Dilla Journal of Education
https://www.du.edu.et/duj

Language Learning Strategy Use of Dilla University English Major Students

Belilew Molla Gebre

Belilew Molla Gebre, Assistant professor at Dilla University, Ethiopia
Email: belilew67@gmail.com

Received: 15 July 2022 Accepted: 10 January 2022 Published: 30 December 2022

ARTICLE INFO.

Key words/phrases: Average and low achievers, Frequency of strategy use, High, Language learning strategy

Abstract

This study was conducted to describe the language learning strategies used by English major students at Dilla University. To this end, all thirty English major second-year students participated in the study. The study utilized a descriptive research design. Data were gathered using Oxford's Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and interviews. Data from interviews were analyzed qualitatively, whereas data obtained through the questionnaire were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20. To analyze the data, descriptive and inferential statistics such as mean, standard deviation, one-way ANOVA, and post hoc tests were applied to determine whether there is a statistically significant mean difference among the groups' language learning strategies. The findings claim that high achievers outperformed their average and low achievers by employing more types and more frequent use of language learning strategies. In the meantime, it was confirmed that there exists a significant mean difference among high-, average-, and low-achieving students' language learning strategies.

1 Introduction

Research has shown that effective learning strategies are essential for facilitating the acquisition of a second or foreign language (L2) (Griffiths, 2013; Oxford, 2017). Due to advances in digital technologies and their applications, the English language has become an essential tool in the 21^{st} century. English is used to seek information, exchange ideas, and network and is now taught as a second or foreign language at all education levels in many countries around the world.

According to research findings, learning strategies support language learners both inside and outside of the classroom as they acquire the English language (Khamkhien, 2011; Oxford, 2011). Finding the most and least often employed strategies among L2 learners has been the focus of several studies (Foster *et al*., 2017; Phonhan, 2016; Rardprakhon, 2016). In general, language learners use a variety of learning strategies to learn English, and LSS is widely used by students (Habok & Magyar, 2018). Additionally, studies have indicated that proficient students are more likely to actively participate in LLS than their less proficient counterparts, use a larger range of methods, and choose a more appropriate strategy (Al-Qahtani, 2013; Habok & Magyar, 2018; Rao, 2016). However, other studies (Phonhan, 2016; Rardprakhon, 2017) have found no connection between proficiency levels and the application of LLS.

Several studies have been conducted to determine which LMS are most commonly used by language learners. According to certain studies, EFL learners tended to employ cognitive strategies more

DOI: 10.20372/dje.v01i02.01

frequently than memory strategies (AlQahtani, 2013; Charoento, 2017; Bonyadi *et al*., 2012; Khamkhien, 2011; Kunasaraphan, 2015; Srisupha, 2012; Tieocharoen & Rimkeeratikul, 2019). According to certain studies, language learners employed social strategies more frequently than other strategies (Suwanarak, 2015; Tieocharoen & Rimkeeratikul, 2019); other studies, however, reported that social strategies were the least frequently utilized by EFL students (Foster *et al*., 2017; Ghavamnia *et al*., 2011; Phonhan, 2016). It is conceivable that different people still use different learning strategies to learn English. Indeed, prior research has shown associations between LLS and a range of variables, including age, gender, and motivation.

Nowadays, in Ethiopia, an increasing number of university students are studying English in different programs as compared to the previous status. Perhaps this can be prompted by considering its national and international acceptance in the modern job market. However, the English language achievement equity, including proficiency, among these students still seems uncertain, which rings a bell to investigators in the country. Particularly, it is possible to discern this disparity with regard to Dilla University EFL learners. For instance, in the 2020 academic year, there were forty-two students enrolled in the first-degree program at this university. Nonetheless, their number dropped from 42 to thirty in the 2021 academic year because twelve of them left the university due to poor performance. In addition, among these thirty students, twenty-four of them scored less than 3.00 in their GPA. The unsatisfactory performance of students in the English language can be attributed to different factors. Teachers' methodology of teaching, quality of teacher training, quality of curricular materials, evaluation methods and processes, lack of continuous professional development (on-the-job training), and attitudes of both teachers and students are some of the factors that affect the performance of students (Cross, 1995).

In light of the foregoing factors, the purpose of this study was to describe the strategies employed by high-, average-, and low-achieving students at Dilla University in order to comprehend these students' special efforts in developing the target language. The study tries to answer the following research questions:

1. What language learning strategies do high-achieving, average-achieving, and low-achieving learners frequently use?

2. Is there a statistically significant mean difference among high, average, and low achievers in the language learning strategies they use?

2 Review of Related Literature

Language Learning Strategies

Numerous studies on LLS have been done over the years (Griffiths, 2013; Griffiths & Cansiz, 2015; Habok & Magyar, 2018; Khamkhien, 2011; Macaro, 2006; Oxford, 2011; Wu, 2008). These studies have shown that LLS improves students' ability to learn languages and their command of the English language. It has also been shown that a variety of elements, including language proficiency, study years, learning objectives, gender, personality traits, learning styles, field of study, aptitude, teaching methods, task specifications, national origin, learning contexts, affective elements, and age, can affect the learner's decision regarding the best approach.

The variety and frequency of learning strategies used are correlated with language proficiency levels. To be more precise, highly proficient learners typically use a wider variety of learning strategies than their less proficient peers (Al-Qahtani, 2013; Gerami & Baighlou, 2011; Giang & Tuan, 2018; Habok & Magyar, 2018), as well as more frequently (Foster *et al*., 2017; Gerami & Baighlou, 2011) and more effectively (Chen, 2009) than their lowly proficient peers. However, some research revealed no connection between LLS execution and language ability levels (Phonhan, 2016; Rardprakhon, 2016). Additionally, whereas some earlier research suggested a favorable relationship between language competence levels and LLS use, other research indicated the exact opposite (Chen, 2009; Gerami & Baighlou, 2011; Giang & Tuan, 2018; Habok & Magyar, 2018).

However, recent research has emphasized that the use of LLS promotes language learning proficiency (Al-Qahtani, 2013, Charoento, 2017, Rao, 2016,

and Wu, 2008), and generally speaking, these studies showed that proficient learners were more likely to be actively engaged in LLS, employ a wider variety of strategies, and select more appropriate strategies than their less proficient peers (Al-Qahtani, 2013; Habo, 2017). Learning techniques are also influenced by the educational environment, instructional materials, and cultural norms (Chamot, 2004; Oxford, 1989). For instance, students may choose individual rather than cooperative strategies in an educational system that emphasizes competitive tasks and learning environments that encourage competitiveness. According to Grainger (2012), the choice of LMS when learning a foreign language did, in fact, depend on the cultural setting and the learning situation.

The use of LLS is influenced by educational contexts and systems as well (Chamot, 2004; Grainger, 2012; Khamkhien, 2011). Zhong (2015) investigated the usage of learning techniques by two Chinese immigrant students over time and discovered a connection between the students' beliefs and their learning tactics. The study found that both Chinese migrant learners modified their learning theories and methods after encountering a novel method of language instruction in New Zealand. Learning techniques can change over time, especially following exposure to a new learning context and setting, as the study demonstrates the complicated relationship between learners' beliefs and learning strategies. According to other studies, the frequency and strategy preferences of learners are socially mediated and context-dependent (Habok & Magyar, 2018; Hashim *et al*., 2018; Tieocharoen & Rimkeeratikul, 2019). All of these results point to the possibility that learning environments and contexts have an impact on how frequently and which learning techniques are used.

