

The relationship between strategy use and vocabulary knowledge of the English students

Houman Bijani, Assistant professor, English Language Department, Islamic AZAD University, Zanzan branch, Zanzan Iran

Azadeh Rahmani, MA Student, English Language Department, Islamic AZAD University, Zanzan branch, Zanzan Iran

Jafar Asadi, MA Student At TEFL (Corresponding Author), English Language Department, Islamic AZAD University, Zanzan branch, Zanzan Iran,

JafarAsadi2015@gmail.com

Tel:00989123411483

Abstract

This paper concentrates on the relation between strategy use and vocabulary knowledge of the second year English students of Shahid Rajaei teachers training university. To find out this relation a questionnaire developed by Oxford (1990) known as SILL was used to measure the strategy use of the students along with a University Word Level Test developed by Beglar, et al.(1999) to measure the vocabulary knowledge of the students. In order to find a relation between two variables Spearman rank order correlation was used for finding any relation between strategy use differences among students. Then students were grouped into two parts, High group with better marks on vocabulary and low group with lower marks on vocabulary and after analyzing their responses on their questionnaires their differences in use of strategies are compared. It was found out that there is a meaningful relation between using Metacognitive, cognitive, affective, compensatory and social strategies with vocabulary knowledge.

Introduction

Over the last twenty years up to now there has been a great interest about learning how to learn and about individual differences in language learning and the way students can best perceive the material being presented to them. Hence there is a common ground among teachers that there is no panacea or single method of teaching for all students nowadays. There are situations in which some students are more successful than others in language learning much less

of the method which is being used by the teacher during instruction. So greater emphasis is on students rather than teachers and teaching methods with regard to language learning strategies that students make use of during their learning process. The use of learning strategies among students is extensively supported in investigations done before and it has been shown that there is a positive support for this.

The vocabulary area has also its importance in language learning and without vocabulary which is the building blocks of language the learning process cannot be successful it is important both for a learner and for a teacher to know that how a student perceives and makes his vocabulary knowledge and why some of students are better at remembering and conceiving words of the language they are studying.

Nowadays it is necessary for both students and teachers to be aware of the learning processes and the strategies that students make use of in their learning and the way it can affect their learning size, so the question that can be posed here is that if there is any relation between language learning strategies and vocabulary knowledge of students in other words do students who are more successful in vocabulary learning use certain strategies other than those of students less successful in learning vocabulary?

Research question:

Is there any relation between strategy use and vocabulary knowledge?

Research hypothesis:

There is no relation between strategy use and vocabulary knowledge.

Review of literature

Already in the 70s, research in the field of language teaching had begun to investigate the profile of the person who learns a second/foreign language 'effectively', i.e. the methods and tactics to which he resorts, and who has conventionally been called "the good learner", in order to create educational tools and methods that would help the so-called 'weak' learners to become more effective (Rubin 1975, Stern 1975). During 80s and 90s research was under the influence of

methods like communicative language teaching and empirical findings of language psychology and this brought more influence on Language learning strategies (Oxford 1990 a) .Language learning strategies are defined as “specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques – such as seeking out conversation partners, or giving oneself encouragement to tackle a difficult language task – used by students to enhance their own learning” (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992, p.36) Chamot (2005, page.112 as cited in Brown 2008) defines strategies roughly as methods that facilitate a learning task and they are mostly conscious and goal driven. O'Malley & Chamot (1990) define learning strategies as thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to understand, learn or retain new information. Holec (1981 as cited in Hong-Nam & Leavel, 2006) argued that learning strategies can foster learners' autonomy in language learning. Students in using strategies may not be aware of the strategies they use but a professional teacher should help them and enable them in using the appropriate strategies students make use of (Nyikos & Oxford, 1993).

Six types of language learning strategies have been defined by Oxford (1990b).

Cognitive strategies enable the learner to manipulate the language material in direct ways, e. g., through reasoning, analysis, note-taking, summarizing, synthesizing, outlining, reorganizing information to develop stronger schemas (knowledge structures), practicing in naturalistic settings, and practicing structures and sounds formally.

