Department of Curriculum & Instruction
College of Education Sciences
Hashemite University
Zarqa - Jordan

**استخدام إستراتيجيات متعلّم اللغة الجيد والضعيف،
والإستراتيجيات المعرفية، وما وراء المعرفية، والاجتماعية،
والوجدانية من قبل طلبة اللغة الإنجليزية
في الجامعة الهاشمية**

د. محمد محي الدين عبيدات
قسم المناهج والتدريس
كلية العلوم التربوية
الجامعة الهاشمية
الزرقاء - الأردن

استخدام إستراتيجيات متعلم اللغة الجيد والضعيف، والإستراتيجيات المعرفية، وما وراء المعرفة، والاجتماعية، والوجدانية من قبل طلبة اللغة الإنجليزية في الجامعة الهاشمية

د. محمد محي الدين عبيدات

قسم المناهج والتدريس

كلية العلوم التربوية

الجامعة الهاشمية

الزرقاء - الأردن

ملخص

هدفت هذه الدراسة بشكل رئيس إلى استقصاء استخدام إستراتيجيات المتعلمين للغة الإنجليزية بشكل جيد وضعيف، واستخدام الإستراتيجيات المعرفية، وما وراء المعرفة، والاجتماعية، والوجدانية، من قبل طلبة اللغة الإنجليزية في الجامعة الهاشمية. وقد استخدم الباحث استبانته وزعت على ٣٠٠ طالب وطالبة. أشارت النتائج بأن الطلبة استخدموا بشكل أكبر خمس إستراتيجيات يتبناها متعلمو اللغة الجيدون، بالإضافة إلى الإستراتيجيات الاجتماعية وما وراء المعرفة. كما أشارت إلى وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية ($\alpha = 0,05$) بين استجابات الطلبة للإستراتيجيات المعرفية، وما وراء المعرفة، والاجتماعية من ناحية مستوى الدراسة، والمعدل التراكمي، والطلاقة اللغوية.

The Use of Good and Poor Language Learner Strategies and of the Cognitive, Meta-cognitive, Social and Affective Strategies by English Language Students in the Hashemite University

Dr. Mohammed M. Obeidat

Department of Curriculum & Instruction
College of Education Sciences
Hashemite University
Zarqa - Jordan

Abstract

This study mainly aimed at investigating the use of good and poor language learner strategies and of the cognitive, meta-cognitive, social and affective by English language students in the Hashemite University. The researcher used a questionnaire distributed to 300 students.

Results indicated that the students used five main strategies adopted by good language learners in addition to the social and meta-cognitive strategies. Results also indicated statistically significant differences ($\alpha= 0.05$) between their responses to the meta-cognitive, cognitive and social strategies according to study level, grade point average and language proficiency.

The Use of Good and Poor Language Learner Strategies and of the Cognitive, Metacognitive, Social and Affective Strategies by English Language Students in the Hashemite University

Dr. Mohammed M. Obeidat

Department of Curriculum & Instruction
College of Education Sciences
Hashemite University
Zarqa - Jordan

Introduction

There are many factors which contribute to the success or failure in language learning. One of these factors is the strategy of learning an individual adopts in order to learn something new in the language. A learning strategy can be defined as a learning process which is consciously selected by the learner. The element of choice is important here because this is what gives a strategy its special character. In addition, the element of consciousness is what distinguishes "strategies" from those processes that are not "strategic" (Cohen, 1998). The learning strategy can also be defined as a choice that the learner makes while learning or using the second language that affects learning in the teaching-learning context (Cook, 2001).

Learning strategies are of two major types. The first type is direct and the second is indirect. The direct strategies are memory, cognition, and compensation, whereas the indirect are metacognitive, affective and social strategies (Oxford, 1990).

Extensive research that goes much deeper into learning strategies has been carried out by (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990) within an overall model of second language (L2) learning based on cognitive psychology. They have defined four main types of strategy used by L2 students. The first type is the cognitive which involves con-

scious ways of tackling learning, such as note-taking, resourcing and elaboration. The second is the metacognitive which involves planning and thinking about learning, such as planning one's learning, monitoring one's own speech or writing and evaluating how well one has done. The third type is the social that involves learning by interacting with others, such as working with fellow students or asking the teacher's help. The fourth type is the affective which serves to regulate emotions, motivation and attitudes.

