

Language Teaching Research Quarterly

2024, Vol. 41, 52–66



Language Learning Strategies, Proficiency And Gender: The Case of Palestinian University Students

Muhannad Abuzaid¹, Carol Griffiths^{2*}

¹Ministry of Education, Palestine

²Girne American University, North Cyprus

Received 08 July 2023

Accepted 28 November 2023

Abstract

This case study, conducted at a Palestinian university, explored the language learning strategies employed by learners of English as a foreign language and the relationship with proficiency. Furthermore, since gender is often considered a major variable in learning success in some areas of the world, the study wished to explore the role of gender in strategy use and level of proficiency in the Palestinian context. The study included 109 (41 male, 68 female) students studying in English preparatory courses prior to entering the university. The data were gathered through an original 60-item language learning strategy questionnaire, modelled to some extent on the *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning* or *SILL* (Oxford, 1990) and constructed from material contributed by the students themselves. The results indicated that students reported medium to frequent strategy use, which was not significantly related to proficiency level, and there were only three significant gender differences according to strategy use, in favor of the females. This suggests that gender is not a salient influence in these students' strategy use or levels of proficiency. This article concludes by suggesting implications both for the immediate context of the study and also for environments beyond the location of the current study.

Keywords: *Language Learning, Gender, Language Learning Strategies, Academic Achievement, Proficiency, Context*

¹Introduction

Traditionally over the centuries/millennia, education has been teacher-centred, and this remains the case in many places up until the present day (e.g., Llego, 2022). However, from around the 1970s, a major paradigm shift began, and the emphasis started to move from the teacher to the

¹ This paper is part of a special issue (2024, 41) entitled: In Honour of Rebecca L. Oxford's Contributions to Language Learning Strategies, Language Teaching, and Peacebuilding (edited by Carol Griffiths and Hassan Mohebbi).

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: carolgriffiths@gau.edu.tr

<https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2024.41.05>

learner (e.g., Hosenfeld, 1976). This meant that, rather than being seen as passive recipients of the teacher's superior knowledge, learners were viewed as active participants in the learning process, capable of using strategies to achieve their own learning goals (e.g., Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975).

In the years since Rubin's (1975) and Stern's (1975) "Good Learner" studies, a great deal of research into the basic question of how strategies relate to proficiency/achievement has been conducted (e.g., O'Malley et al., 1985; Green & Oxford, 1995; Griffiths, 2003; Habok & Magyar, 2018). Research has also explored the relationships between/among strategy use and learner variables such as age, motivation, nationality, and gender (e.g., Griffiths, 2018). In addition, the context in which learning occurs has been increasingly recognized as an important influencing variable (e.g., Oxford, 1996; Takeuchi et al. 2007; Grenfell & Harris, 2017; Hajar, 2019). Whether it be geographical, social, political, religious, or ecological, the environment in which teaching takes place can have a major impact on the effectiveness of the learning and on the strategies which are promoted, permitted or practicable in particular contexts.

Bearing these factors in mind, the study reported in this article aimed to investigate strategy use in an area of the world where relatively little such research has been conducted (Palestine). Given that this is an area where conflict "often grabs headlines" (Cardwell, 2018, para. 1), we might wonder whether this has an effect on education, which is a common result of such conflict (e.g., UNICEF, 2023); if so, what is the relationship to gender, which remains a challenge for the achievement of parity in many places around the world (e.g., UNESCO, 2019); and what strategies might learners use to achieve proficiency in such an environment. Following the report and discussion of the findings of the study, implications for other areas of the world will be suggested.

Language Learning Strategies: Previous Research

As noted in the Introduction, it is Rubin (1975) and Stern (1975) who are often credited with introducing the strategy concept to language learning with their studies of good language learners. Others were keen to follow their initiative, both before and after the turn of the millennium (e.g., Chamot, 1987, 2009; Cohen, 1998, 2011; Griffiths, 2003, 2018; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990, 2017; Wenden, 1991).

Strategy Definition

In spite of this initial enthusiasm, however, in the years since the strategy concept has been controversial. A decade after the landmark articles by Rubin (1975) and Stern (1975), O'Malley et al. (1985, p.22), reported "considerable confusion" regarding the strategy term, while the adjective "elusive" was used by Wenden and Rubin (1987, p.7) and the epithet "fuzzy" was applied by Ellis (1994, p.529). In the face of such disputes, Dörnyei (2005) questioned whether language learning strategies existed and suggested *self-regulation* as a more appropriate term. A year later, Macaro (2006, p.320) abandoned the search for "an all-encompassing definition" and settled instead for a series of essential features, and another 12 years later, Gu (2012, p.330) described "a prototypical core and dimensions of variation" rather than trying to achieve a generally agreed definition.