Students that are highly motivated employ more techniques and do so more frequently than their less motivated peers (Al-Qahtani, 2013). In fact, motivated students use a wider variety of tactics and are also better equipped to choose the most effective ones (Oxford, 1990). In other words, motivation affects the learner's choice of approach in addition to the overall frequency of strategy implementation. This is consistent with prior research showing that motivation and LMS enable students to create a strategic learning plan (Griffiths, 2013; Kunasaraphan, 2015; Macaro, 2006; Taguchi, 2002). When compared to discrete methods, motivation does, in fact, shape one's strategic plans and aid in combining metacognitive awareness with larger learning objectives. Additionally, incentives encourage students to finish their assignments. Griffiths (2013) claimed that motivation comes from both the inside and the outside.

It is crucial for academics and practitioners to comprehend how students use strategies because it may offer helpful insights into how languages are learnt and how learning techniques are employed to develop language, particularly in EFL circumstances.

Oxford's Taxonomy

Oxford (1990), cited in Paredes (2010), developed a novel system of language learning strategies based on earlier studies on learning techniques. Oxford (1990) split LMS into two categories: direct learning techniques and indirect learning approaches. The specialized use of language is one of the memory, cognitive, and compensatory mechanisms that make up direct learning. Three different indirect learning methods that support and direct language learning without directly using the language are metacognitive, emotional, and social strategies (Oxford, 1990).

Direct Strategies

Direct learning strategies come in three different varieties: memory techniques, cognitive strategies, and compensatory strategies. Memory strategies help students connect ideas or things in their second language, but they may not always call for in-depth knowledge (Oxford, 2003, $p.13$). Students can learn and recall information in a logical order using a variety of memory-related techniques (e.g., acronyms), while other techniques help students, a learn and recall information by using sounds (e.g., rhyming), images (e.g., a mental image of the word itself or its meaning), a combination of sounds and images (e.g., the keyword method), body movement (e.g., total physicresponse), and, mechanical means (e.g., flashcard) (Oxford, 2003). The learner is able to immediately apply the linguistic material

through taking notes, making arguments, and using other cognitive strategies.

Indirect Strategies

As was already said, Oxford's (1990) indirect learning strategies can be categorized under the social, emotional, and metacognitive categories. The management and facilitation of language acquisition typically do not directly involve the target language. Social strategies enhance interaction and increase empathy since they entail exchanges between and among people (Canale, 1983), as is described in Parades (2010). An example of a social strategy is asking the speaker to repeat themselves, paraphrase, talk more slowly, and so on. The emotional demands of the learner, such as the self-assurance and tenacity required for learners to actively engage in language learning, are the focus of affective approaches. For instance, laughing at one's own mistakes can help reduce fear (Vlckova *et al*., 2013).

Metacognitive strategies include all three of these aspects of the language learning process: planning, observing, and evaluating (Fewell, 2010). The opportunity to practice in-conversation skills in real-world situations is actively sought for or created by learners (for example, by joining a discussion group) (Paredes, 2010). Despite disagreements over the definition of LLS, these methods aid language learners in taking control of their education, enhancing their competency, and—most importantly—becoming autonomous (Vandergrift, 2002; Paredes, 2010).

According to Ellis (994), Oxford's SILL is regarded as the most thorough classification of LLS and has been extensively utilized for gathering data on numerous language learners throughout the world (Green & Oxford, 1995; Wharton, 2000; Hsiao & Oxford, 2002; Lan & Oxford, 2003). This instrument has been translated into other languages and is standardized. It was widely used by researchers to gather data on a sizable population of primarily foreign language learners, and it was also utilized in studies that correlated the usage of strategies with factors like gender, competence level, learning styles, culture, and length of language study (Green & Oxford, 1995; Wharton, 2000). Given that this research examines the impact of strategy on gender, academic year, and length of English study.

3 Methods

3.1 Research Design

The current study employed a descriptive case study research design. This is due to the fact that many problems in education are best examined by using this method. Moreover, it plays a significant role in the description, explanation, and interpretation of present situations, events, and trends, which are vital topics of interest.

Since it is a descriptive research design, a mixed approach was implemented. This is due to the fact that the combined use of quantitative and qualitative research methods provides an expanded understanding of research problems (Creswell, 2009). What's more, mixed methods are inclusive, pluralistic, complementary, and more convenient than quantitative or qualitative methods alone (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Accordingly, the current researcher preferred to employ such a sort of method, for he felt that the mixed approach provided a better grasp of the research problem.

3.2 Target Population and Sampling

This study, conducted at Dilla University, sought to investigate the strategies employed by high, average, and low achievers. Just like the setting, the subjects were purposefully selected by the researcher because the present investigator assumed that the students had better awareness of language learning strategies than freshmen at the university. The total population that took part in this study was thirty EFL students, based on a comprehensive sampling technique. All participants in this study were first-degree learners. High, average, and low achievers were identified among these participants based on their three semester cumulative results. Students who managed to score between 2 and 2.5 points in their English language learning were considered low achievers, and the students whose grade ranged from 2.5 to 3.00 points were called average achievers in this study. The high achievers are the ones who were able to achieve a 3.0 or higher GPA in their English language learning. The ages of these students ranged from 19 to 22

years old. Participants have nearly the same year of English learning experience. They studied English beginning in primary school and progressing through tertiary school. All participants in this study neither entered language schools nor lived in English-speaking countries.

3.3 Data Gathering Instruments

Two research instruments were employed in this study to gain the required information from the respondents and assess their strategy use. These were a self-report questionnaire for ESL/EFL learners (SILL) and a semi-structured interview.

The self-report questionnaire (SILL)

In order to measure the strategy use of the target population, Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learners (SILL) was adopted for this study owing to the following important reasons: Firstly, this tool actually allows the collection of information on a variety of issues in a relatively short time that is both cost-effective and easy for analysis. Secondly, it allows comparisons of answers among respondents. Thirdly, this type of method reaches many more people. Moreover, SILL is "the most comprehensive instrument to date" (Ellis, 1994, $p.539$); Oxford's classification is "more systematic in linking individual strategies as well as strategy groups" (Oxford, 1990, $p.14$).

In the SILL, language learning strategies fall into six major categories: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social, in which they enable the assessment of EFL learning strategies. The items were created using five-point likert-scales (closed-ended), which reveal the frequency of use of learning strategies (as 1 = "Never True of Me"; 2 = "Usually Not True of Me"; 3 = "Somewhat True of Me"; 4 = "Usually True of Me"; 5 = "Always True of Me").

The internal consistency and reliability of the self-report questionnaire were checked. Cronbach's alphas for *metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, memory strategies, social strategies, compensation strategies*, and *affective strategies* were 0.85, 0.893, 0.761, 0.899, 0.725, and 0.633, respectively. This indicates that all items of individual strategies form a scale that has reasonable internal consistency and reliability for multiple-item scales.