The research has identified the learning strategies often used by people who are good at languages. Good language learners employ five main strategies, which are active participation, the realization of the language as a system, the view of language as communication and the realization that learning a language involves affective problems (Rubin, 1975). These learners also take risks wisely in the language-learning situation, make efforts to discover the way in which language learning works, cooperate with other language learners, repeat something over and over and use the native language for an expression or adding word endings from the new language onto words from the native (Oxford, 1990).

In addition, good language learners often have the will to guess accurately, and to communicate or to learn for communication. They also have the desire to practise the language, and to monitor their own speech, or to attend to meaning and form (Johnson, 2001).

However, poor language learners use different learning strategies. These strategies are preference of written work and dependence on the teacher's help (Naiman, Frohlich, Stern & Todesco, 1978).

Many studies were done on the area of language-learning strategy use in various teaching-learning contexts. Some of these studies were conducted on the strategies employed by second language learners in general and others were conducted on good and poor language learners in particular. In addition, various studies took into account a range of variables to measure. However, the studies reviewed are the ones available and they could be regarded in a way or another to be relevant to the present study.

In terms of the types of strategies English as a second language (ESL) students used in general in the teaching-learning context, it was found that cognitive strategies accounted for the majority of those reported by the students, namely 53 per cent, whereas the metacognitive accounted for 30 per cent and the social made up the remaining 17 per cent (O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Kupper, & Russo, 1985).

In a qualitative study carried out by (Takeuchi, 2003) in the Japanese foreign language (FL) context about good and poor second language learners, results showed that the metacognitive, memory and cognitive strategies were especially favoured by the good ones. However, the results showed that poor learners were for spoon feeding; that is the teacher's detailed explanation of language elements.

As regards the cognitive strategies, results indicated that they were used by students with intermediate proficiency, whereas metacognitive and social ones were employed by those with high proficiency. Results also indicated that males used cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies much more than females (Wharton, 2000).

Similar results were obtained with regard to metacognitive strategies. It was found that the students who were good at Russian could self-manage themselves with the language concerning specific learning behaviors and skills, particularly when they dealt with course materials and classroom activities (Rivers, 2001).

In terms of gender, different results were obtained. It was found that cognitive and metacognitive strategies were used significantly more often by females and that males used more affective strategies (Catalan, 2003). These results are in agreement with those obtained by (Peacock & Belinda, 2003) and by (Catalan, 2003). However, the results obtained by (Phakiti, 2003) agree with those found by (Wharton, 2000) but they disagree with what was found by (Peacock & Belinda, 2003) and (Catalan, 2003). Phakiti (2003) stated that males reported significantly higher use of metacognitive strategies than females.

In the same study carried out by (Peacock & Belinda, 2003), it was found that older students were strong in affective and social strategies. This agrees with what (Snow & Hoefnagel-Hohle, 1978) stated. They stated that older learners were better at using strategies while learning Dutch.

In respect to strategy use and learners' achievement, it was found that older and younger high achievers were better than the lower in the use of metacognitive, social and compensation strategies (Snow & Hoefnagel-Hohle, 1978). This result generally supports the results found by (Yamamori, Isoda, Hiromori & Oxford, 2003). They stated that there was a strong correlation between achievement and the use of a wide array of learning strategies.

We see from the studies above that the majority indicated a high correlation between proficiency, achievement and age and the greater use of strategies. In terms of gender, the studies differed in their results. Some indicated that more strategies were significantly employed by males and vice versa. However, these studies were done in contexts different from ours. Therefore, it was necessary to conduct this study in Jordan to shed more light on the learning strategies (e.g., good and poor learner strategies) students adopt while learning English as a second language and on their use of the cognitive, metacognitive, social and affective strategies. The study will involve four variables: sex, level of study, grade average and language proficiency.