Nevertheless, in order to be able to carry out meaningful research, a definition of the concept under investigation is essential. An extremely comprehensive definition was

provided by Oxford (2017, p.48)

learning strategies are complex, dynamic thoughts and actions, selected and used by learners with some degree of consciousness in specific contexts in order to regulate multiple aspects of themselves (such as cognitive, emotional, and social) for the purpose of (a) accomplishing language tasks; (b) improving language performance or use; and/or (c) enhancing long-term proficiency. Strategies are mentally guided but may also have physical and therefore observable manifestations. Learners often use strategies flexibly and creatively; combine them in various ways, such as strategy clusters or strategy chains; and orchestrate them to meet learning needs. Strategies are teachable. Learners in their contexts decide which strategies to use.

However, as noted by Thomas et al. (2019), Oxford's (2017) definition goes well beyond merely defining. A much more concise definition is provided by Griffiths (2018, p.22), according to whom, language learning strategies are "*actions chosen by learners for the purpose of learning language*", which emphasizes the active nature of strategies which are chosen by learners in order to facilitate the purpose of language learning.

Strategies and Proficiency

A major preoccupation for strategy research has been the relationship with achievement in language learning. Some researchers have questioned the effect of strategies on proficiency. As an example, Porte (1988), found that the underachieving learners in his study were nevertheless active strategy users, and a similar conclusion was reached by Vann & Abraham (1990). They therefore questioned the idea that strategies might have anything to do with how successful learners might be. More recently, no significant relationship between strategy use and proficiency level was found by Fajrina et al. (2021)

Other studies have produced mixed results. O'Malley et al. (1985), for instance, reported extensive use of strategies by students at all levels, but higher metacognitive strategy deployment among higher-level students. In Ehrman and Oxford's (1995) study it was cognitive strategies that were used more frequently by more successful students. A recent study by Kwon and Yu (2023) also produced mixed results when they found a significant positive relationship between test results and planning, comprehending and retrieval strategies, but a significant negative relationship for monitoring and evaluation strategies.

Green and Oxford (1995), however, demonstrated a clear significantly positive relationship between strategy use and successful learning among their Puerto Rican university students. Griffiths (2003) also found that her higher-level international students studying in New Zealand used more language learning strategies significantly more often than lower-level students. Khairul (2004) likewise found a significant relationship between strategy use and achievement, and when Saleem (2009) investigated strategy use among high school students, she also found that strategies had a significant relationship to achievement. When Abu Radwan (2011) investigated the relationship between English proficiency and strategy use, he found that more experienced learners employed more strategies than less experienced learners, and Zou and Lertlitb (2022) also found that strategy use varied significantly according to proficiency level.

Mallahi (2022) likewise discovered significant differences in strategy use according to skill level. In other words, although some researchers have come to negative or ambiguous conclusions regarding the relationship of strategies to proficiency, there are many others where a significantly positive relationship has been found.

Strategies and Gender

Strategies have also been investigated in relation to many other variables, including gender. The issue of gender is one which has attracted considerable attention over the years, and results have been very mixed (e.g., Abu Radwan, 2011; Al-Kohlani; Aslan, 2009; Çeribaş, 2017; Kök, 2023; Li & Li, 2022; Murni & Sahril, 2018; Nyikos, 2008; Sumarni & Rachmawaty, 2019).

Most studies have shown that females tend to be more strategically active and/or proficient than males, but there are exceptions. Tran (1988), for instance, found that his Vietnamese male learners used more strategies than the females, although cultural factors were suggested as a compounding variable which might help to explain this result. Griffiths (2003) found that although the females in her study in New Zealand used more strategies than their male classmates and were slightly more proficient, the differences were not significant. In Turkey, Çeribaş (2017) found that the male students in his study were more proficient than the females, although the difference was not significant, and there were also no significant differences in strategy use according to gender.

But a classic study by Green and Oxford (1995) at a university in Latin America found that the females used significantly more strategies than the males, as well as being significantly more proficient. According also to Khalil (2005), the findings of a study in Palestine indicate that females use strategies significantly more frequently than males, but they are not significantly more proficient. These differing results obtained from studies in various locations raise the question of the degree to which these findings might be context-dependent and might also, perhaps, vary according to the prevailing gender ideology.

The study

In the light of the literature reviewed above, the current study aimed to investigate the following research questions:

RQ1: What strategies do learners use to learn language?

RQ2: How is students' proficiency level related to strategy use?

RQ3: How is gender related to strategy use?