Interview

A semi-structured interview was used in order to substantiate the information gained via the questionnaire. To obtain detailed information from subjects, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews. By the same token, it permits a free response. Since the purpose of this interview was to supplement the data collected through the self-report questionnaire, it was designed on the basis of the questionnaire. For this reason, the contents of the interview were almost identical to the contents of the questionnaire. Three students from each of the three groups, low, average, and high achievers, were purposefully chosen for the interview.

3.4 Data Analysis Techniques

The organized data was entered into a computer and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 program. The analysis was performed for individual and average summated scale items by high-achieving learners, average-achieving learners, and low-achieving learners. The results attained from SPSS analysis were categorized according to the six main strategies: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social, along with their descriptive and inferential statistics results and respective items.

In each principal category, students' preferences for each individual and summarizing scale item were computed by mean. Then, high-achieving learners, average-achieving learners, and low-achieving learners' major strategy preferences were put in a rank order; then, mean and percentages were used in comparisons of the six main strategies preferred by the three achievers. Finally, a one-way ANOVA was run to look for significant differences in the use of main strategies by high-achieving students, average-achieving students, and low-achieving students at $p.05$. A statistically significant difference was calculated at the $p - value$ of .05 in this study and discussed on the basis of their three semesters' cumulative results.

At this point, it is important to realize that the one-way ANOVA is an **omnibus** test statistic and cannot tell us which specific groups were statistically significantly different from each other, only that at least two groups were. A post hoc test was used to determine which specific groups differed from each other.

4 Results and Discussion

The major objective of the present study was to identify the frequency of language learning strategies that high-, average-, and low-achieving students use. To this end, a self-report questionnaire and interview were used.

Table 1: Metacognitive Strategy use

Achievement		MetacognitiveStrategy1	MetaStrg2	MetaStrg3	MetaStrg4	MetaStrg5	MetaStrg6	MetaStrg7	MetaStrg8	MetaStrg9	MetaStrg10
Low	Mean	2.12	2.53	2.88	2.76	2.65	2.94	2.47	2.53	2.65	2.88
	SD	.781	1.281	1.269	1.348	1.222	1.298	1.281	1.231	.931	1.317
	Skewness	-.219	.432	.039	.658	.079	-.073	.378	-.077	.828	.057
	N	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
Medium	Mean	2.71	3.14	3.86	4.43	2.86	2.86	3.00	3.43	2.43	3.43
	SD	.951	1.464	1.215	.787	.900	1.464	1.000	1.272	1.813	.976
	Skewness	-.863	.109	-.414	-1.115	.353	-.109	-1.400	.222	.983	.277
	N	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
High	Mean	3.67	3.33	4.17	4.50	4.67	3.83	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.00
	SD	.816	1.211	1.169	.548	.516	.983	1.549	1.211	1.033	1.549
	Skewness	.857	.075	-1.586	.000	-.968	-1.438	-.968	-1.952	-.968	-1.936
	N	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Total	Mean	2.57	2.83	3.37	3.50	3.10	3.10	2.90	3.10	2.93	3.23
	SD	1.006	1.315	1.326	1.383	1.296	1.296	1.373	1.398	1.363	1.331
	Skewness	.131	.231	-.262	-.335	-.096	-.299	.106	-.109	.391	-.272
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30

Items 1 to 10 were set to explore how often high, average, and low achievers use metacognitive strategies to deal with their English shortcomings. The results indicated that the frequency of metacognitive strategy use for low achievers ranges from 2.21 to 2.94. Item 1 ("If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing") was the least used strategy, and Item 6 ("I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English") was the most frequently used strategy. Item 2 with the mean score of 2.53, "When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures," Item 8 with the mean score of 3.00, "I have clear goals for improving my English skills," and Item 10 with the mean score of 2.88, "I think about my progress in learning English," were the strategies low achievers commonly used. According to the results in the above table, it can be concluded that low achievers were medium strategy users. According to Oxford (1990), these students need strategy training to maximize their language learning.

The frequency of metacognitive strategy use among average learners ranges from 2.43 to 4.43. The most frequently used metacognitive strategy for average achievers is Item 4, with a mean score of 4.43 ("I try to find out how to be a better learner of English"), and the least frequently used strategy was Item 8, with a mean score of 2.43 ("I have clear goals for improving my English skills"). The mean scores of Items 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 9 were 2.71, 3.14, 2.86, 3.00, and 2.43, respectively. This indicated that the average learner's frequency of metacognitive strategy use is in the range of medium strategy users, which calls for strategy training. This category of students used Items 3 and 4 most frequently, with a mean of 3.86 and 4.43, respectively.

The frequency of metacognitive strategy use for high achievers ranges from 3.23 to 4.67. Item 10, with a mean score of 3.23, "I think about my progress in learning English," was the least frequently used, and Item 5, with a mean score of 4.67, "I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better," was the most frequently used strategy for high achievers. The mean scores for items 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 were 3.67, 3.86, 4.50, 4.67, 3.83, 4.00, 4.33, and 4.33, respectively. The results indicated that high achievers use metacognitive strategies most frequently.

Table 2: Cognitive Strategy use

Achievement		Cogntv Strg11	Cogntv Strg12	Cogntv Strg13	Cogntv Strg14	Cogntv Strg15	Cogntv Strg16	Cogntv Strg17	Cogntv Strg18	Cogntv Strg19	Cogntv Strg20	Cogntv Strg21
Low	Mean	2.35	2.29	2.41	2.82	2.71	2.82	2.59	3.00	2.65	2.59	2.65
	SD	.996	1.105	.870	1.468	1.047	1.074	1.004	1.369	1.115	1.004	.996
	Skewness	.031	.280	.306	.344	-.809	.392	.147	-.166	.501	-.273	1.258
	N	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
Medium	Mean	2.57	2.86	2.71	2.71	2.57	3.71	3.57	2.57	2.71	2.86	2.71
	SD	1.397	.900	1.254	.951	1.272	1.113	1.272	1.512	1.113	1.215	1.254
	Skewness	1.079	-1.569	.740	-.863	-.222	-.249	-.222	.620	-.249	1.147	1.450
	N	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
High	Mean	3.67	4.50	4.50	4.33	3.67	4.17	3.83	4.50	4.50	4.67	4.83
	SD	1.506	.548	.837	.816	1.751	1.169	.753	.548	.837	.516	.408
	Skewness	-1.270	.000	-1.537	-.857	-.919	-1.586	.313	.000	-1.537	-.968	-2.449
	N	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Total	Mean	2.67	2.87	2.90	3.10	2.87	3.30	3.07	3.20	3.03	3.07	3.10
	SD	1.269	1.279	1.242	1.373	1.279	1.208	1.143	1.424	1.273	1.258	1.296
	Skewness	.358	-.052	.433	-.021	-.158	.003	.010	-.301	.149	.089	.515
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30

Items 11 to 21 were set to explore how often the high, average, and low achievers use cognitive strategies when they learn English. The results revealed that the frequency of cognitive strategies used by low achievers ranges from 2.29 to 3.00. Item 12: "I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly then go back and read carefully)" was the least frequently used strategy, while Item 18: "I say or write new English words several times." was the most frequently used. Item 14 with the mean score of 2, Item 16 with the mean score of 2.82, and Item 15 with the mean score of 2.71 were the most frequently used cognitive strategies by low achievers next to Item 18 with the mean score of 3.00. Therefore, it can be concluded that low achievers are low cognitive strategy users. According to Oxford (1990), these students badly need strategy training to improve their English language ability.