Aims of the study

This study aims at investigating the use of a set of learning strategies (i.e., good and poor language learner strategies) by a sample of English language students at the Hashemite University. It also aims at investigating the type(s) of learning strategies (i.e., cognitive, metacognitive, social and affective strategies) they favour while learning the language. Moreover, the study aims to explore whether there are any significant differences in their responses to the four strategy types. More specifically, the study attempts to find answers to the following questions:

1. What are the learning strategies the students use while learning the language?
2. What are the types of learning strategies the students favour in the teaching-learning context?
3. Are there any statistically significant sex differences ($\alpha= 0.05$) between the means of students' responses to each strategy type?
4. Are there any statistically significant differences ($\alpha= 0.05$) between the means of students' responses to each type according to study level?
5. Are there any statistically significant differences ($\alpha= 0.05$) in the students' responses according to grade point average?
6. Are there any statistically significant differences ($\alpha= 0.05$) in their responses according to language proficiency?

Importance of the study

The importance of this study lies in the value of the area under investigation, and in the educational level of the subjects chosen for the purposes of the study. That is, the learning strategy or the type(s) of strategies used by learners is regarded to be an important factor, which contributes to acquiring a second or foreign language in the teaching-learning context. This factor does not only influence boys and girls in school but it also influences university students. Such great influence on these students has led the researcher to conduct this study whose purpose is to explore the use of some good and poor language learner strategies and the use of some types of strategies by English language majors at the university level.

Research method and procedures

Population versus sample

The population of the study consists of all English majors studying at the Hashemite University (N=460). Two hundred and five students are males and two hundred and fifty-five are females. The

sample of the study is three hundred first-, second-, third- and fourth-year students. This sample was chosen randomly from the files that are normally kept by their academic supervisors. The computer slips also helped in this regard. One hundred and thirty six students are males and one hundred and sixty four are females. Table 1 shows the distribution of students over sex and level of study.

Table (1)
Distribution of the questionnaire according to sex & level of study

Sex	Study year				Total sample
	First-year	Second-year	Third-year	Fourth-year	
Male	27	25	41	43	136
Female	50	49	40	25	164
Total	77	74	81	68	300

Research instrument

The research instrument employed to achieve the aims of this study is a questionnaire, through which a set of language-learning strategies often used by good and poor learners and four main strategy types are explored. Through this questionnaire, four major variables are also explored: sex, level of study (study year), grade point average (2-2.49 points/ satisfactory, 2.50-2.99/ good, 3-3.69/ very good and 3.70-4/ excellent), and language proficiency (good, fair and poor).

33 items were suggested in the questionnaire for measurement. These items were divided into two sets. The first set consisted of 13 items related to learning strategies often adopted by the learners who are good and poor at learning the second language, whereas the second consisted of 20 items associated with strategy types. 9 of these items were designated to cognitive strategies, 5 to

metacognitive, 4 to social and 2 to affective. Then the two sets were put in a four-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4).

To know the face validity of the questionnaire, I have given it to a group of instructors chosen from the teaching staff at the Faculty of Educational Sciences (Two of whom are specialists in evaluation and assessment, 3 in psychology and 1 in English language teaching methodology). It was also offered to 2 English staff members. In light of their comments and suggestions, 2 items from the second set of the questionnaire were deleted since, as the instructors indicated, they would not assess exactly what they were intended to assess.

In order to find out the reliability factor of the questionnaire, a Test-Re-Test way of analysis was employed on 50 of the students who were not involved in the study. The results of this analysis indicated that the correlation coefficient was found to be .83.

The items of each set in the questionnaire (see appendix) were distributed randomly. In terms of the first set, items 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 were concerned with good language learner strategies while items 2 and 8 were concerned with the poor one. In respect to the second set, items 14, 16, 18, 20, 24, 25, 27, 28, and 30 were concerned with cognitive strategies while items 15, 17, 21 and 29 were concerned with metacognitive. In addition, items 19, 22 and 26 dealt with measuring the students' social strategies while items 23 and 31 dealt with measuring students' affective strategies.