RQ4: To what extent is gender related to proficiency?

Research Design

In order to explore language learning strategy use among Palestinian students, and the relationships to proficiency and gender, this study employed an original inventory constructed from data obtained from students at the university. The effectiveness of questionnaires used for research has been questioned (e.g., Gu et al., 1995), but others acknowledge questionnaires as an efficient means of collecting data and as capable of providing illuminating insights if analyzed and interpreted with care (e.g., Nunan, 1992).

Participants

The participants in the study reported in this article were enrolled in preparatory courses at a Palestinian university. The sample consisted of four sections of students registered at the university. Based on a test conducted on entry to the university, students were grouped from A1 to B2 according to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). There were 109 students who completed the questionnaire specially designed for the study (see below). Of these, 68 were female and 41 were male.

Instrumentation

The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning or *SILL* (Oxford 1990) was considered as an instrument for this study. The publication of the *SILL*, a self-report questionnaire by Oxford (1990) represented a giant leap forward in strategy research. It has also been used, and continues to be used, by many researchers around the world in the years since (e.g., Griffiths, 2003; Khairul, 2004; Harish, 2014; Zou & Lertlib, 2022), but given issues of cultural appropriacy acknowledged by Oxford herself (2017) and discussed by Amerstorfer (2018), it was decided to design an original instrument specifically aimed at the students in the context of the current study.

The instrument for this study was constructed from responses to open-ended questions about strategy use from a small group of students (N=30) at the university. When analyzed thematically, 60 items were identified, and this data appeared to fall into fourteen main categories: vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, reading, listening, speaking, writing, monitoring learning and evaluating progress, as well as managing the environment, time, emotions, motivation and social interaction. These items were further grouped according to

- language knowledge (vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation – 15 items)
- language skills (reading, listening, speaking, writing – 16 items)
- metacognition (managing the environment, time, emotions, motivation and social interaction plus monitoring and evaluation – 29 items).

These items were then transformed into closed-ended questions, modelled to some extent on the format established in the *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning* or *SILL* (Oxford, 1990). Participants were asked to rate 60 strategy items on a 5-point Likert scale from 5 (=very often) to 1 (never).

The instrument was piloted by asking qualified teachers to complete it. Modifications were then made according to their responses. Based on this procedure, it was concluded that the questionnaire was appropriate for investigating students' language learning strategy use as reported in the current study (a Palestinian university).

Data Collection

The instrument used in this study was initially produced as a Word document (see Appendix 2), which was then converted into a Google survey form. This was then sent to the participants by email. Altogether 109 completed questionnaire forms were received.

Data Analysis

The data was first entered into Excel and then into SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) for analysis. Here the data was tested for reliability (Cronbach's Alpha) and

subjected to a factor analysis (Principal Component). Since Likert scales produce ordinal data, medians were employed as a test of central tendency, a nonparametric correlational test (Spearman's) was employed to test the correlation between strategy use and course level, and a non-parametric test of difference (Mann Whitney U) was used to check differences according to the nominal variable of gender (Cohen et al., 2018; Dörnyei, 2007).

Results

Reliability

Over the whole questionnaire (60 items), the Cronbach Alpha coefficient for reliability was 0.979, which is a very high level of reliability in the social sciences (e.g., Dörnyei, 2007). This suggests that the instrument was measuring the target factor (language learning strategies) reliably.

Factor Analysis

According to a Principal Component Analysis, all of the questionnaire items were found to load at more than 0.5 (the highest being 0.779, the lowest 0.529). This is considerably higher than the usual standard minimum of 0.3 (e.g., Dörnyei, 2007). It can therefore be concluded that the items of the questionnaire form a unified construct.

Median Reported Strategy Use

Tables 1-3 (see Appendix 1) include the median ratings over all 60 items of the questionnaire. According to these results, 17 (28%) of the strategy items were rated 4 (=often). The remaining items (43 or 72%) were rated moderately often (=3). None of the strategy items was rated not often (2) or never (1), which suggests that all of the items are used at least moderately often by the participants. In the case of all the items, the range was 4, from very often (=5) to never (=1), suggesting that students vary considerably in their strategy choices and the frequency with which they use their chosen strategies

Table 1 (see Appendix 1) includes the items from the questionnaire related to language knowledge (vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation, n=15). There were 3 items with a median of 4, all of them related to vocabulary, indicating that it is these items which attracted the strongest level of reported frequency of strategy use, which, in turn, perhaps suggests that it is vocabulary which is of greatest concern for these students.

