

A Comparison on the Use of Language Learning Strategies by Male and Female Vietnamese Tertiary Students of Non-English Majors

Nguyen Trong Nhan, M.A.
Ho Thi Lai, M.TESOL

=====
Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 13:4 April 2013
=====

Abstract

This article reports research on the similarities and differences in the frequency of strategy use for EFL learning by 50 male and 50 female Vietnamese first-year-students at HoChiMinh City University of Natural Resources and Environment in Vietnam. Using Oxford's (1990) SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) Version 7.0 as the questionnaire in English and Vietnamese, the study found that both male and female Vietnamese students reported a medium frequency for the use of language learning strategies although the reported strategy use was greater for males than females. The female Vietnamese learners tended to use indirect strategies more often and direct strategies less often than the males did. Compensation and social strategies were remarkably preferred by the males while memory and affective strategies were most employed by the females.

Keywords: language learning strategies, males, females, Vietnamese

1. Introduction

Learners may have their own learning strategies, some of which can be employed to learn a second language. It is crucially important to make students aware that there may be some other better language learning strategies (LLS) than their own. The students, therefore, can learn from their more successful peers' LLS and employ the strategies appropriate to their respective learning style, aptitude, and personality. Sadtono (1996) indicates that differences in achievement in second language learning are often related to differences in strategy use. After examining the relationship between sex differences and language learning performance, many researchers conclude that gender has a real and profound influence on language learning

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 13:4 April 2013

Nguyen Trong Nhan, M.A. and Ho Thi Lai, M.TESOL

A Comparison on the Use of Language Learning Strategies by Male and Female Vietnamese Tertiary Students of Non-English Majors

strategies (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989; Goh & Kwah, 1997; Green & Oxford, 1995; Gu, 2002; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006; Lan & Oxford, 2003; Wen & Wang, 1996).

According to Oxford (1990), the more teachers know about their students' current learning strategy preferences, the more effectively they can attune instructions to specific students' needs. Griffiths and Parr (2001) urge EFL/ESL teachers to do their own research to find out their students' use of LLS, not depend on their subjective assumptions or results of other related projects conducted in other contexts to guess how their students learn English. With an awareness of learner differences, the researchers wish to investigate how different LLS suggested by Oxford (1990) operate for the two sexes in the EFL context of Vietnam.

This study aims to compare and contrast the self-report use of LLS by male and female Vietnamese students of non-English majors. The researchers, consequently, sought plausible answers to the following research question: What are the similarities and differences in frequency of LLS use by male and female first-year-students in general English classes at HoChiMinh City University of Natural Resources and Environment?

2. Language Learning Strategies

According to Hedge (2000), researchers who wish to investigate the literature on LLS should be aware of the following facts. First, there have been various labels given to strategies, such as "language processing strategies", "tactics", "plans", and "techniques", with no easy equivalences among them. Second, since the early studies of the good language learner's characteristics by Frohlich, Naiman and Todesco in the 1970s, different authors have clarified and discussed different ways of classifying LLS, and various frameworks have been developed, such as those of Chamot, Ellis, Kupper, O'Malley, and Oxford (Hedge, 2000, p. 5).

Kumaravadivelu (2006) notes that it is only during the 1970s that researchers began to study systematically the learners' explicit and implicit efforts to learn a second language. Rubin (1975) defines learning strategies as "the techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge" (p. 43). Rubin (1987, p. 23) also states that LLS "affect learning directly"

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 13:4 April 2013

Nguyen Trong Nhan, M.A. and Ho Thi Lai, M.TESOL

A Comparison on the Use of Language Learning Strategies by Male and Female Vietnamese Tertiary Students of Non-English Majors

and “contribute to the development of the language system which the learner constructs”. Focusing on the competence, the goal of any language learning, Tarone (1983) defines LLS as “an attempt to develop linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the target language” (p. 67). Looking at the consciousness characteristic of LLS, Cohen (1998) defines LLS as “the steps or actions selected consciously by learners either to improve the learning of a second language or the use of it or both” (p. 5). The term language learning strategies now refers to what learners know and do to regulate their learning (Kumaravadivelu, 2006).