Three hundred and fifty questionnaires were handed to the students through their instructors. The percentage of the questionnaires returned was approximately 86%. which means 50 questionnaires were not returned. The reason, as the instructors told me, is that they were not able to force the students to return them since the matter was regarded to be voluntary. As soon as the questionnaires were received, the data were transcribed for the need of statistical analysis. The Cronbach alpha was obtained and found to be .82

The questionnaire was subjected to a reliability assessment using an SPSSX statistical package. It demonstrated internal reliability, achieving a Cronbach alpha of ($\alpha=.85$) with all the items, producing a significant item-total scale correlation.

Statistical procedures

This study used particular statistical techniques in the data analysis. They are the means, standard deviation and the analysis of variance (One-way ANOVA). The means and the standard deviation were used for the arrangement of the items of the two sets in the questionnaire and for indicating whether there are statistical significant differences ($\alpha= 0.05$) between the means of students' responses to the cognitive, metacognitive, social and affective strategies.

Presentation of results

In order to answer the first question 'What are the learning strategies the students use while learning the language?', the means of students' responses to the items of the first part of the questionnaire were arranged decreasingly in order to show which learning strategy was employed more than the other. This is shown in table 2.

Table 2 shows that the mean of students' responses to the learning strategies they adopt while learning the language is close to each other. However, the table indicates that the first five strategies the students put to greater use are associated with expanding knowledge ($M=2.93$), making guesses ($M=2.86$), seeking opportunities to speak the language ($M=2.80$), practicing self-correction ($M=2.75$) and making mistakes in order to learn and communicate ($M=2.72$). This table also indicates that the learning strategy "practising written work" ($M=2.64$), which is often used by poor language learners, is much more used than "learning the language by rote" strategy ($M=2.50$).

Table (2)
Mean scores & students' learning strategies

	Item	Mean	S D
1.	I pay attention to expanding my knowledge.	2.93	.96
2.	I make guesses about things that I do not know in the target language.	2.86	.98
3.	I seek opportunities to speak the language.	2.80	.95
4.	I practise self-correction during communication.	2.75	.94
5.	I make mistakes in order to learn and to communicate.	2.72	.93
6.	I create opportunities to use the language.	2.64	.91
7.	I make efforts to discover the way in which language learning works by reading books.	2.64	.99
8.	I find appropriate ways of adapting or modifying the teaching situation to suit me.	2.64	.98
9.	I practise written work, such as grammar exercises.	2.64	.94
10.	I challenge the demands of foreign language.	2.63	.97
11.	I use native language expressions in the target language.	2.62	.95
12.	I take risks in language learning situations although there is a chance for making mistakes.	2.57	.89
13.	I learn the language by rote.	2.50	1.07

In order to answer the second question 'What are the types of learning strategies the students favour while learning the language?', the strategy types were arranged according to the mean of students' responses to the items of each. That is, they were organized decreasingly. See Table 3.

Table (3)
Mean scores & students' strategy types

Strategy type	Mean	SD
Social	2.91	.63
Meta cognitive	2.87	.62
Cognitive	2.76	.42
Affective	2.72	.65

Table 3 shows that the strategy types the students often use are the social ($M=2.91$) and metacognitive ($M=2.87$) strategies. However, the table shows that the third and fourth strategies used are the cognitive ($M=2.76$) and affective ($M=2.72$).

As for the third question which investigates whether there are any statistical significant differences ($\alpha= 0.05$) between the means of students' responses to each strategy type according to sex, the analysis of variance (One-way ANOVA) was used for the four types. Table 4 describes the results of this analysis.

Table (4)
Results of the analysis of variance of the four strategy types according to sex

Strategy type	Sex	M	SD	F	Sig.
Cognitive	Male	2.80	.42	.470	.49
	Female	2.76	.41		
Meta Cognitive	Male	2.88	.59	.742	.39
	Female	2.82	.64		
Social	Male	2.89	.67	.582	.45
	Female	2.95	.59		
Affective	Male	2.69	.64	.440	.51
	Female	2.74	.67		

Table 4 shows no statistically significant differences ($\alpha= 0.05$) between the means of male and female students' responses to each of the four strategy types.

To answer the fourth question which inquires into whether there are any statistical significant differences ($\alpha= 0.05$) between the means of students' responses according to level of study, the analysis of variance (One-way ANOVA) was employed in the data analysis (See table 5).