Table 2 (see Appendix 1) reports the questionnaire items related to skills (reading, listening, speaking, writing, n=16). In this table there are five strategy items with a median of 4 (often) all of them related to listening. As with vocabulary from the previous group of language knowledge strategies, the result here indicates that, since listening attracts the highest strategy ratings, it is this skill which is of most concern.

Table 3 (see Appendix 1) deals with metacognitive strategies (n=29) for managing, monitoring and evaluating learning. There are nine items with a median of 4, of which a majority (n=5) are included among the strategies for monitoring and evaluation. Again, these results would seem to suggest that it is these strategies with which students are most concerned.

Correlations of Strategy Ratings with Proficiency Level

According to Spearman's non-parametric test of correlation for ordinal data, there were no significant correlations between strategies reportedly used by these students and proficiency level. This suggests that students at all proficiency levels use strategies at similar rates of frequency.

Differences for Strategy Use according to Gender

According to a Mann-Whitney non-parametric test of difference for nominal data, there were only three out of the sixty strategies that revealed significant gender differences, all of them relating to skills:

Skills item 8 ($p=0.011$): I listen to the words and try to picture what the speaker is saying.

Skills item 12 ($p=0.038$): I participate in group discussion

Skills item 13 ($p=0.048$): I write essays or short stories in my free time

In all three of these cases, female students reported using them more frequently than the male students. However, the finding that the difference was significant in only three out of sixty items (or 5% of the total), and the p -value is not high for any of them, suggests that there is relatively little variation between males and females regarding strategy use.

Differences for Proficiency according to Gender

According to the results of a Mann-Whitney non-parametric test of difference for nominal data, there were no significant differences according to proficiency level according to gender.

Discussion

This study was undertaken for the following purposes: to investigate what strategies the students used to facilitate language learning; to explore the relationship between strategy use and proficiency; to discover whether there was any difference in strategy use according to gender; and to discover whether there was any difference in proficiency level according to gender.

Regarding the use of language learning strategies, this study found quite a high level of frequency over the 60 items of the questionnaire, with none of the medians going below 3 (moderately often). This result is similar to that of Abu-Shamais (2003), who also found a medium to high level of strategy use among the Palestinian students in his study.

An examination of Table 1 (see Appendix 1) reveals that strategies related to vocabulary received the highest level of frequency regarding language knowledge. These include the traditional strategies of using new words in a sentence, relating new words in the target language to words in the L1, and translating new vocabulary into the mother tongue. This result would seem to reinforce the importance ascribed to vocabulary when learning a new language (e.g., Coxhead, 2014; Nation, 2013; Schmitt, 2000).

Regarding skills (Table 2, see Appendix 1), strategies relating to listening received the highest levels of frequency, including listening to songs, watching video material in the target language, paying attention when someone is speaking in the new language, and listening to words and trying to make a mental picture of what the speaker is saying. The emphasis on listening strategies is in accord with other research (e.g., Kök, 2023; Rahman et

al., 2023; Vandergrift & Tafaghodatari, 2010).

The importance of metacognitive strategies (Table 3, see Appendix 1) for managing and controlling learning has long been recognized (e.g., O'Malley et al., 1985; Anderson, 2008; Griffiths, 2018). In the case of the current study, nine metacognitive strategies received a rating of 4 (often), of which the largest group involved those related to monitoring and evaluation (including keeping a journal, comparing current with past knowledge, careful checking, monitoring goals, and self-evaluation). In addition to these, there were three affective strategies (included among metacognitive strategies by Griffiths, 2018), relating to controlling emotions, using positive self-talk and maintaining a good study/life balance. A strategy relating to maintaining goal-orientation was also rated 4.

A primary goal of this study was to investigate the relationship between strategy use and achievement. Based on the results of some previous research (e.g., Green & Oxford, 1995; Griffiths, 2003), it was anticipated that high achievers in the B2 level would report a significantly higher level of frequency with use of strategies than those in the lower levels. However, according to the results of the current study, students at all levels reported remarkably similar frequency of strategy use – there were no significant correlations between strategy use and level of proficiency. Although this finding contrasts with those of Green and Oxford (1995) and Griffiths (2003), it is similar to those of Sariçoban and Sariçaoğlu (2008), who found a statistically significant relationship between students' proficiency levels and the compensation strategies they employed, but they found no link between the other strategies and academic achievement.

According to the findings of this study, there are few significant differences regarding strategy use according to gender. There is an exception for items 8 (trying to visualize what the speaker is saying while listening), 12 (relating to participation in group discussions), and 13 (relating to writing in free time). According to the results, the female student use these strategies slightly more often than their male classmates.