Average learners' cognitive strategy use ranges from 2.57 to 3.71. The most frequently used cognitive strategy for average achievers is Item 15, with a mean score of 3.71 ("I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English"), and the least frequently used strategy was Item 17, with a mean score of 2.57 ("I say or write new English words several times"). Items 13, 19, and 21, with a mean score of 2.71, and 16 and 18, with a mean score of 3.57, were the least frequently used cognitive strategies next to Item 18 by average achievers. The result indicated that average learners' frequency of cognitive strategy use is in the range of medium and high strategy users.

The frequency of cognitive strategy use for high achievers ranges from 3.67 to 4.83. Item 21 with a mean score of 4.83 "I start conversations in English" was the most frequently used cognitive strategy used by high achievers. However, items 11, 15, and 20 ("I read for pleasure in English," "I try to talk like a native English speaker," and "I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English," respectively) were the least used cognitive strategies in comparison with other strategies. The result indicated that high achievers are good strategy users.

The result of the interview revealed that high achievers could clearly identify the types of strategies they frequently deploy in learning the target language. They noted that they usually use strategies such as watching TV or films spoken in English, reading for pleasure, practicing the language, making summaries of the information they read and hear, saying or writing new English words several times, writing messages and letters in English, etc. The high achievers responded that they mostly grasp

new words based on context. They also noted that they sometimes use dictionaries to look up unknown words or ask for their meanings in order to understand the reading text. Therefore, the interview results were in line with the findings from the questionnaire.

Table 3: Memory Strategy use

Achievement		Memory Strg22	Memory Strg23	Memory Strg24	Memory Strg25	Memory Strg26	Memory Strg27	Memory Strg28
Low	Mean	2.35	2.41	2.82	2.76	2.59	2.29	2.24
	SD	1.115	.870	.883	.970	.870	1.047	.970
	Skewness	.113	.306	-.237	.066	.339	.439	.399
	N	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
Medium	Mean	2.29	2.43	2.71	2.71	3.00	3.43	3.14
	SD	.951	1.134	.951	1.496	1.155	1.618	1.773
	Skewness	.863	-.235	-.863	.256	-.909	-.317	-.297
	N	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
High	Mean	3.67	3.17	3.00	3.50	3.50	4.50	4.17
	SD	1.366	.983	1.673	1.225	.837	1.225	.753
	Skewness	-.523	-.456	.384	.490	-1.537	-2.449	-.313
	N	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Total	Mean	2.60	2.57	2.83	2.90	2.87	3.00	2.83
	SD	1.221	.971	1.053	1.155	.973	1.486	1.367
	Skewness	.361	.041	.165	.207	-.198	.203	.148
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30

Items 22 to 28 were aimed at finding out how frequently the high, average, and low achievers implement memory strategies to remember what they learn regarding the target language. The result revealed that the frequency of memory strategy use for low achievers ranges from 2.24 to 2.82. Item 28 ("I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them") was the least used strategy, and Item 24 ("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 strategy. Item 27, with a mean score of 2.29, and Item 22, with a mean score of 2.35, were the least frequently used strategies next to Item 28, "I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them." However, Item 25, with a mean score of 2.71, "I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign," and Item 26, with a mean score of 2.59, "To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses," were the most frequently used memory strategies by low achievers next to Item 24. Generally, low achievers are considered to be low memory strategy users.

Average learners' memory strategy use ranges from 2.29 to 3.43. The most frequently used memory strategy for average achievers is Item 27, with a mean score of 3.43 ("I connect the sound of a new English word with an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word"), and the least frequently used strategy was Item 22, with a mean score of 2.29 ("I review English lessons often"). The data revealed that average achievers' use of memory strategies was not different from that of low achievers.

The frequency of memory strategy use for high achievers ranges from 3.00 to 4.50. Item 27, with a mean score of 4.50, "I connect the sound of a new English word with an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word," was the most frequently used memory strategy used by high achievers. However, Item 23, with a mean score of 3.17, "I think of relationships between what I al-

ready know and new things I learn in English," and Item 24, with a mean score of 3.00, "I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used," were the least frequently used memory strategies.

The findings from the interview were also in line with the findings from the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to describe their memory strategy when learning English. It was confirmed that the more successful learners being interviewed in this study noted that they deploy different sorts of strategies to recall English lessons and words. The seven types of m are reviewing the lessons frequently, creating a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used, making connections between what they already know and new things they learn in English, using new English words in a sentence so that they can remember them easily, remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign, writing words on a piece of paper or on their hand and studying the words while they walk, sit, and so on. On the other hand, the two average achievers said that they somewhat utilize three specific strategies (linking the sound of a new English word with an image or picture of the word, internalizing what they have taught, and reviewing their English lessons) to help them memorize things in learning the target language. Low achievers, for their part, stated that they rarely use special strategies to recall English lessons and words. The statistical data and the frequency level demonstrate the dominance of the high achievers over the average and low achievers in employing memory strategies.

Table 4: Social Strategy use

Achievement		Social Strg30	Social Strg31	Social Strg32	Social Strg33	Social Strg34
Low	Mean	2.18	2.82	2.47	2.76	2.24
	SD	1.074	1.131	1.179	1.033	1.200
	Skewness	.293	.388	.469	.146	.962
	N	17	17	17	17	17
Medium	Mean	2.14	2.71	3.86	2.71	3.00
	SD	1.215	1.113	1.215	1.496	1.155
	Skewness	.414	1.784	-.414	.256	.909
	N	7	7	7	7	7
High	Mean	4.83	5.00	5.00	4.17	4.17
	SD	.408	.000	.000	1.169	1.169
	Skewness	-2.449	.	.	-1.586	-1.586
	N	6	6	6	6	6
Total	Mean	2.70	3.23	3.30	3.03	2.80
	SD	1.466	1.331	1.466	1.273	1.375
	Skewness	.280	.198	-.139	.041	.386
	N	30	30	30	30	30

Items 30 to 34 were designed to attain data on how frequently high, average, and low achievers employ social strategies to accelerate their progress in English. The result revealed that the frequency of social strategy use for low achievers ranges from 2.18 to 2.82. Item 31: "If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again." was the most frequently used strategy, and Item 30: "I try to learn about the culture of English speakers." was the least frequently used strategy.

Average learners' social strategy use ranges from 2.14–3.86. The most frequently used social strategy for average achievers is Item 32, with a mean score of 3.86 ("I ask questions in English"), and the least

frequently used strategy was Item 30, with a mean score of 2.14 ("I try to learn about the culture of English speakers"). The data revealed that average achievers' use of social strategies was not different from that of low achievers.

The frequency of social strategy use for high achievers ranges from 4.17–5.00. Item 31 and 32 received a 5.00 mean score. "If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again" and "I ask questions in English" were the most frequently used social strategies used by high achievers. However, Item 33, with a mean score of 4.17, "I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk," and Item 34, with a mean score of 4.17, "I practice English with other students," were the least frequently used social strategies, though the range is high for strategy usage.