Table (5)
Results of the analysis of variance of the four strategy types according to students' study level

Strategy type	Level	M	SD	F	Sig.
Cognitive	First-year	2.67	.40	2.58	.05
	Second-year	2.83	.38		
	Third-year	2.78	.47		
	Fourth year	2.84	.38		
Meta Cognitive	First-year	2.68	.57	2.81	*.04
	Second-year	2.87	.60		
	Third-year	2.93	.63		
	Fourth-year	2.91	.65		
Social	First-year	2.87	.64	.470	.70
	Second-year	2.92	.50		
	Third-year	2.98	.70		
	Fourth year	2.92	.64		
Affective	First-year	2.64	.64	.615	.60
	Second-year	2.78	.66		
	Third-year	2.72	.73		
	Fourth-year	2.74	.56		

Table 5 shows no statistically significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the means of students' responses to the cognitive, social and affective learning strategies according to students' level of study. However, the table shows a statistically significant difference ($\alpha = 0.05$) between students' responses to the metacognitive. The difference is in favour of the third- and fourth-year students.

To answer the fifth question which explores whether there are any statistical significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the means of students' responses to each strategy type according to grade point average, the analysis of variance (One-way ANOVA) was also used in the data analysis. Table 6 presents the results of this analysis.

Table (6)
Results of the analysis of variance of the four strategy types according to students' grade point average

Strategy type	Grade average	M	SD	F	Sig.
Cognitive	2-2.49	2.73	.48	.562	.64
	2.50-2.99	2.80	.40		
	3-3.69	2.80	.33		
	3.70-4	2.78	.44		
Meta Cognitive	2-2.49	2.71	.64	3.87	*.01
	2.50-2.99	2.85	.61		
	3-3.69	3.03	.52		
	3.70-4	2.79	.66		
Social	2-2.49	2.85	.67	1.07	.36
	2.50-2.99	2.89	.66		
	3-3.69	3.02	.55		
	3.70-4	2.94	.57		
Affective	2-2.49	2.62	.67	1.14	.33
	2.50-2.99	2.77	.63		
	3-3.69	2.78	.69		
	3.70-4	2.69	.57		

Table 6 shows no statistically significant differences ($\alpha= 0.05$) between the means of students' responses to the first, third and fourth strategies. However, the table shows a statistically significant difference ($\alpha= 0.05$) between their responses to the second strategy 'metacognitive'. This difference is in favour of the students whose grade point average ranges between 3 and 3.69. The reason is that the mean score ($M=3.02$) of the responses of this grade average group is higher than that of the responses of the remaining three groups.

And in order to answer the sixth question which examines whether there are any statistical significant differences ($\alpha= 0.05$) between the means of students' responses according to language proficiency, the analysis of variance (ANOVA 3 X 4) was used in this regard. Table 7 explains the results of this analysis.

Table (7)

The results of the analysis of variance of the four strategy types according to language proficiency

Strategy type	Lang. proficiency	M	SD	F	Sig.
Cognitive	Good	2.85	.38	4.28*	.01
	Fair	2.71	.41		
	Poor	2.71	.53		
Meta Cognitive	Good	2.97	.58	6.33*	.002
	Fair	2.77	.62		
	Poor	2.61	.66		
Social	Good	3.02	.55	3.59*	.02
	Fair	2.83	.68		
	Poor	2.85	.67		
Affective	Good	2.76	.68	1.64	.19
	Fair	2.71	.61		
	Poor	2.55	.68		

Table 7 shows a statistically significant difference ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the means of students' responses to the first three strategies attributed to language proficiency. The difference is in favour of the students whose language proficiency is good. However, the table shows no statistically significant difference ($\alpha = 0.05$) between their responses to the fourth strategy "Affective".

Discussion of results

The results of the study reveal that the students use extensively four main strategies while learning English as a second language. These strategies are connected with expanding knowledge, making guesses about things that they do not know in English, seeking opportunities to speak the language, self-correction and making mistakes in order to learn and to communicate. Second language learners, particularly the good ones, use these learning strategies in the teaching-learning context (Rubin, 1975; Oxford, 1990 & Johnson, 2001).