Some previous strategy studies have found strategy use to be significantly affected by gender (e.g., Abu Radwan, 2011; Green & Oxford, 1995; Tran, 1988). Except for Tran (1988), all of these studies found that females used more strategies than males. Nevertheless, other researchers (e.g., Abu Shmais, 2003; Griffiths, 2003) have found that gender did not have a significant effect on strategy use. In the case of this current study, very few significant differences were found according to gender regarding strategy use (only 3 out of 60, or 5% of the strategy items). This low number suggests that gender is not a major factor in terms of strategy use, and in accord with the conclusion reached by Nyikos (2008), might well be related to multiple other variables as much as gender per se (e.g., ecological, social or affective factors).

Some studies (e.g., Çeribaş, 2017; Green & Oxford, 1995) have found differences in level of proficiency according to gender. In the case of the Green and Oxford (1995) study, it was the females who were more proficient; in the case of Çeribaş's study (2017), the males were more proficient (though not significantly so). According to the results of this study, however, there were no significant differences in proficiency according to gender, in accord with the studies by Griffiths (2003) and Khalil (2005).

Although according to the results of this study strategy use was not statistically correlated with proficiency level, students reported generally active strategy use across

levels. According to Lai (2009, p.276) "Training students in the use of learning strategies and assisting them in creating their own specific ways of learning will make them independent and successful learners". Since independence and autonomy tend to be among the distinguishing characteristics of successful students (e.g., Wenden, 1991), this therefore implies that it is useful to encourage students to actively and purposefully employ strategies appropriate for their own goals and individual characteristics. In order to promote strategy awareness, materials such as the books by Tang and Griffiths (2014) or Chamot and Harris (2018) might be useful resources.

Although this study was conducted in Palestine, it would seem to suggest potentially useful implications for other locations, especially those where serious conflict and/or gender discrimination exist. The result from this study that males and females are equally proficient is encouraging and supported by evidence from the literature (e.g., Cardwell, 2018; UNESCO, 2019). The fact that they have achieved this in an environment where conflict is frequently in the international news is very much to their credit. Research to investigate how they have achieved this and how this might be applied to other environments could be of major benefit to many around the world.

The original questionnaire constructed for and used in this study was found to be a reliable means of surveying the concept under investigation – language learning strategies. Future studies might well consider using this instrument (included in Appendix 2) to assess language learning strategies, perhaps with adaptations according to the target participants, culture and context. More research is needed into the relationship between students' gender and strategy usage, also investigating some of the other related factors suggested by Nyikos (2008) which might impact students' strategy use (e.g., age, cultural background, etc.). Future studies could collect data using instruments other than the questionnaire used in this study. Other methodologies (e.g., interviews, narratives, observation, etc.) could add triangulation and enlightening qualitative perspectives (e.g., Hajar, 2019) to the essentially quantitative dimension offered by a Likert-scale questionnaire. Since the current study was conducted in just one location, replication in other contexts has the potential to add useful extra dimensions relating to culture, ideology and ecology. This study focused on just two variables (gender and proficiency). Future studies might well include other factors such as age, culture, ecology, etc.

Conclusion


This research included 109 students (68 females, 41 males) enrolled in Palestinian university preparatory English courses. The main aims were to investigate the strategies the students use to learn language, the extent to which students' proficiency level is related to their strategy use, and the extent to which gender is related to proficiency level and language learning strategy use. The students reported a high level of strategy use: all strategy items received a median rating of 4 (often) or 3 (moderately often) and no strategy items were rated not often (2) or never (1). However, neither strategy use nor gender showed a significant relationship to proficiency level, and only 3 out of the 60 items in the questionnaire showed significant differences according to gender.

Overall, we might conclude that these students are active strategy users, although strategy use has no statistically significant relationship to their level of proficiency, since

students appear to be frequent strategy users across all proficiency levels. Furthermore, there are no differences according to gender for proficiency and very few for strategy use. This would seem to be an encouraging result in terms of gender equality which others might care to research in terms of how it is achieved in the context of the current study in order to be able to apply the findings to their own environments.

ORCID

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1427-1679>

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4653-8482>

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Funding

Not applicable.

Ethics Declarations

Competing Interests

No, there are no conflicting interests.

Rights and Permissions

Open Access

This article is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which grants permission to use, share, adapt, distribute and reproduce in any medium or format provided that proper credit is given to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if any changes were made.