Metacognitive strategies (e.g. Identifying one's own learning style, preferences and needs, planning for an L2 task, gathering and organizing materials, arranging a study space and a schedule, monitoring mistakes, and evaluating task success, and evaluating the success of any type of learning strategy) are employed for managing the learning process overall.

Memory strategies help learners link one L2 item or concept with another but do not necessarily involve deep understanding. Various memory-related strategies enable learners to learn and retrieve information in an orderly string (e.g., acronyms), while other techniques create learning and retrieval via sounds (e.g., rhyming), images (e.g., a mental picture of the word itself or the meaning of the word), a combination of sounds and images (e.g., the keyword method), body movement (e.g., total physical response), mechanical means (e.g., flashcards), or location (e.g., on a page or blackboard).

Compensatory strategies (e.g., guessing from the context in listening and reading; using synonyms and “talking around” the missing word to aid speaking and writing; and strictly for speaking, using gestures or pause words) help the learner make up for missing knowledge.

Affective strategies, such as identifying one’s mood and anxiety level, talking about feelings, rewarding oneself for good performance, and using deep breathing or positive self-talk.

Social strategies (e.g., asking questions to get verification, asking for clarification of a confusing point, asking for help in doing a language task, talking with a native-speaking conversation partner, and exploring cultural and social norms) help the learner work with others and understand the target culture as well as the language.

Vocabulary knowledge is a determining factor for beginning reading as well as reading comprehension. Children acquire vocabulary in their primary language indirectly, through interaction with fluent adults. Students reading in their first language have already learned 5,000 to 7,000 words before they begin formal reading instruction Studies on Language Learning Strategies (Biemiller & Slonin, 2001 as cited in August 2003). Knowledge of a word contains both definition and also has association with the world (Stahl, 2005 as cited in Azam Mokhtar et al., 2010a). In language learning, vocabulary is the essential part in EFL ESL literature that is it is a determining factor in listening, speaking, reading writing (Lee & Munice, 2006). Laufer and Goldstein (2004) found out a hierarchy of vocabulary skills. The hierarchy refers to four levels of skills: (a) active recall (ability to supply the target word (most difficult), (b) passive recall (ability to supply the meaning of a target word), (c) active recognition (ability to recognize the target word when given its meaning), and (d) passive recognition or ability to recognize the meaning of a target word given meaning options (easiest). The definitions given about vocabulary knowledge has been defined as some subknowledges like knowledge of written and spoken forms, morphological knowledge, knowledge of word meaning, colloquial and grammatical knowledge, connotative and associational knowledge, and the knowledge of social and or other factors affecting the use of words. (Nation, 1990 as note in Laufer & Goldstein, 2004).

In the case of testing vocabulary knowledge work done by Nation (1990) revolutionized the field of vocabulary testing as he tried to systematize the testing of vocabulary knowledge of native

speakers by using dictionary as starting point. The question here is “how can we take a representative sample from a dictionary?” (Nation, 1993a p.1). He concluded that for devising a test

1. Choose a dictionary that is big enough to cover the known vocabulary of the people being investigated,
2. Use a reliable way of discovering the total number of entries in the dictionary,
3. Use explicit criteria for deciding and stating (a) what items will not be included in the count and (b) what will be regarded as members of a word family,
4. Use a sampling procedure that is not biased towards items which occupy more space and have more entries,
5. Choose a sample that is large enough to allow an estimate of vocabulary size that can be given with a reasonable degree of confidence,
6. The sampling should be checked for the reliability of the application of the criteria for exclusion and inclusion of items,
7. The sample should be checked against a frequency list to make sure that there is no bias in the sampling towards high-frequency items,
8. In the written report of the study, describe clearly and explicitly how each of the previous seven procedures was followed in sufficient detail to allow replication of any or all of the procedures.