Table 5: Compensation Strategies use

Achievement		Compensation Strategy 35	Compensation Strategy 36	Compensation Strategy 37
Low	Mean	2.47	2.47	2.00
	SD	.943	1.007	1.000
	Skewness	-.158	.091	.425
	N	17	17	17
Medium	Mean	2.57	2.71	2.43
	SD	.787	1.604	1.272
	Skewness	1.115	.305	1.581
	N	7	7	7
High	Mean	3.67	4.33	4.33
	SD	1.211	1.211	.516
	Skewness	-.075	-1.952	.968
	N	6	6	6
Total	Mean	2.73	2.90	2.57
	SD	1.048	1.373	1.331
	Skewness	.387	.192	.411
	N	30	30	30

Items 35 to 37 were designed to attain data on how frequently high, average, and low achievers employ compensation strategies to accelerate their progress in English. The result revealed that the frequency of compensation strategy usage for low achievers ranges from 2.00 to 2.47. Item 37, "I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English," was the least frequently used strategy, and items 35, "I try to guess what the other person will say next in English," and item 36, "I read English without looking up every new word," with a mean score of 2.47, were the most frequently used strategies, though the mean scores were very close to low stratagem usage.

Average learner compensation strategy use ranges from 2.43 to 32.71. The most frequently used compensation strategy usage for average achievers is Item 36, with a mean score of 2.71 for "I read English without looking up every new word," and the least frequently used strategy was Item 37, with a mean score of 2.43 for "I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English." The data revealed that average achievers' use of compensation strategies was not different from that of low achievers.

The frequency of compensation strategy usage for high achievers ranges from 3.67 to 4.33. Item 36 and 37, with a mean score of 4.33, "I read English without looking up every new word" and "I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English," respectively, were the most frequently used compensation strategies used by high achievers. However, Item 35, with a mean score of 3.67, "I try to guess what the other person will say next

in English," was the least frequently used compensation strategy, though the range is high in strategy usage.

The results from the interview revealed that the high achievers were able to identify about three compensation strategies, such as using gestures, synonyms, paraphrasing, and so on. On the contrary, both the average achievers and the low achievers managed to refer to fewer language learning strategies. This clearly depicts that the more effective learners statistically surpass the other two groups in employing compensation strategies.

Table 6: Affective Strategy use

Achievement		Affective Strategy 38	Affective Strategy 39	Affective Strategy 40
Low	Mean	2.24	2.47	2.41
	SD	1.251	.943	1.064
	Skewness	.798	-.158	.084
	N	17	17	17
Medium	Mean	2.71	3.00	3.57
	SD	1.496	.816	1.134
	Skewness	.256	.000	-.725
	N	7	7	7
High	Mean	3.33	4.50	3.50
	SD	1.211	.548	1.225
	Skewness	.075	.000	-.490
	N	6	6	6
Total	Mean	2.57	3.00	2.90
	SD	1.331	1.145	1.213
	Skewness	.411	.000	-.045
	N	30	30	30

Items 38–40 were set up to collect data on how frequently the target population of this study applies affective strategies. The result revealed that the frequency of affective strategy usage for low achievers ranges from 2.24 to 2.47. Item 38, "I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English," was the least frequently used affective strategy, and Item 39, with a mean score of 2.47, "I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English," was the most frequently used strategy, though the mean score was very close to low strategy usage.

Average learners' affective strategy usage ranges from 2.71 to 3.57. The most frequently used affective strategy for average achievers is Item 40, with a mean score of 3.57. "I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English" was the most frequently used strategy. However, Item 38, with a mean score of 2.71, "I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English," was the least used affective strategy.

The frequency of affective strategy usage for high achievers ranges from 3.33 to 4.50. item with a mean score of 4.50 "I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English." was the most frequently used affective strategy used by high achievers. However, Item 38, with a mean score of 3.33, "I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English," was the least frequently used affective strategy, which is in the category of medium strategy usage.

The findings from the interview also support the results from the questionnaire. Respondents in the interview were asked to describe the types of language learning strategies they often utilize to control their anxiety when they speak in front of

people, such as during presentations. In this regard, according to the high achievers in the interview, recognizing their anxiety, encouraging themselves, talking to someone else about their feelings, and trying to relax during using English are the four types of strategies that they mostly use to reduce their negative feelings when using English. One average performer in the interview responded that she usually tries to think about her strong side when using English. The other respondent said that she sometimes tries to relax while using English. Low achievers reported that listening to music or religious songs, sharing their feelings, and praying to their creator are three types of strategies they frequently use by the time they have an English presentation. This demonstrates the superiority of the high achievers over the average achievers, as well as the low achievers, in applying affective strategies.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for Summeted Variables

Main Variables Vs Achievement		N	Mean	SD	Std. Error	95% CI for Mean		Min.	Max.
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Metacognitive strategies	Low	17	2.6412	.80550	.19536	2.2270	3.0553	1.20	3.90
	Medium	7	3.2143	.28536	.10785	2.9504	3.4782	2.90	3.70
	High	6	4.0833	.44460	.18151	3.6168	4.5499	3.50	4.60
	Total	30	3.0633	.85681	.15643	2.7434	3.3833	1.20	4.60
Cognitive strategies	Low	17	2.6257	.69076	.16753	2.2705	2.9808	1.45	3.73
	Medium	7	2.8701	.54761	.20698	2.3637	3.3766	2.00	3.64
	High	6	4.2879	.43186	.17631	3.8347	4.7411	3.64	4.64
	Total	30	3.0152	.88690	.16193	2.6840	3.3463	1.45	4.64
Memory strategies	Low	17	2.4958	.57169	.13866	2.2019	2.7897	1.43	3.43
	Medium	7	2.8163	.86392	.32653	2.0173	3.6153	1.57	4.00
	High	6	3.6429	.54772	.22361	3.0681	4.2177	3.00	4.29
	Total	30	2.8000	.76665	.13997	2.5137	3.0863	1.43	4.29
Social strategies	Low	17	2.4941	.87783	.21291	2.0428	2.9455	1.00	4.60
	Medium	7	2.8857	1.02539	.38756	1.9374	3.8340	1.60	4.40
	High	6	4.6333	.29439	.12019	4.3244	4.9423	4.40	5.00
	Total	30	3.0133	1.16729	.21312	2.5775	3.4492	1.00	5.00
Compensation strategies	Low	17	2.3137	.69192	.16782	1.9580	2.6695	1.00	3.33
	Medium	7	2.5714	1.08379	.40963	1.5691	3.5738	1.67	4.67
	High	6	4.1111	.17213	.07027	3.9305	4.2918	4.00	4.33
	Total	30	2.7333	1.00725	.18390	2.3572	3.1094	1.00	4.67
Affective strategies	Low	17	2.3725	.78954	.19149	1.9666	2.7785	1.00	4.33
	Medium	7	3.0952	.46004	.17388	2.6698	3.5207	2.67	4.00
	High	6	3.7778	.68853	.28109	3.0552	4.5003	3.00	4.67
	Total	30	2.8222	.89157	.16278	2.4893	3.1551	1.00	4.67

The table 7 above provides some useful descriptive statistics, including the mean, standard deviation, and 95% confidence intervals for the dependent variables (*metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, memory strategies, social strategies, compensation strategies*, and *affective strategies*) for each separate group (low achievers, average achievers, and high achievers), and when all groups are combined (total). These figures are useful when we need to describe our data.