The current study is based on the framework developed by Oxford (1990). According to Oxford’s taxonomy, LLS are “operations employed by the learner to aid the acquisition, storage, retrieval and use of information” and “specific actions...to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more efficient, and more transferable to new situations” (p. 8). Oxford also categorizes LLS into direct strategies (including *memory strategies*, *cognitive strategies*, and *compensation strategies*) and indirect strategies (including *metacognitive strategies*, *affective strategies*, and *social strategies*). *Memory strategies* help learners store and retrieve new information, for example, using rhymes or flashcards to remember new words in the target language. *Cognitive strategies* are devices applied by learners to better understand and produce the target language, such as writing notes, messages, letters or reports in the target language. *Compensation strategies* are intended to make up for missing knowledge while using the language, such as making guesses to understand unfamiliar words in the target language. *Metacognitive strategies* allow learners to control their own cognition including the planning, organization, evaluation and monitoring of their language learning, for example, looking for opportunities to read as much as possible in the target language. *Affective strategies* refer to the methods that help learners regulate their emotions, motivations and attitudes, such as trying to relax whenever being afraid of using the target language. *Social strategies* include the ways of interacting with other people in the context of language learning, such as asking a speaker to slow down or to repeat something in the target language.

3. Teachers’ Perceptions with regard to Their Students’ Use of Language Learning Strategies

Although issues related to individual learner factors and learner variables have received much attention, issues related to teachers have not been researched thoroughly (Griffiths, 2007). According to Cortazzi and Jin (1996) and Hird (1995), Asian teachers traditionally expect the learning output to be error-free, and they greatly value memory strategies. Some other researchers pointed to the influence of teachers on modifying usual stereotypes of Asian learners. Howe (1993) and Lewis and McCook (2002), with their studies of Vietnam, addressed the popular misconception of passivity among Asian students by suggesting that whether EFL learners were passive or active in class depended more on their teachers' expectations than on culturally-based learning styles and strategies.

Examining teachers' perceptions of their students' strategy use, Chalmers and Volet (1997), Griffiths (2007) and Nguyen (2007) all discovered that the teachers' beliefs and the students' actual strategy use were not well matched. Chalmers and Volet (1997) stated that while teachers considered South-East Asian students studying in Australia as rote learners adopting surface strategies to learning, most of these students were strategic learners adopting effective LLS. In Vietnam, Nguyen (2007) revealed significant discrepancies between teachers' perceptions and students' self-report on strategy use. While Vietnamese teachers believed that their students were "medium" strategy users overall, five out of six LLS categories were reported to be used less frequently than in the teachers' views. Griffiths (2007) also pointed out a high level of disagreement between strategies that students reported using frequently and those regarded as very important by teachers. He found that students did not frequently use one of three LLS that teachers considered highly important.

In conclusion, the results from all above investigations of the intersection between teachers' and learners' perceptions of strategy use prove that students' actual use of LLS has been at variance with their teachers' assumptions. All teachers of English, therefore, instead of guessing how their students learn English, should do their own research to improve the teaching and learning situations.

4. Relationship between Gender and the Use of Language learning Strategies

In most of the studies where sex differences emerge, females have been reported as using LLS more often than males (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989; Hashim & Salih, 1994; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006; Oxford, 1993; Peacock & Ho, 2003; Sy, 1994, 1995; Wharton, 2000). Females not only employ more LLS but they also employ these strategies more effectively (Ellis, 1994; Ehrman & Oxford, 1989; Green & Oxford, 1995; Oxford, 1993). As for the use of particular LLS, females tend to use more social strategies (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006; Politzer, 1983) and more memory and metacognitive strategies (Khalil, 2005; Wen & Wang, 1996) than males do. Besides, Goh and Kwah (1997), and Gu (2002) find that females also show more frequent use of compensation and affective strategies than their male counterparts do.

However, the sex-difference-findings supporting greater strategy use by females may be influenced by the context and culture of the language learning. Some studies (Carter & Nunan, 2001; Tercanlioglu, 2004; Tran, 1988; Wharton, 2000) show that male learners use more LLS than females do in certain categories. Tran (1988), in his study of adult Vietnamese refugees in the USA, finds that males are more likely to use a variety of LLS than females. Wharton (2000), using Oxford's 80-item SILL with a group of 678 tertiary students learning Japanese and French as foreign languages in Singapore, reports that males often employ a greater number of LLS than females. Besides, looking into the strategy use by foreign language learners at a Turkish University, Tercanlioglu (2004) points out significant sex differences in favor of males' greater use of LLS.