Results also reveal that the students use the social and metacognitive strategies more than the cognitive and affective ones. These results do not agree with what O'Malley et al., (1985) obtained in their qualitative study. They found that metacognitive strategies accounted only for 30 per cent and the social for 17 per cent.

In terms of strategy type, the results do not show any significant sex differences in students' responses to each of the four strategy types (i.e., cognitive, metacognitive, social and affective strategies). I think that the reason for the absence of differences is that both males and females live and are still living in relatively the same educational, social and cultural context. However, these results are not in consistent with those obtained by several researchers (Wharton, 2000; Catalan, 2003 & Phakiti, 2003). It was found that males used cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies more than females (Wharton, 2000). It was also found that females used some cognitive and metacognitive strategies more than males (Catalan, 2003). In addition, the results obtained by (Phakiti, 2003) indicated that males reported significantly a higher use of metacognitive strategies than females. Again this difference in results in terms of strategy use could be attributed to the difference in the educational, social and cultural contexts, which might have had an impact on the types of strategies males and females adopted while learning the second language.

Results do not reveal any significant differences in the students' responses to the cognitive, social and affective strategies according to level of study. They, however, reveal significant differences in their responses to the metacognitive. These differences are in favour of the third- and fourth-year students. It is expected that the older students or the fourth-year ones, for example, will adopt more types of strategies, such as the cognitive, affective and social than the younger or than the third-, second- and first-year students. The reason is that the older ones are often more mature in terms of cognition, emotion and with regard to language competence and social acquaintance in general. However, these results are not consistent with the findings obtained by Peacock & Belinda (2003) who found that the older students were strong in affective and

social areas. I agree with what Snow & Hoefnagel-Hohle (1978) indicated. They indicated that the age of their subjects was a positive advantage for the adults and children who had gone abroad to learn a second language. I think that the positive advantage older students had might be attributed to the stability of their personality, particularly in terms of the emotional and social aspects of their lives.

Results show nonstatistically significant differences in the students' responses to the cognitive, social and affective learning strategies according to grade point average. However, they show significant differences in the metacognitive. These differences are in favour of the students whose grade point average ranges between 3 and 3.69. As it was anticipated, very good achievers often use metacognitive strategies more than those whose achievement is low or even good. More specifically, our students who are regarded by the university to be high achievers thought about learning the target language, monitored the four language skills and evaluated how well they did in the language.

Results reveal that there are significant differences between the students' responses to the cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies according to language proficiency. The differences are in favour of the students whose language proficiency is good. However, the results reveal no significant differences in the affective strategies. The first part of these results relatively agrees with the results obtained by Wharton (2000) who found that metacognitive and social strategies were employed by the students with high proficiency.

In the light of these results, the study implies the following:

(1) Since the cognitive and affective strategies are not widely used by the subjects of the study, more efforts should be exerted to train them, for example, on how to identify the language material that needs to be learned and on how to group it for easier learning. More efforts should also be made to reduce their anxiety and encourage them while learning the language.

(2) First- and second-year students, who are younger in this study, and the low achievers whose average ranges between 2 to 2.99 ought to be helped in planning their own learning better, in monitoring their own speech and writing and in evaluating continually how well they have done in the language.

Conclusion

The important conclusion that may come out of the present study conducted on a sample of English majors in the Hashemite University is that this study might not give us a complete or a very clear idea about the use of the strategies of learning a second language in higher education in Jordan. Moreover, the lack of studies conducted on this area (i.e., language strategy use) in the Arab world has deprived us of making genuine comparisons and contrasts between research findings. Therefore, further studies should be conducted on the area both in Jordan and in the Arab world. Each of these studies ought to use more than one research instrument for the purpose of the triangulation of the results.

References

- Catalan, R. (2003). Sex differences in L2 vocabulary learning strategies. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13 (1), 54-78.
- Cohen, A. (1998). **Strategies in learning and using a second language**. London & New York: Longman
- Cook, V. (2001). **Second language learning and language teaching**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, K. (2001). **An introduction to foreign language learning and teaching**. London: Pearson Education.
- Naiman, N., Frohlich, H., Stern, H., & Todesco, A. (1978). **The good language learner**. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education: Research in Education Series, 7.