The mean metacognitive strategy use of high-

achieving students, average-achieving students, and low-achieving students was 4.0833, 3.2143, and 2.6412, respectively. This indicates that the high achievers use metacognitive strategies more than the average students do, and the medium achievers use these strategies more than the low achievers do. It can be generalized that there is high, medium, and low metacognitive strategy usage among the three groups, respectively.

The mean cognitive strategy use of high-achieving students, average-achieving students, and low-achieving students was 4.2879, 2.8701, and 2.6257, respectively. This implies that the high achievers utilize such types of LLSs better than the average person and the low achievers do. This leads us to conclude that there is high cognitive strategy usage for high achievers and low cognitive strategy usage for medium achievers and low achievers.

The mean memory strategy implementation of high-achieving students, average-achieving students, and low-achieving students was 3.6429, 2.8163, and 2.4958, respectively. This indicates that the high achievers employ them more than the average and the low achievers do. This implies that there is medium memory strategy usage for high achievers and low memory strategy usage for both medium achievers and low achievers.

The mean social strategy application of high-achieving students, average-achieving students, and low-achieving students was found to be 4.6333, 2.8857, and 2.4941, respectively. This means that the high achievers apply social strategies more than the average achievers, as well as the low achievers. This can be generalized to say that there is high social strategy usage among high achievers. Contrary to this, low memory strategy usage for medium and low achievers was observed.

The mean compensation strategy used by high-achieving students, average-achieving students, and low-achieving students was 4.1111, 2.5714, and 2.3137, respectively. This reveals that the high achievers use compensation strategies more frequently than the average employee and the low achievers do. This indicates the availability of high compensation strategy use for high achievers as opposed to both medium and low achievers.

The mean affective strategy utilization of high-achieving students, average-achieving students, and low-achieving students was 3.7778, 3.0952, and 2.3725, respectively. This infers that the high achievers surpass the average in using affective strategies, and the medium achievers use these strategies more frequently than the low achievers do. As a result, it is possible to conclude that high achievers and medium achievers use a medium affective strategy. Yet, it is low for low-achieving students.

Generally, as indicated in Table 7, the mean scores could be ranked in the following order of learning strategies used:

For high-achieving learners: 1^{st} = social learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 4.635, SD = 0.294), 2^{nd} = memory learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 4.633, SD = 0.294), 3^{rd} = cognitive learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 4.287, SD = 0.431), 4^{th} = compensation learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 4.111, SD = 0.172), 5^{th} = metacognitive learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 4.083, SD = 0.444), and 6^{th} = affective learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 3.777, SD = 0.688). On the basis of the data provided so far, social strategies, which are known as indirect strategies under Oxford's system, are the most frequently used strategies of all the six main language learning strategies with regard to high achievers. On the contrary, these learners use metacognitive and affective strategies least of all. This leads us to conclude that high achievers have better knowledge with respect to direct LLSs than indirect LLSs.

For average-achieving learners: 1^{st} = metacognitive learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 3.214, SD = 0.285), 2^{nd} = affective learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 3.095, SD = 0.460), 3^{rd} = social learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 2.886, SD = 1.025), 4^{th} = cognitive learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 2.870, SD = 0.547), 5^{th} = memory learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 2.819, SD = 0.863), and 6^{th} = compensation learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 2.571, SD = 1.083). In this case, it reveals that strategy usage is somewhat moderate. At the same time, the data indicate that unlike high achievers, average achievers more frequently apply indirect LLSs compared to direct LLSs.

For low-achieving learners: 1^{st} = metacognitive learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 2.641, SD = 0.805); 2^{nd}

= cognitive learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 2.626, SD = 0.690). 3^{rd} = memory learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 2.496, SD = 0.571), 4^{th} = social learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 2.494, SD = 0.877), 5^{th} = affective learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 2.373, SD = 0.789), and 6^{th} = compensation learning strategies ($\bar{x}$ = 2.314, SD = 0.691). It can be concluded that there was low strategy use.

Table 8: ANOVA Table

Variables		**Sum of Squares**	*df*	**Mean Square**	F	$Sig.$
Metacognitive strategies	Between Groups	9.432	2	4.716	10.738	.000
	Within Groups	11.858	27	.439		
	Total	21.290	29			
Cognitive strategies	Between Groups	12.445	2	6.223	16.207	.000
	Within Groups	10.366	27	.384		
	Total	22.811	29			
Memory strategies	Between Groups	5.837	2	2.919	7.032	.003
	Within Groups	11.207	27	.415		
	Total	17.045	29			
Social strategies	Between Groups	20.443	2	10.222	14.471	.000
	Within Groups	19.071	27	.706		
	Total	39.515	29			
Compensation strategies	Between Groups	14.566	2	7.283	13.237	.000
	Within Groups	14.856	27	.550		
	Total	29.422	29			
Affective strategies	Between Groups	9.438	2	4.719	9.359	.001
	Within Groups	13.614	27	.504		
	Total	23.052	29			

Table 8 shows the output of the ANOVA analysis and whether there is a statistically significant difference among our group means. We can see that the significance value for metacognitive strategies is 0.000 *(F (2, 29) = 10.738, p = 0.000)*, the significance value for cognitive strategies is 0.000 *(F (2, 29) = 16.207, p = 0.000)*, the significance value for memory strategies is 0.003 *(F (2, 29) = 7.032, p = 0.003)*, the significance value for social strategies is 0.000 *(F (2, 29) = 14.471, p = 0.000)*, the significance value for compensation strategies is 0.000 *(F (2, 29) = 13.237, p = 0.000)*, and thesignificance value for affective strategies is 0.001 *(F (2, 29) = 9.359, p = 0.001)*, respectively. The result revealed that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean of all six constructs of language learning strategy use among the three ability groups.

In order to identify the specific groups that differed, the post hoc test was used. The multiple comparisons depict which groups differed from each other.

Table 9: Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable	(I) Achievement	(J) Achievement	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	$Sig.$	95% CI	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Metacognitive strategies	Low	Medium	-.57311	.29762	.065	-1.1838	.0376
		High	-1.44216*	.31469	.000	-2.0879	-.7965
	Medium	Low	.57311	.29762	.065	-.0376	1.1838
		High	-.86905*	.36870	.026	-1.6256	-.1125
	High	Low	1.44216*	.31469	.000	.7965	2.0879
		Medium	.86905*	.36870	.026	.1125	1.6256
Cognitive strategies	Low	Medium	-.24446	.27827	.387	-.8154	.3265
		High	-1.66221*	.29423	.000	-2.2659	-1.0585
	Medium	Low	.24446	.27827	.387	-.3265	.8154
		High	-1.41775*	.34473	.000	-2.1251	-.7104
	High	Low	1.66221*	.29423	.000	1.0585	2.2659
		Medium	1.41775*	.34473	.000	.7104	2.1251
Memory strategies	Low	Medium	-.32053	.28934	.278	-.9142	.2731
		High	-1.14706*	.30594	.001	-1.7748	-.5193
	Medium	Low	.32053	.28934	.278	-.2731	.9142
		High	-.82653*	.35844	.029	-1.5620	-.0911
	High	Low	1.14706*	.30594	.001	.5193	1.7748
		Medium	.82653*	.35844	.029	.0911	1.5620
Social strategies	Low	Medium	-.39160	.37743	.309	-1.1660	.3828
		High	-2.13922*	.39909	.000	-2.9581	-1.3203
	Medium	Low	.39160	.37743	.309	-.3828	1.1660
		High	-1.74762*	.46758	.001	-2.7070	-.7882
	High	Low	2.13922*	.39909	.000	1.3203	2.9581
		Medium	1.74762*	.46758	.001	.7882	2.7070
Compensation strategies	Low	Medium	-.25770	.33312	.446	-.9412	.4258
		High	-1.79739*	.35223	.000	-2.5201	-1.0747
	Medium	Low	.25770	.33312	.446	-.4258	.9412
		High	-1.53968*	.41268	.001	-2.3864	-.6929
	High	Low	1.79739*	.35223	.000	1.0747	2.5201
		Medium	1.53968*	.41268	.001	.6929	2.3864
Affective strategies	Low	Medium	-.72269*	.31889	.032	-1.3770	-.0684
		High	-1.40523*	.33719	.000	-2.0971	-.7134
	Medium	Low	.72269*	.31889	.032	.0684	1.3770
		High	-.68254	.39506	.095	-1.4931	.1280
	High	Low	1.40523*	.33719	.000	.7134	2.0971
		Medium	.68254	.39506	.095	-.1280	1.4931