Not all projects examining strategy use between the two sexes find significant differences. Young and Oxford's (1997) study on LLS used by native English-speaking learners of Spanish shows no important differences between males and females. Ma (1999) states that gender has no significant impacts on the choice of such strategies as Memory, Metacognitive and Affective strategies. In addition, Griffiths (2003) finds that neither gender nor age really affects the learners' strategy use. Congruent with the findings by Ma (1999), Young and Oxford (1997) and Griffiths (2003), Shmais (2003) does not report any statistically significant differences in strategy use among tertiary students because of sex differences.

In short, the relationship between gender and the use of LLS is not explicit due to different results generated by much research. Even in the same context of EFL in China, studies by Ma (1999) and Wen and Wang (1996) yield conflicting results. Therefore, more studies need to be conducted to verify the role of sex in determining language learning strategies.

5. Methodology

5.1. Subjects

One hundred Vietnamese first-year-students of non-English majors (Hydrometeorology, Environment, Geodesy, Geology, Land Management, Business Administration, and Information Technology) at HoChiMinh City University of Natural Resources and Environment participated in the study. These EFL learners, consisting of 50 males and 50 females between the ages of 18 and 19, were taking the General English Course at the university. The course aimed at improving the learners' vocabulary, grammar, and the target language macro-skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). These participants had learnt English formally for 3 - 7 years in junior and senior high school and their English levels ranged from elementary to pre-intermediate.

Every year, there are more than five thousand high school graduates entering the university and taking part in general English classes; therefore, to make the findings more generalized to Vietnamese learners of EFL, different types of subjects from 20 provinces throughout the country were chosen.

5.2. Instrument

Since some LLS, such as asking questions for clarification and taking notes, are directly observable, Rubin (1975) originally used observation to assess language learning strategy use. Nevertheless, observing LLS is a very challenging task because it involves cognitive processes that neither learners nor the teacher may be able to specify. Carter and Nunan (2001) state that some LLS, such as using inductive logic to determine a grammar rule or making mental associations between a new word and known concepts, are clearly unobservable. In conducting this investigation, it was decided to employ Oxford's (1990) SILL (Strategy Inventory for

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 13:4 April 2013
Nguyen Trong Nhan, M.A. and Ho Thi Lai, M.TESOL
A Comparison on the Use of Language Learning Strategies by Male and Female
Vietnamese Tertiary Students of Non-English Majors

Language Learning) Version 7.0 (see Appendix A) as the research method. The SILL questionnaire was adopted as the only instrument to collect data because of its worldwide-recognized value and reliability, as there have been more than 40 large-scaled studies and 120 dissertations and theses using this (Riazi & Rahimi, 2005). However, the chosen 100 subjects in this research were only first-year EFL students so the possibility of their misunderstanding the English SILL was high. Therefore, the questionnaire was presented in Vietnamese (see Appendix B) to ensure that all of the subjects could understand the instructions and statements thoroughly.

Oxford's SILL Version 7.0, a self-report questionnaire used to assess the frequency of strategy use by ESL/EFL learners, presents a set of 50 LLS across skills and supplies the participants with a Likert scale of five options that are "1. Never or almost never true of me, 2. Usually not true of me, 3. Somewhat true of me, 4. Usually true of me, and 5. Always or almost always true of me". The set of 50 LLS includes 9 memory strategies (items 1 - 9), 14 cognitive strategies (items 10 - 23), 6 compensation strategies (items 24 - 29), 9 metacognitive strategies (items 30 - 38), 6 affective strategies (items 39 - 44), and 6 social strategies (items 45 - 50).