(Nation, 1993b pp. 31-38)

Investigation on language learning strategies and vocabulary learning

Recently investigation in the field of language learning strategies has focused on the relation of using such strategies and learning language. In fact the aim of such studies is to find out which category of language learning strategies the better learner makes use the most. Gu & Johnson (1996) found out that the learners use metacognitive strategies the most when they try learning language. They also found out that contextual guessing; using dictionaries, note taking, paying attention to word formation, contextual encoding, and activation of newly learned words also help learners in their learning. They also found that visual repetition of words is negative predictor of both vocabulary size and general proficiency. In an study of depth of vocabulary and learners' lexical differencing strategy use and success Nassaji (2004) found that those with stronger vocabulary knowledge use certain strategies more frequently than those with limited vocabulary knowledge. Fan (2003) also found some relation between frequency of use, perceived usefulness, and actual usefulness of second language vocabulary strategies. He found that most proficient students make use of strategies like guessing, using more sources, using dictionary, using known words than less proficient students. In particular more proficient students had used outside the class readings which he concluded that, is as important as if not more important than

the inside the class paying attention to words. Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006b) found that there is a curvilinear relation for strategy use among learners in a way that intermediate learners made use of strategies more than elementary and advance level learners. They also found that the students made use of metacognitive strategies most whereas they showed the least of affective and memory strategies.

Methodology:

Subjects: Subjects of the study were 30 sophomore students of English major from Shahid Rejaee Teachers Training University. The range of their age was from 18 years to 24 years old. They were 15 males and 15 females. They are all university students doing their third semester and it was plausible to assert that they were at intermediate level of English knowledge of vocabulary. The presumption for selecting this sample was that all the students were from the same academic background and they were all students of English major and devotedly attended to their learning and in fact were all caring and attentive to their learning and roughly were aware of the way they learnt.

Instruments: There were two instruments used to collect the data from the sample. One was the strategy inventory for language learning written and developed by Oxford. One great advantage of this questionnaire is its high reliability and validity. Reported reliabilities for the ESL/EFL SILL range from 0.86 to 0.91 when learners respond to the questionnaire in the second language (English). Reliability coefficient increases when the questionnaire is translated into students' native language to 0.91 to 0.94 (Oxford, 1990 as cited in Anderson, 2005). This instrument was used to gather data for independent variable (strategy use). With this in mind a translated version of the SILL (in Persian) was used for data gathering to remove any ambiguity for the students while selecting the items. The other instrument used for the study was a revised version of 2000 university word level vocabulary test done by Beglar & Hunt (1999). They revised the word level test which Nation (1990) devised. They reported on reliability and validity of the test to range from 0.86 to 0.95. The test also purports to be highly correlated with TOFEL test particularly with the reading and grammar subsections.

Procedure: Students were invited to take part in this research. They were invited to a classroom for the test and questionnaires were given to them to fill them out. They were told that this

program has no academic side effect for them so that they fill them out with more veracity and honesty. There was no time limit for them to fill the questionnaires out and they were told to fill them in a way they are, not in a way they think they should be. The order for answering was in a way that first they were given the questions and immediately after, they were given the SILL questionnaires to fill so that they were able to ruminate over their vocabulary learning and the way they activate them.

Data analysis: Data analysis included the computation of description statistics (mean, standard deviation, and frequencies) to get the information about statistics of the participants and to get overall strategy use. In order to find any relationship between strategy use and vocabulary knowledge Spearman correlation was conducted between scores gained on vocabulary test and scores gained on the SILL questionnaire obtained from the students. The next phase of analysis consisted of analysis of the items in questionnaires one by one and comparing the strategies used by students with higher knowledge of vocabulary and those of students with lower knowledge of vocabulary.