*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The data in Table 9 revealed that for *metacognitive learning strategies*, there was a statistically significant difference among groups as determined by a one-way ANOVA (F (2, 29) = 10.738, p = 0.000). A LCD post hoc test revealed that in the use of *metacognitive learning strategies*, the high-achieving learners were statistically significantly higher than the low-achieving learners (1.442 $\pm$ 0.314, p =.000) and the average-achieving learners (0.869 $\pm$ 0.368, p =.026). There was no statistically significant difference between the medium-achieving learners' and the low-achieving learners' groups (p = 0.065).

For *cognitive learning strategies*, a statistically significant difference was displayed among the groups as determined by a one-way ANOVA (F (2, 29) = 16.207, p = 0.000). A LCD post hoc test showed that in the use of *cognitive learning strategies*, the high-achieving learners were statistically significantly higher than the low-achieving learners (1.662 $\pm$ 0.294, p =.000) and the average-achieving learners (1.417 $\pm$ 0.344, p =.000). No statistically significant difference was observed between the medium-achieving learners' and the low-achieving learners' groups (p = 0.387).

For *memory learning strategies*, there was a statistically significant difference among groups as determined by a one-way ANOVA (F (2, 29) = 7.032, p = 0.003). A LCD post hoc test indicated that in the use of *memory learning strategies*, the high achievers were statistically significantly higher than the low achievers (1.147 $\pm$ 0.305, p =.001) and the average achieving learners (0.826 $\pm$ 0.358, p =.029). There was no statistically significant difference between the medium-achieving and low-achieving groups (p = 0.278).

For *social learning strategies*, there was a statistically significant difference among groups as determined by a one-way ANOVA (F (2, 29) = 14.471, p = 0.000). A LCD post hoc test revealed that in the use of social learning strategies, the high-achieving learners were statistically significantly higher than the low-achieving learners (2.139 $\pm$ 0.399, p =.000) and the average-achieving learners (1.747 $\pm$ 0.467, p =.001). There was no statistically significant difference between the medium-achieving learners' and the low-achieving learners' groups (p = 0.309).

Regarding the *compensation learning strategies*, it is possible to see the existence of a statistically significant difference among the three groups as determined by a one-way ANOVA (F (2, 29) = 13.237, p = 0.000). A LCD post hoc test demonstrated that regarding the utilization of *compensation learning strategies*, the high-achieving learners were statistically significantly higher than the low-achieving learners (1.797 $\pm$ 0.352, p =.000) and the average-achieving learners (1.539 $\pm$ 0.412, p =.001). There was no statistically significant difference between the medium-achieving learners' and the low-achieving learners' groups (p = 0.446).

For *affective learning strategies, it is possible to say that* there is a statistically significant difference among groups as determined by a one-way ANOVA test (F (2, 29) = 9.359, p = 0.001). A LCD post hoc test showed that with regard to the use of affective learning strategies, the low-achieving learners were statistically significantly lower than the average-achieving learners (-0.722 $\pm$ 0.318, p =.032) and the high-achieving learners (-1.405 $\pm$ 0.337, p =.000). There was no statistically significant difference between the average-achieving learners and the high-achieving learners' groups (p = 0.095).

To put it in a nutshell, the responses of the subjects to the interview questions point out that the more successful learners, in contrast with the average and the less successful learners have high language learning strategy utilization in learning the English language. Thus, the data gained from the interviews corresponds with the data obtained through the questionnaire.

5 Discussions

As can be observed from the students' responses in this study, it would seem reasonable to conclude that learners' use of language learning strategies in learning English is unsatisfactory. More specifically, the three groups (the high achievers, the average achievers, and the low achievers) did not equally utilize language learning strategies to develop their English language performance. At higher levels, low achievers use neither direct nor indirect LLS, indicating a lack of understanding of their strategy's application.

On the other hand, average achievers use only two strategies (the metacognitive and the affective strategies) at high frequency out of the six main language learning strategies. This means that average achievers lack good experience with the implementation of the three subcategories of direct strategies and social strategies under indirect strategies.

Unlike the two achievers, the high achievers utilize all six main language learning strategies, both direct and indirect, at a high frequency level. This indicates that the high achievers outperform their average and low counterparts by applying a wide range of language learning strategies, which apparently implies their better experience with their strategy use in English language learning. In supporting this, research on the utilization of foreign language learning strategies also reflects similar results in favor of more successful learners as higher and more frequent users (Al-Qahtani, 2013; Gerami & Baighlou, 2011; Giang & Tuan, 2018; Habok & Magyar, 2018; Foster *et al*., 2017; Gerami & Baighlou, 2011; Chen, 2009). Furthermore, it is in accord with research on language learning strategies that has particularly focused on the characteristics of good and bad learners. For instance, good learners provide reasons why they are efficient learners; their tactics are related to the type of learning task, and arrangements are made according to changing situations; they ask for support from their peers, teachers, or family when necessary; and they have confidence in their abilities to learn.

At the same time, a few studies reveal that metacognitive strategies were found to be employed predominantly by high achievers (Chamot, 2005; Lai, 2005; Vandergrift, 2003). Nevertheless, this study disproves this fact for the reason that social strategies are applied more frequently by high achievers in the first place. The current study also refutes the notion that more successful learners use monitoring strategies under metacognitive strategies more frequently (Vandergrift, 2003), because they use finding opportunities strategies under this principal category more frequently.

Generally, the present study recognizes that there is a strong connection between learners' language strategies and their language performance. Regarding the positive relationship between high use of LSS and language performance, literature also proves its existence (Oxford and Burry, 1995).

6 Conclusions

The general objective of this study was to explore the language learning strategies used by English majors. The data in the students' responses confirm that the high achievers, the average achievers, and the low achievers employ the six major language learning strategies at different frequencies. This could be ranked in the following order of strategy application:

High-achieving learners employ language learning strategies in the following order: social learning strategies, memory learning strategies, cognitive learning strategies, compensation learning strategies, metacognitive learning strategies, and affective learning strategies. It can be concluded that high-achieving Ethiopian English learners are good language learners.