References

- Abu Radwan, A. (2011). Effects of L2 proficiency and gender on choice of language. learning strategies by university students majoring in English. *Asian EFL Journal*, 12, 115-163.
- Abu Shmais, W. (2003). *Language learning strategy use in Palestine*. *TESL Electronic Journal*, 7(2), 1-13. <https://tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume7/ej26/ej26a3/>
- Al-Kohlani, S. (2021). Educational gender inequality in the Muslim world: A problem of a cultural heritage, religion, or modernization? *Social Science Quarterly*, 102, 1920-1930.
- Amerstorfer, C. (2018). Past its expiry date? The SILL in modern mixed-methods strategy research. *SSLLT*, 8(2), 497-523.
- Anderson, N. (2008). Metacognition and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* (pp.99-109). Cambridge University Press
- Aslan, O. (2009). The role of gender and language learning strategies in learning English. *The Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University*. unpublished thesis.
- Cardwell, L. (2018). The state of girl's education in Palestine. <https://borgenproject.org/the-state-of-girls-education-in-palestine/>
- Çeribaş, Y. (2017). Gender and strategies in the language classroom. In K. Dikilitaş & C. Griffiths (Eds), *Developing language teacher autonomy through action research* (pp.203-215). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chamot, A. (1987). The learning strategies of ESL students. In A.Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp.71-83). Prentice Hall
- Chamot, A. (2009). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach*. Pearson Longman
- Chamot, A., & Harris, V. (Eds) (2018). *Learning strategy instruction in the language classroom: Issues and implementation*. Multilingual Matters.
- Cohen, A. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Longman.
- Cohen, A. (2011). *Strategies in learning and using a second language* (2nd edition). Longman.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th edition). Routledge.
- Coxhead, A. (2014). *New ways in teaching vocabulary. Revised*. TESOL.

- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *Psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Ehrman, M. & Oxford, R. (1995). Cognition plus: Correlates of language learning success. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(1), 67-89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1995.tb05417.x>
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Fajrina, D. Everatt, J. & Sadeghi, A. (2021). Writing strategies used by Indonesian EFL students with different English proficiency. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 21, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2021.21.01>
- Green, J., & Oxford, R. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 261-297. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587625>
- Grenfell, M. & Harris, V. (2017). *Language learner strategies: Contexts, issues and applications in second language learning and teaching*. Bloomsbury.
- Griffiths, C. (2003). *Language learning strategy use and proficiency: the relationship between patterns of reported language learning strategy (LLS) use by speakers of other languages and proficiency with implications for the teaching/learning situation*. (PhD thesis, University of Auckland, New Zealand). <http://hdl.handle.net/2292/9>
- Griffiths, C. (2018). *The strategy factor in successful language learning (2nd edition): The tornado effect*. Multilingual Matters.
- Gu, Y. (2012). Learning strategies: Prototypical core and dimensions of variation. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, 3(4), 330–356.
- Gu, Y., Wen, Q., & Wu, D. (1995). How often is *Often*? Reference ambiguities of the Likert-scale in language learning strategy research. *Occasional Papers in English Language Teaching*, 5, 19-35.
- Habok, A., & Magyar, A. (2018). The effect of language learning strategies on proficiency, attitudes and school achievement. *Institute of Education, University of Szeged, Hungary*. 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02358>
- Hajar, S. (2019). A critical review of research on language learning strategies used by Arab learners of English. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, 10(3), 239-257. <http://sisaljournal.org/archives/sep19/hajar>
- Harish, S. (2014). Social strategy use and language learning contexts: a case study of Malayalee undergraduate students in India. *System*, 43, 64-73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.01.002>
- Hosenfeld, C. (1976). Learning about learning: Discovering our students' strategies. *Foreign Language Annals*, 9, 117-129. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1976.tb02637.x>
- Khairul, S. (2004). *Perception of language learning strategies used by Indonesian secondary school learners according to gender and field of study and their relationships within English language achievement*. Unpublished thesis. School of Graduate Studies, University Putra, Malaysia.
- Khalil, A. (2005). Assessment of language learning strategies used by Palestinian EFL learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(1), 108-119. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2005.tb02458.x>
- Kök, I. (2023). Investigating learners' listening comprehension strategy awareness and its implications for language learning. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 33, 132–149. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2023.33.07>
- Kwon, S. & Yu, G (2023). Investigating differences in test-takers' use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in audio-only and video-based listening comprehension test. *System*, 114. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103017>
- Lai, Y. (2009). Language strategy use and English proficiency of university freshmen in Taiwan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(2), 255-280. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00167.x>
- Llego, M. (2022). *How to make the teacher-centred approach more effective*. <https://www.teacherph.com/teacher-centered-approach/>
- Nation, I.S.P. (2013). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: Revising the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(3), 320-337.
- Mallahi, O. (2022). Investigating the strategies and problems of Iranian EFL learners while writing summaries in academic contexts. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 28, 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2022.28.01>
- Murni, M., & Sahril, N. (2018). Exploring students' learning strategies and gender differences in English language teaching. *International Journal of Language Education*, 2(1), 51-64.
- Nyikos, M. (2008). Gender and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* (pp.73-82). Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley, J., & Chamot, A. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Newbury House.