Analysis:

Descriptive statistics shows the basic statistics of the results gained from the student.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Score	30	7.00	27.00	19.2333	6.63160
Memory	30	11.00	26.00	18.5333	4.32900
Cognitive	30	10.00	26.00	18.2333	4.26439
Compensation	30	11.00	29.00	19.7667	4.14133
Metacognitive	30	11.00	28.00	20.7333	4.98918
Affective	30	11.00	25.00	17.0333	4.65709
Social	30	6.00	31.00	17.8000	6.15546
Valid N (listwise)	30				

For conducting item analysis the students were separated from each other and were assigned to two groups based on the score they gained on the vocabulary test. The vocabulary test consisted of 27 items and the maximum score could be 27 and the minimum score can be 0. Based on this,

the students were assigned to two groups, those with high knowledge of vocabulary and those with low knowledge of vocabulary. As can be seen from the Table 2 those who have scored 20 and above will be assigned to the group one (students with high vocabulary knowledge). Those who have scored between 18 and 10 will be considered students with average vocabulary knowledge and the third group will be those who have scored less than ten, but due to the very small number of these students they were assigned to the second group. Overall students are assigned to two groups: High and low

Table 2: Score on vocabulary test

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	7.00	1	3.3	3.3	3.3
	8.00	1	3.3	3.3	6.7
	9.00	1	3.3	3.3	10.0
	10.00	1	3.3	3.3	13.3
	11.00	2	6.7	6.7	20.0
	12.00	1	3.3	3.3	23.3
	13.00	1	3.3	3.3	26.7
	14.00	2	6.7	6.7	33.3
	15.00	1	3.3	3.3	36.7
	18.00	1	3.3	3.3	40.0
	20.00	2	6.7	6.7	46.7
	22.00	2	6.7	6.7	53.3
	24.00	5	16.7	16.7	70.0
	25.00	5	16.7	16.7	86.7
	26.00	2	6.7	6.7	93.3
	27.00	2	6.7	6.7	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

The correlation procedure was conducted for the data we had acquired. It should be noted that for getting the results there were some outliers and during the analysis there was a need for them

to be excluded from the study. It was like some of the students had overstated or understated their learning strategies and that was affecting the outcome of the study.

Table 3: Spearman Correlations

		Score	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	social
Spearman's rho	Score Correlation	1.000	.162	.563**	.512**	.752**	.433*	.482**
	Coefficient							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.410	.001	.005	.000	.019	.009
	N	30	28	29	28	29	29	28

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

As it can be seen from the table 3 the correlation is meaning full for 5 domains of strategy use at the 0.005 levels of significance, so the null hypothesis can be rejected and there is a relation between strategy use and vocabulary knowledge.

Results and discussion:

As it can be seen from the correlation Tables there are relations between using strategies and vocabulary knowledge. The results are significant at five domains. From the students' reports it is clear that metacognitive, cognitive and compensation strategies are at work the most and then social and affective strategies also have relation with students' vocabulary size. There is just one strategy that showed no relation to students' learning.

After finding relation between the two variables it is also helpful to conduct an item analysis to see what the attitudes of the students were towards the items in the questionnaire to see the differences between the way these two groups lead their learning and vocabulary storage.

Strategy use by the high group:

Cognitive strategy: The high group students have reported to be strongly agreed with "I try to talk like native Second Language speakers" the most (38.9%) in the questionnaire and in fact they make use of this strategy the most in the cognitive domain. The next strategy that they have reported to use in this domain is "I practice the sounds of second language" that 33.3% have

reported to be strongly agreed with this. The other strategies that they have reported to be strongly agreed with are “I read for pleasure in the Second Language”, “I first skim a Second Language passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully”, “I find the meaning of an Second Language word by dividing it into parts that I understand” with each one having been selected by 22% of the participants. The strategies that the participants have reported to be agreed with are “I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in the Second Language” which 50% of the participant have selected it, “I say or write new Second Language words several times” which 44% have reported to use it, “I start conversations in the Second Language” and “I make summaries of information that I hear or read in the Second Language “which 38.9% of the participants have selected them, items “I use the Second Language words I know in different ways” and “I read for pleasure in the Second Language” have been selected each by 33.3% of the participants and finally “I watch Second Language TV shows spoken in Second Language or go to movies spoken in Second Language” and “I find the meaning of an Second Language word by dividing it into parts that I understand” have been shown to be selected by 27.8% of the participants. So what can be concluded is that more successful students firstly try to find a relation between target language words and their first language and then they try to practice it by writing it down several times and then practice the words to be like those of native speakers because 39% have reported to try to talk like native speakers. They also use those words in conversations they start when they want to talk in Second Language; they also try to summarize what they hear in Second language. The strategy in this domain that the students have reported to be disagreed with the most is “I try to find patterns in the Second Language” with 33% to have reported to be disagreed with and 38% have used it sometimes.