Average-achieving learners employ language learning strategies in the following order: metacognitive learning strategies, affective learning strategies, social learning strategies, cognitive learning strategies, memory learning strategies, and compensation learning strategies. The data revealed that average learners were not better than low achievers in some strategies, such as memory, social, and compensation. This indicated that this group of learners needs language learning strategy training and close attention from their teachers.

Low-achieving learners also utilize language learning strategies in the order of: metacognitive learning strategies, cognitive learning strategies, memory learning strategies, social learning strategies, affective learning strategies, and compensation learning strategies. According to the data, this group of students is bad at using strategies and bad at achieving. Therefore, they should be given due attention in language learning strategy training.

Both high and average achievers revealed statistically significant mean differences in all language learning strategies excluding affective strategies as examined by one-way ANOVA. Meanwhile, it was found that a statistically significant mean dif-

ference existed between the high achievers and the low achievers in all major language learning strategies. However, no significant mean difference was discovered between average and low achievers. For this reason, it can be concluded that there was high strategy usage with regard to high-achieving learners, approximately medium strategy usage for medium-achieving learners, and low strategy usage for low-achieving learners. This actually purports that more effective students have better experiences using LLS as compared with medium achievers and low achievers.

Conflict of Interest

The author of this article has declared that there is no conflict of interest. He also confirmed that he has thoroughly read and approved the manuscript to be published in this journal.

Ethical Approval

Consent was sought form the research participants. Confidentiality was maintained in reporting information.

References

Al-Qahtani, M. (2013). Relationship between English language, learning strategies, attitudes, motivation, and students' academic achievement. *Education in Medicine Journal*, 5(3), 19-29.

Bonyadi, A., Nikou, F., & Shahbaz, S. (2012). The relationship between EFL learners' self-efficacy beliefs and their language learning strategy use. *English Language Teaching*, 5(8), 113-121.

Bedell, D. & Oxford, R. (1996). *Cross-cultural comparison of language learning strategies in the People's Republic of China and other countries*. **In**: R. Oxford (Ed.). Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives (pp. 47- 60). Honolulu: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii.

Bruten, J. (2001). Strategies for success: Profiling the effective learner of German. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34 (2), 216-225.

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

Chen, M. (2009). Influence of grade level on perceptual learning style preferences and language learning strategies of Taiwanese English as a foreign language learners. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 19(2), 304-308.

Fitzpatrick, D. (2011). Making sense of the English language proficiency in Thailand: An exploration of teachers' practices and dispositions. [Doctoral thesis, University of Exeter].

Foster, S., Sriphrom, C., & Nampanya, R. (2017). 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), 92-1-2.

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

Gerami, M., & Baighlou, S. (2011). Language learning strategies used by successful and unsuccessful Iranian EFL students. Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29, 1567-1576.

Ghavamnia, M., Kassaian, Z., & Dabaghi, A. (2011). The relationship between language learning strategies, language learning beliefs, motivation, and proficiency: A study of EFL learners in Iran. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(5), 1156-1161.

Giang, B., & Tuan, V. (2018). Language learning strategies of Vietnamese EFL freshmen. *Arab World English Journal*, 9(3), 61-83.

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

Griffiths, C. (2013). The strategy factor in successful language learning. Multilingual Matters.

Griffiths, C., & Cansiz, G. (2015). Language learning strategies: A holistic view. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(3), 473-493.

Habok, A., & Magyar, A. (2018). The effect of language learning strategies on proficiency, attitudes and school achievement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(2358), 1-8.

Hashim, H., Yunus, M., & Hashim, H. (2018). Language learning strategies used by Adult learners of teaching English as a second language (TESL). *TESOL International Journal*, 13(4), 39-48.

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

Kanchai, T. (2019). Thai EFL university lecturers' viewpoints towards impacts of the CEFR on their English language curricula and teaching practice. *NIDA Journal of Language and Communication*, 24(35), 23-47.

Khamkhien, A. (2011). Language learning strategies used by Thai and Vietnamese university students. *Manusya: Journal of Humanities*, 14(2), 1-23.

Lai, Y.C. (2005). Language learning strategy use and language proficiency for English as a foreign language (EFL) learners in Taiwan. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, California: USA.

Lan, R. & Oxford, R. (2003). Language learning strategy profiles of elementary school students in Taiwan. *IRAL*, 41(4), 339- 379.

Nguyen, H., & Terry, D. (2017). English learning strategies among EFL learners: *A narrative approach. Journal of Language Learning*, 3(1), 4-19.

Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language learning strategies and beyond*: A look at strategies in the context of styles. **In**: S. S. Magnan (Ed.), Shifting the Instructional Focus to the Learner (pp. 35-55). Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Oxford, R. (2011). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies*. Routledge.

Oxford, R. (2017). *Teaching and Researching Language Learning Strategies*: Self-Regulation in Context (2^{nd} edition). Routledge.

Paredes, E. (2010). Language Learning Strategy Use by Colombian Adult English Language Learners: A Phenomenological Study. Unpublished PhD thesis. Florida International University.

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.

Pornpibul, N. (2005). Quantitative and qualitative views of EFL learners' strategies: A focus on communication strategies. *Journal of Studies in the English Language*, 2.

Prakongchati, N. (2012). The use of language learning strategies in English learning contexts. *Humanities and Social Sciences*, 29(1), 65-87.

Rao, Z. (2016). Language learning strategies and English proficiency: Interpretations from information-processing theory. *The Language Learning Journal*, 44(1), 90-106.

Rardprakhon, J. (2016). Language learning strategies used by Thai engineering freshmen with different English academic achievement levels. [Master's thesis, Burapha University, Chonburi].

Srisupha, R. (2012). Thai students' language learning strategies. *Quarterly Journal of Chinese Studies*, 2(2), 53-67.

Suwanarak, K. (2015). Learning English as Thai adult learners: An insight into experience in using learning strategies. *English Language Teaching*, 8(12), 144-157.

Taguchi, T. (2002). Learner factors affecting the use of learning strategies in cross-cultural contexts. *Prospect*, 17(2), 18-34.

Thomas, N., & Rose, H. (2019). Do language learning strategies need to be self-directed? Disentangling strategies from self-regulated learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(1), 248-257.

Tieocharoen, W., & Rimkeeratikul, S. (2019). Learning strategies and teaching methods in Thai and Vietnamese universities. *Arab World English Journal*, 10(3), 99-112.

Toomnan, P. (2019). Types of study program and language learning strategies of university students: A case in the northeast of Thailand. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(3), 1850-1861.

Vandergrift, L. (2003). Orchestrating Strategy Use: Toward a Model of the Skilled Second Language Listener. *Language Learning*, 53(3), 463-496.

Vlckova, K. et al. (2013). Classification theories of foreign language learning strategies: an exploratory analysis. *Studia paedagogica*. 8 (4). 93-114.

Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning*, 50(2), 203-244.

Williams, M. & Burden, R. (1997). Psychology for language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Zhang, L., & Xiao, Y. (2014). Language learning strategies, motivation and EFL proficiency: A study of Chinese tertiary-level non-English majors. *Asian Englishes*, 9(2), 20-47.

Zhong, Q. (2015). Changes in two migrant learners' beliefs, learning strategy use and language achievements in a New Zealand context. *System*, 53, 107-118.