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

O'Malley, J., Chamot, A., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Kupper, L., & Russo, R. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. **Language Learning**, **35**(3), 21-46.

Oxford, R. (1990). **Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know** Rowley. Mass: Newbury House.

Peacock, M., & Belinda, H. (2003). Student language strategies across eight disciplines. **International Journal of Applied Linguistics**, **13** (2), 179-201.

Phakiti, A. (2003). A closer look at gender and strategy use in L2 reading. **Language Learning**, **53** (4), 649-703.

Rivers, W. (2001). Autonomy at the costs: An Ethnography of metacognitive self-assessment and self-management among experienced language learners. **Modern Language Journal**, **85** (2), 279-291.

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

Snow, C., & Hoefnagel-Hohle, M. (1978). The critical age for language acquisition: evidence from second language learning. **Child Development**, **49**(2), 1114-28.

Takeuchi, O. (2003). What can we learn from good foreign language learners? A qualitative study in the Japanese foreign language context. **System**, **31** (3), 385-392.

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

Yamamori, K., Isoda, T., Hiromori, T., & Oxford, R. (2003). Using cluster analysis to uncover L2 learner differences in strategy use, will to learn, and achievement over time. **International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching**, **41**(4), 381-410.

APPENDIX

(A copy of the questionnaire on language-learning strategy use)

Dear student:

You are kindly requested to complete this questionnaire, which is necessary for the research currently conducted by the researcher who is investigating the use of a set of learning strategies by English language students studying in the Hashemite University. The researcher is also investigating the type(s) of learning strategies the students favour in the teaching-learning context.

The information obtained will be treated confidentially and will be used only for research purposes.

Your co-operation is highly appreciated.
Thank you

Researcher

Name:(Optional)

Put a tick (√) where applicable.

Sex: Male Female

Level of study:

- First-year student
- Second-year student
- Third-year student
- Fourth-year student

Grade point average:

- 2-2.49 points 2.50-2.99 points 3-3.69 points
- 3.70-4 points

Language proficiency: Good Fair Poor

Here is a list of learning strategies employed by second or foreign language learners in the teaching-learning context. Please, put a tick (✓) in the block, which shows the extent to which you use the strategy while learning the language.

	Statement	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To some extent	To a certain extent
1.	I create opportunities to use the language.				
2.	I practise written work, such as grammar exercises.				
3.	I take risks in language-learning situations although there is a chance for making mistakes.				
4.	I make efforts to discover the way in which language learning works by reading books.				
5.	I use native language expressions for expressions in the target language.				
6.	I seek opportunities to speak the language.				
7.	I find appropriate ways of adapting or modifying the teaching situation to suit me.				
8.	I learn the language by rote.				
9.	I pay attention to expanding my language knowledge.				
10.	I make mistakes in order to learn and to communicate.				
11.	I challenge the demands of foreign language.				
12.	I practice self-correction during communication.				
13.	I make guesses about things that I do not know in the target language.				

	Statement	Strongly Agree SA	Agree A	Disagree D	Strongly Disagree SD
14.	I often identify the English language material that need not be learned.				
15.	I feel I have control over the language material.				
16.	I distinguish it from other language material that need not to be learned.				
17.	I commonly plan for my work.				
18.	I do not repeat the language material over and over, either orally or practically.				
19.	I rarely employ the language material in communicative exchanges with colleagues and instructors.				
20.	I constantly call the language material up from memory.				
21.	I often monitor my own speech or writing.				
22.	I work with my fellow students to improve my language skills.				
23.	I feel that I am nervous when I want to learn something new in the language.				
24.	I rehearse the language material for communicative exchanges.				
25.	I frequently take classroom notes.				
26.	I often ask my instructor to help me.				
27.	I do not use dictionaries and other resources to learn something new in the language.				
28.	I relate new information to old during the learning process.				
29.	I continually evaluate how well I have done in the language.				
30.	I group the language material for easier learning (e.g., grouping vocabulary by category into nouns, verbs, and so forth).				
31.	I consistently encourage myself to learn the language.				