- Oxford, R. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context*, (2nd edition). Routledge.
- Oxford, R. (Ed.) (1996). *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Centre: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Porte, G. (1988). Poor language learners and their strategies for dealing with new vocabulary. *ELT Journal*, 42(3), 167-171. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/42.3.167>
- Rahman, N., Chowdhury, S., & Mazgutova, D. (2023). Rethinking teaching listening skills: A case study. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 33, 176-190.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the 'good language learner' can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(1), 41-51. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3586011>
- Saleem, L. (2009). *The impact of self-learning strategy on the learners' achievement in public secondary schools from the English teachers' perspective in Tulkarm Governorate*. Unpublished thesis. An- Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine.
- Sarıçoban, A., & Sariçaoğlu, A. (2008). The effect of the relationship between learning and teaching strategies on academic achievement. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 2(2), 162-175.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Stern, H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31(4), 304-318.
- Sumarni, S., & Rachmawaty, N. (2019). Gender differences in language learning strategies. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 6(1), 13-22. <https://doi.org/ethicallingua.org/25409190/article/view/3>
- Takeuchi, O., Griffiths, C. & Coyle, D. (2007). Applying strategies to contexts: the role of individual, situational and group differences. In A. Cohen & E. Macaro (Eds), *Language Learner Strategies* (pp.69-92). Oxford University Press.
- Tang, Y., & Griffiths, C. (2014). *The keys to highly effective English learning*. Jiangxi Education Publishing House.
- Thomas, N., Rose, H. & Pojanapunya, P. (2021). Conceptual issues in strategy research: Examining the roles of teachers and students in formal education settings. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 12(2), 353-269. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2019-0033>
- Tran, T. (1988). Sex differences in English language acculturation and learning strategies among Vietnamese adults aged 40 and over in the United States, *Sex Roles*, 19, 747-758.
- UNESCO (2019). *Global education monitoring report 2019: Building bridges for gender equality*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000368753>
- UNICEF (2023). *Education under attack*. <https://www.unicef.org/education-under-attack>
- Vann, R., & Abraham, R. (1990). Strategies of unsuccessful language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(2), 177-198. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586898>
- Vandergrift, L. & Tafaghodari, M. (2010). Teaching L2 learners how to listen does make a difference: An empirical study. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 470-497.
- Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy*. Prentice Hall.
- Wenden, A. & Rubin, J. (Eds) (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. Prentice Hall.
- Zou, B., & Lertlitb, S. (2022). Oxford's Strategy Inventory for Language Learning: English learning of Chinese students in a Thai university. *Learn Journal*, 15(2), 705-723. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1358724.pdf>

Appendix 1

Tables 1-3 Including the Median Strategy Ratings from the Study

Table 1
Median Reported Ratings for Language Learning Strategy Use for the 15 Items of the Strategy Questionnaire related to Knowledge of the Language

No	In order to learn new language	MED
1	I use new words in a sentence.	4
2	I write new words on a paper or in a notebook.	3
3	I repeat new words to myself.	3
4	I remember the location where I encountered a new word.	3
5	I relate new words to words in my own language.	4
6	I translate new words into my own language.	4
7	I open virtual classes on the Internet to learn grammar.	3
8	I create a mind-map or a table to get an overview of grammar rules.	3
9	I notice my mistakes and use that information to improve.	3

10	I do grammar exercises.	3
11	I read and listen to texts in the new language and try to notice characteristics of grammar use.	3
12	I listen to the pronunciation of the words on Google translate.	3
13	I say new words several times.	3
14	I try to talk like native speakers.	3
15	I practise pronunciation with native speakers or other learners.	3

Table 2

Median Reported Ratings for Language Learning Strategy Use for the 16 Items of the Strategy Questionnaire relating to Language Skills

No	In order to learn new language	MED
1	I read newspapers, stories or books.	3
2	I read for pleasure in the new language.	3
3	I first skim a passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	3
4	I annotate or highlight heading or subheadings.	3
5	I listen to songs.	4
6	I watch movies or TV shows spoken in the new language.	4
7	I pay attention when someone is speaking in the new language.	4
8	I listen to the words and try to picture what the speaker is saying in my mind.	4
9	I talk to people who speak the language in online chats.	3
10	I pay attention when someone is speaking in the new language.	4
11	I discuss learning materials and information with others.	3
12	I participate in group discussion.	3
13	I write essays or short stories in my free time.	3
14	I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in the new language.	3
15	I write new words several times.	3
16	I write simple and uncomplicated words and sentences.	3