Metacognitive strategy: This domain showed to be highly correlated with students’ vocabulary knowledge. it was concluded that students make use of these strategies the most that all but one of the strategy items are reported to be highly useful in their learning. In this domain the mostly used strategies are “I pay attention when someone is speaking Second Language” and “I think about my progress in learning Second Language” by 80% and 73% of the learners respectively. Strategy “I try to find out how to be a better learner of Second Language” is reported to be used by 72%. Strategy “I notice my Second Language mistakes and use that information to help me do better” is selected by 67% of the learners and strategies “I try to find as many ways as I can to

use my Second Language” and “I have clear goals for improving my Second Language skills” have been selected by 61% of the learners. 55% of the learners also reported to have selected “I look for people I can talk to in Second Language” and “I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in Second Language”. The only strategy that was reported by learners not to be useful as much as the previous strategies is “I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study Second Language” which only 44% of the learners reported to be either strongly agreed or agreed with it. The conclusion drawn from these results is that better learners are highly caring about learning about. They mostly try to be in contact with Second Language and ponder over their learning, set goals for their learning, pay attention to their mistakes in their Second Language and try to activate their second language in many ways they can as good as possible.

Compensation strategy: Here the strategies that students believe to have come in handy for them are “If I can't think of a Second Language word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing” with 84% of the students using it, “When I can't think of a word during a conversation in the Second Language, I use gestures” with 72% selecting it, and “I read Second Language without looking up every new word”, “To understand unfamiliar Second Language words, I make guesses”, “I try to guess what the other person will say next in the Second Language” by being reported to be use by 66%, 61%, 50% of the students respectively. The least often used strategy is “I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in the Second Language”. It can be understood that the students with greater vocabulary knowledge are exquisite in their selection of words and they mostly prefer to use words and at most use gestures when they are using words instead of concocting a word that may bring about confusion.

Affective: In this domain some of the strategies are highly accepted while some others are highly rejected by the learners. The strategy “I encourage myself to speak Second Language even when I am afraid of making a mistake” is accepted by 71% of the learners. The strategy “I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using Second Language” is also reported to be used by 61% and “I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in Second Language” is reported by 50% of the learners, but on the other hand the strategies “I write down my feelings in a language learning dairy”, “I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning Second Language” are highly reported to be neglected by the learners in the way that for the former 84% and for the latter 72% of the learners have not accepted these strategies to be a part of their learning plan. Overall learners use

these strategies up to the point that they may help them in their learning and using their language and to overcome their anxiety and promote risk taking, but they don't show any tendency in writing about their learning and talking about their feeling about their learning.

Social strategy: The reason that in this domain the correlation is less strong is that the students' preferences for using these strategies are so perverse and by analyzing the items of the strategies one by one it can be seen that except two strategies others have in-between percentages. The strategy "If I do not understand something in Second Language, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again" is the most widely accepted one by 67% of the students and "I try to learn about the culture of Second Language speakers" by 56% of the students, but other strategies in this domain are evenly selected by the students and it cannot not be firmly said which one is the most preferable by the students. It can be understood that the students use this strategy whenever they are in trouble like when they cannot understand something and ask for repetition or when they want to know the people they are learning their language, but for the rest of the strategies they have ambivalent attitudes.