Even though the SILL is considered a reliable inventory, it has potential problems associated with its use of self-report techniques and questionnaires (Ellis, 1994; LoCastro, 1994; Oxford & Green, 1995). It might not always be able to identify the participants' actual strategy use as some informants can give responses that are actually not their own thinking. Therefore, to assist the validity and reliability of the study, the following procedure was undertaken. First, the concept of LLS was introduced and clarified to the subjects. They were also provided with a satisfactory explanation of what the LLS in the SILL involve. Second, the study's purpose and the data gathering process were explained clearly to the informants who were informed that their participation would not influence their grades. Third, these EFL learners had three days to think about the LLS that they found useful and their actual use of LLS before responding to the questionnaire. The *General Instructions to Administrators of the SILL* presented by Oxford (1990) was employed as the survey guidelines.

5.3. Data Analysis

The received data was classified into categories of LLS as mentioned in Oxford's SILL and transferred into mean and ranking profiles presented in tables and charts as illustrations of the results. The categorized data was then analyzed with contrastive and descriptive methods integrated with the researchers' arguments, manifesting their interpretation and evaluation of the findings.

6. Results and Discussion

One hundred copies of the questionnaire were delivered to the 100 informants and all of them returned. According to Oxford (1990, p. 300), mean scores fall between 1.0 and 2.4 are considered as "Low" use of LLS, between 2.5 and 3.4 are "Medium" use, and between 3.5 and 5.0 are "High" strategy use. The following tables (1 and 2) compare and contrast the means and ranking profiles for six subcategories of the SILL by male versus female students.

Table 1: Mean and ranking profile for the six categories of LLS in the SILL used by the females

SILL categories	Mean	Ranking
Memory (<i>direct</i>)	3.5	1
Affective (<i>indirect</i>)	3.4	2
Compensation (<i>direct</i>)	3.1	3
Cognitive (<i>direct</i>)	2.9	4
Metacognitive (<i>indirect</i>)	2.8	5
Social (<i>indirect</i>)	2.7	6
Average	3.1	

Table 2: Mean and ranking profile for the six categories of LLS in the SILL used by the males

SILL categories	Mean	Ranking
Compensation (<i>direct</i>)	4.3	1
Social (<i>indirect</i>)	3.4	2

Cognitive (<i>direct</i>)	3.2	3
Metacognitive (<i>indirect</i>)	3.0	4
Memory (<i>direct</i>)	2.8	5
Affective (<i>indirect</i>)	2.4	6
Average	3.2	

6.1. Similarities in the Use of Language Learning Strategies between the Male and Female Participants

Before receiving the data, observation made the researchers expect that the female subjects who usually appear to be more diligent and autonomous in class would report being more aware of the importance of LLS in EFL learning and would use LLS more frequently than their male peers did. However, as shown in table 1 and table 2, on average, both male and female participants reported a medium frequency for the mean strategy use on the entire SILL (M = 3.2 and 3.1 respectively). Among the six categories of the SILL, each group of participants reported high frequent use of only one strategy category: The males highly employed compensation strategies with M = 4.3 and the girls highly used memory strategies with M = 3.5. It is interesting to find that both of the male and female students reported the highest use of direct strategies (compensation for males and memory for females) and the least use of indirect strategies (affective for males and social for females). The reason may be that the use of indirect strategies entails more effort and time than the use of direct strategies. These first-year-students seemed to find it easier, more familiar, and more convenient to memorize information (memory strategies) and make up for their missing knowledge (compensation strategies) than to regulate their emotions (affective strategies) and cooperate with others (social strategies). Nevertheless, direct and indirect LLS make different contributions to EFL learning, so EFL learners, in order to achieve more success, need to employ both of these LLS categories.

According to Richard, Platt, and Platt (2002), the employment of metacognitive strategies is controlled by the metacognitive knowledge that is influenced by age, L2 proficiency, experience or duration of L2 study. This might explain the medium use of metacognitive strategies by both male and female subjects who were around 18-year-old freshmen with little experience in learning English as a foreign language. The medium use of metacognitive strategies by both male and female participants also reveals the fact that in general, these students were not yet proficient to organize their EFL learning carefully, monitor their learning processes effectively and evaluate their accomplishments frequently.