Table 3

Median Reported Ratings for Language Learning Strategy Use for the 29 Items of the Strategy Questionnaire relating to Metacognition

No	In order to learn new language	MED
1	I try to create a clean and orderly environment around me.	3
2	I examine the size and shape of the room, arrangement of desks and chairs, and technology.	3
3	I sit in a specific place each class.	3
4	I keep my phone away from me.	3
5	I start working on assignments early.	3
6	I determine a list of daily accomplishments.	3
7	I set periods for rest.	3
8	During exams I set a special schedule with material and times that I want to complete.	3
9	I organize my sleeping hours.	3
10	I try to control my emotions.	4
11	I go to walk with my friends.	3
12	I try to lower my anxiety by taking a deep breath.	3
13	I use laughter.	3
14	I keep my end goal in mind.	4
15	I try different study approaches.	3
16	I try to make a balance between my life and my learning.	4
17	I use positive self-talk.	4
18	I join social clubs	3
19	I talk to those around me.	3
20	I set a specific time for socializing.	3
21	I break down the goal into smaller tasks.	3
22	I set a reward system.	3

23	I check everything and make sure of it.	3
24	I let experts correct my mistakes.	3
25	I keep a journal about my progress.	4
26	I compare my learning development with my past knowledge.	4
27	I check everything and make sure of it.	4
28	I make sure that I have accomplished the goals.	4
29	I evaluate myself through an exam.	4

Appendix 2

**The full questionnaire is printed here to assist with possible replication*

Dear Participant,

Please read the following list of strategies (actions chosen by learners for the purpose of learning language) which have been suggested by language learners. Please rate them according to how often you personally use them, using the scale

5=very often 4=often 3=moderately often 2=not often 1=never

No	In order to learn new language	Med
1	I use new words in a sentence.	
2	I write new words on a paper or in a notebook.	
3	I repeat new words to myself.	
4	I remember the location where I encountered a new word.	
5	I relate new words to words in my own language.	
6	I translate new words into my own language.	
7	I open virtual classes on the Internet to learn grammar.	
8	I create a mind-map or a table to get an overview of grammar rules.	
9	I notice my mistakes and use that information to improve.	
10	I do grammar exercises.	
11	I read and listen to texts in the new language and try to notice characteristics of grammar use.	
12	I listen to the pronunciation of the words on Google translate.	
13	I say new words several times.	
14	I try to talk like native speakers.	
15	I practise pronunciation with native speakers or other learners.	
16	I read newspapers, stories or books.	
17	I read for pleasure in the new language.	
18	I first skim a passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	
19	I annotate or highlight heading or subheadings.	
20	I listen to songs.	
21	I watch movies or TV shows spoken in the new language.	
22	I pay attention when someone is speaking in the new language.	
23	I listen to the words and try to picture what the speaker is saying in my mind.	
24	I talk to people who speak the language in online chats.	
25	I pay attention when someone is speaking in the new language.	
26	I discuss learning materials and information with others.	
27	I participate in group discussion.	
28	I write essays or short stories in my free time.	
29	I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in the new language.	
30	I write new words several times.	
31	I write simple and uncomplicated words and sentences.	
32	I try to create a clean and orderly environment around me.	
33	I examine the size and shape of the room, arrangement of desks and chairs, and technology.	
34	I sit in a specific place each class.	
35	I keep my phone away from me.	
36	I start working on assignments early.	

Muhannad Abuzaid, Carol Griffiths

37	I determine a list of daily accomplishments.	
38	I set periods for rest.	
39	During exams I set a special schedule with material and times that I want to complete.	
40	I organize my sleeping hours.	
41	I try to control my emotions.	
42	I go to walk with my friends.	
43	I try to lower my anxiety by taking a deep breath.	
44	I use laughter.	
45	I keep my end goal in mind.	
46	I try different study approaches.	
47	I try to make a balance between my life and my learning.	
48	I use positive self-talk.	
49	I join social clubs	
50	I talk to those around me.	
51	I set a specific time for socializing.	
52	I break down the goal into smaller tasks.	
53	I set a reward system.	
54	I check everything and make sure of it.	
55	I let experts correct my mistakes.	
56	I keep a journal about my progress.	
57	I compare my learning development with my past knowledge.	
58	I check everything and make sure of it.	
59	I make sure that I have accomplished the goals.	
60	I evaluate myself through an exam.	