Memory: This domain didn't show any correlation with vocabulary knowledge and the reason is that some of the memory strategies are reported to be helpful in learning vocabulary and some are not useful at all. The strategy "I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in the Second Language" is reported to be used by 72% of the learners. The strategies "I use new Second Language words in a sentence so I can remember them", "I connect the sound of a new Second Language word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word", and "I remember new Second Language words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign" have been reported to be used by 51% of the learners. On the other hand the strategies "I use flashcards to remember new Second Language words" and "I physically act out new Second Language words" not to be used by 88% and 61% of the learners respectively. What can be understood from this is that the students prefer using leaning in association with their previous knowledge, associating pictures, sounds, images etc. with their learning, but they don't like using flash cards. It may have different reasons and the most important reason may be that they don't know the right method of using it.

Strategy use by the low group:

Compensation strategy: In this domain the strategy that these students have reported to use the most is “I read Second Language without looking up every new word” , but they have reported not to have inclination to use” I try to guess what the other person will say next in the Second Language” with 50% of the students reporting this one, and also strategies like “I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in the Second Language” and “If I can't think of an Second Language word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing” are not very popular strategies found among these students (41% have disagreed with using this). It shows that they are aware of extensive reading (reading without checking all the words) but this strategy may work as debilitating factor for their knowledge of words. High group also have reported to use this strategy but they use it along with other strategies in a way that it doesn't hinder their learning, but for low group it is the only strategy that they have reported to use and this may have had a negative effect on their learning.

Metacognitive strategy: This domain of strategies has a key factor in determining the reason for the success of one group and for the lack of success of the other group. One of the strategies that has an important role in success and high group has made use of was “I try to find as many ways as I can to use my Second Language”, but low group students have reported to be disagree with this strategy mostly and 67% of them have reported not to use it. 50% of them are disagreeing with strategies “I pay attention when someone is speaking Second Language” and “I look for people I can talk to in Second Language”. The only strategies which have been reported to be used by 50% of the students are” I try to find out how to be a better learner of Second Language” and “I think about my progress in learning Second Language”.

Social strategy: A very different view toward language strategy use to those of high group was found in this domain in which from among all six strategies in this domain students were disagreed with five of the strategies. 67% of the students were against strategies like “I ask Second Language speakers to correct me when I talk”, “I ask questions in Second Language”, and “I try to learn about the culture of Second Language speakers.58% of them also are not in favor of the strategies like “If I do not understand something in Second Language, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again” and “I practice Second Language with other students”. These findings show that they are not very much in favor of social aspects of language. For the

high group there was not a high correlation either, but they were in favor of some aspects of this strategy while for the low group they completely have neglected all aspects of it. Even when they cannot understand something in their L2 they don't show any motivation in asking them.

Affective strategy: This domain of strategy use also has the situation like that of social strategy. Students don't seem to enjoy this strategy either. The strategy "I write down my feelings in a language learning diary" is rejected by 92% of the students. Strategies "I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using Second Language" and "I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning Second Language" are rejected by 67% of the students. They don't show a great tendency to use the rest of the strategies. Again there is a sharp contrast between high and low group in this domain.

Memory strategy: It appeared that this group makes use of this domain more than the other two as went before, but this usage is still a lot less than that of the high group. 50% of them reported to use the strategies "I connect the sound of a new Second Language word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word" and "I use flashcards to remember new Second Language words". Here using flashcards is reported, the one that high group didn't report to use and again this can be a sign that Persian students don't know how to use this flashcards or if they use it, they use it inappropriately. On the other hand 58% of them have reported to be disagreed with "I physically act out new Second Language words" and "I remember new Second Language words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign". It is evident that the taste for using memory strategies between two groups is completely different and this also can be a determining factor in the size of vocabulary for each group.