When analyzing the two groups' use of individual strategy items, the most used strategies were those that involved vocabulary learning, whereas the least-used items were

those that involved speaking and listening to others in English. It is possible that these EFL students, both males and females, have problems with speaking and listening skills. Ton (2006) stated that a large number of her fresh university graduates were not employed by foreign enterprises because of their poor English listening and speaking skills. Many investigations carried out with the aim of improving the quality of teaching and learning English in Vietnam show that “traditional pedagogy, emphasizing the acquisition of grammar and vocabulary rather than communicative competence” is one of the causes of the problem (Pham, 2005, p. 337).

Reading for fun or pleasure in English can expose the learners to various authentic materials that can contribute much to the success in the target language learning. However, nearly a half of both male and female participants (23 girls and 24 boys) marked the responses “Never or almost never true of me” and “Usually not true of me” to the statement “I read for pleasure in English.” This can be interpreted that to these students, reading was not a pleasure but rather an obligation in learning English. This finding is in accordance with experience that many EFL Vietnamese learners found it extremely difficult to read English authentic materials such as magazines, newspapers, and novels, and they only practiced their reading under compulsion by the teacher. A plausible reason for this is that these EFL students possessed low proficiency or competence in reading comprehension and authentic materials in English are not always available in the Vietnamese teaching context.

6.2. Differences in the Use of Language Learning Strategies between the Male and Female Participants

The statistics presented in table 1 and table 2 amaze the researchers in the following aspects. Contrary to our assumption and expectation, the male students generally reported making more use of LLS than the females did although the distinction was not very much. The males also tended to employ direct LLS more frequently and indirect LLS less frequently than the females did.

The most remarkable point from the findings is that memory and affective strategies were the first and second favorite LLS of the females whereas these two categories were placed at the bottom of the table by the males. This means that the females made more use of storing and retrieving information (remembering), and managed their own emotions, motivations and attitudes in their EFL learning more than the males. Attitudes and motivations play a decisive role in language learning, so it is possible that the female students were much more interested in English and English language learning than their peers were, though this would need to be investigated further.

However, the males tended to be much more effective in overcoming deficiencies in the knowledge of the target language as their most-used strategy group was compensation ($M = 4.3$), which was ranked as the third one by the girls ($M = 3.1$).

With regard to the category of social strategies, they were ranked as the second most frequently used by the males but least frequently used by the females; the males manifested a much greater eagerness and activeness in seeking opportunities to interact with others through the target language. To some extent, this may reflex the typical differences between the traditional Vietnamese male and female characteristics where girls and women should be indirect, tentative, even passive and humble in daily interaction.

Although the female subjects tended to be not keen to learn with others, they reported being much more aware of the importance of culture in learning English. There are 34 females (versus 16 males) who chose the item “I try to learn about the culture of English speakers” as true for them. According to Nguyen and Ho (2012), the combination of linguistic perspective and socio-cultural perspective is significantly crucial to a successful learner; therefore, both improving communicative competence and heightening the awareness of the target culture are of utmost necessity. Wardhaugh (1998) believes that language learners ought to take into account the interwoven relationship between language and culture; learners cannot understand or appreciate the one without knowledge of the other.

7. Conclusion

The findings reveal that the reported use of language learning strategies was greater for males than for females, although the difference is small (M = 3.1 for females and M = 3.2 for males). These mean scores also show that both genders reported a medium frequency for the use of LLS according to Oxford's (1990) interpretation of scores. Specifically, female Vietnamese students tended to use indirect strategies more often and use direct strategies less often than the males did. Compensation and social strategies were significantly preferred by the males while memory and affective strategies were most employed by the females.

The project's results show the correlation between the use of language learning strategies and the learner's gender, and differences of strategy use between Vietnamese males and females are apparent. These differences can fall into many categories of LLS in the SILL, and gender, therefore, has a clearly influential impact on how these Vietnamese first-year-students of non-English majors learn English. However, it may be necessary to investigate whether the more successful Vietnamese learners of English are using LLS and which ones.