Cognitive strategy: The most interesting finding was in this domain. With regard to correlation table it is clear what a determining factor it has for the size of vocabulary of the students. High group learners reported to have resorted to this strategy a lot while a complete shift in using this domain can be found here. From among 13 items that this domain of strategy contains students have reported to be disagreed with 12 items. For example strategies like "I read for pleasure in the Second Language" and "I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in the Second Language" have been disagreed with 75% of the students or 67% of the students have reported to be disagreed with strategies like "I try to talk like native Second Language speakers", "I practice the

sounds of Second Language”, and “I use the Second Language words I know in different ways”. The only strategy that somehow found popularity among some of the students was “I say or write new Second Language words several times” that 41% reported to use it and 33% reported to disagree with it.

Conclusion:

What was found in this study was that the use of strategies really have relation with the vocabulary size of the students specifically and language learning generally. The most beneficial strategies that help better learners to increase their vocabulary size were cognitive and metacognitive strategies while other domains also had relations, but In fact these two strategies had determining factors in the differences found between two groups of students. This finding is also traceable to the review of literature part of the study in which previous studies somehow showed that these two strategies have a key role in the difference between more and less successful students. The difference could also be found in other domains of strategy use.

Something which can be worthy in this phase of this research is now that we know there is such differences among learners and some are aware of such strategies while others are not, so why don't teachers teach them explicitly to the students. Some of the students may not be aware of such strategies at all while others may know that they have taken a special route to the language learning, but the route may not have been taken correctly i.e. they may not know the correct way of using these strategies like using flashcards as it went before. So an interesting question here that “are these strategies teachable?” Does instruction on such strategies have an enormous effect on the students' learning? This question may be a good topic for further investigation and may help weak students to use the same way that the most proficient students make use of in their language learning.

References:

1. Beglar, D., & Hunt, A, (1999). Revising and Validating the 2000 Word Level and University Word Level Vocabulary Tests. *Language Testing* 16(2), 131-162
2. Biemiller A., & Slonim, N. (2001). Estimating root word vocabulary growth in normative and advantaged populations: Evidence for a common sequence of vocabulary acquisition. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93 (3), 498-520.

3. Chamot, A. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: current issues and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25. 112-130.
4. Fan, M.Y. (2003). Frequency of use, perceived usefulness, and actual usefulness of second language vocabulary strategies: A study of Hong Kong learners. *Modern Language Journal* 87(2) pp.222-241
5. Gu, Y. & Johnson, K.R. (1996). Vocabulary Learning Strategies and Language Learning Outcomes. *Language Learning* 46(4) pp. 643-679
6. Holec, H., 1981. *Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning*. Pergamon Press, Oxford.
7. Hong-Nam, k., & Leavell, A. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *SYSTEM* 34. 399–415
8. Laufer, B., & Goldstein, Z. (2004). Testing vocabulary knowledge: Size, strength, and computer adaptiveness. *Language Learning*, 54, 399–436.
9. Lee, S.L. & Munice, J. (2006). From respective to productive: Improving ESL learners' use of vocabulary in a postreading composition task. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(2), 295-320.
10. Nassaji, H. (2006). The Relationship Between Depth of Vocabulary Knowledge and L2 Learners' Lexical Inferencing Strategy Use and Success. *Modern Language Journal* 90 (3), pp. 387-401
11. Nation, ISP, (1990). *Teaching and learning Vocabulary*. Rowley: Newbury house.
12. Nation, P. (1990). Using dictionaries to estimate vocabulary size: essential, but rarely followed, procedures. *Language testing*, 10(1), 27-40
- 13.
14. Nyikos, M., & Oxford, R.L., 1993: A factor-analytic study of language learning strategy use: Interpretations from information processing theory and social psychology. *Modern Language Journal*, 77 (1), 11-23.
15. Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury. House Publishers.
16. Rubin J. (1975). What the “good language learner” can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*. 9, 41-51.
17. Scarcella, R. & Oxford, R., 1992: *The Tapestry of Language Learning: The Individual in the Communicative Classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle
18. Stahl, S.A. (2005). Four problems with teaching word meanings and what to do to make vocabulary an integral part of instruction. In E.H. Hiebert and M.L. Kamil (Eds.), *Teaching and learning vocabulary: Bringing research to practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.