=====

References

- Carter, R., & Nunan, D. (2001). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chalmers, D., & Volet, S. (1997). Common misconceptions about students from South-East Asia studying in Australia. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 16(1), 87-98.
- Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). Culture of learning: Language classroom in China. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 169-206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 1-13.
- Goh, C. C. M., & Kwah, P. F. (1997). Chinese ESL students' learning strategies: A look at frequency, proficiency and gender. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(1), 39-53.
- Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 261-297.
- Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language learning strategy use. *System*, 31, 367-383.
- Griffiths, C. (2007). Language learning strategies: Students' and teachers' perceptions. *ELT Journal*, 61(2). doi:10.1093/elt/ccm001
- Griffiths, C., & Parr, J. M. (2001). Language learning strategies: Theory and perception. *ELT Journal*, 55, 247-255.
- Gu, Y. (2002). Gender, academic major, and vocabulary learning strategies of Chinese EFL learners. *RELC Journal*, 33(1), 35-54.
- Hashim, R. A., & Sahil, S. A. (1994). Examining learners' language learning strategies. *RELC Journal*, 25(2), 1-20.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hird, B. (1995). How communicative can language teaching be in China? *Prospect*, 10(3), 21-27.
- Hong-Nam, K., & Leavell, A. G. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System*, 34, 399-415.
- Howe, S. (1993). Teaching in Vietnam. *Interchange*, 22, 29-32.
- Khalil, A. (2005). Assessment of language learning strategies used by Palestinian EFL learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38, 108-117.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Lan, R., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). Language learning strategy profiles of elementary school students in Taiwan. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 41, 339-379.
- Lewis, M., & McCook, F. (2002). Cultures of teaching: Voices from Vietnam. *ELT Journal*, 56(2), 346-353.

- LoCastro, V. (1994). Learner strategies and learning environment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 409-414.
- Ma, R. (1999). Language learning strategies of a sample of tertiary-level students in the P. R. China. *Guidelines*, 21(1), 1–11.
- Nguyen, T. H. (2007). Pattern of language learning strategy use of second-year-EFL students and teachers' perception of such use. *VNU Journal of Science – Foreign Languages*, 23, 242-256.
- Nguyen, N. T. & Ho, L. T. (2012). The influences of age and power relations on Vietnamese tertiary students of non-English majors in making spoken invitations in English. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(5), 902-908.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Oxford, R. L. (1993). Instructional implications of gender differences in second/foreign language learning styles and strategies. *Applied Language Learning*, 4, 65-94.
- Oxford, R. L., & Green, J. M. (1995). Making sense of learning strategy assessment: Toward a higher standard of research accuracy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 166-174.
- Peacock, M., & Ho, B. (2003). Student language learning strategies across eight disciplines. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 179-200.
- Pham, H. H. (2005). University English classrooms in Vietnam. *ELT Journal*, 59(4), 336-338.
- Politzer, R. L. (1983). An exploratory study of self reported language learning behaviors and their relation to achievement. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6, 54-68.
- Riazi, A., & Rahimi, M. (2005). Iranian EFL learners' pattern of language learning strategy use. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 2, 103-114.
- Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Beijing: Foreign Languages Teaching and Research Press.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the “good language learner” can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(1), 41-51.
- Rubin, J. (1987). Learner strategies: Theoretical assumptions, research history and typology. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 15-30). Englewood Cliffs, New York: Prentice/Hall International.
- Sadtono, E. (1996). Wanted: Good language learners. *TEFIN Journal*, 8(1), 42-56.
- Shmais, W. A. (2003). Language learning strategy use in Palestine. *TESL-EJ*, 7(2), 1-17.

- Sy, B. M. (1994). Sex differences and language learning strategies. Papers from the eleventh conference on English teaching and learning in the Republic of China (pp. 19-41). Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co.
- Sy, B. M. (1995). Gender differences, perceptions on foreign language learning and language learning strategies. Paper presented at the twelfth conference on English teaching and learning in the Republic of China (pp. 215-277). Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co.
- Tarone, E. (1983). Some thoughts on the notion of communicative strategy. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 61-74). London: Longman.
- Tercanlioglu, L. (2004). Exploring gender effect on adult foreign language learning strategies. *Issues in Educational Research*, 14(2), 181-193.
- Ton, N. N. H. (2006). Linguistic imperialism, English as an international language, and Vietnam. *Teacher's Edition*, 20, 27-33.
- 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.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1998). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wen, Q., & Wang, H. (1996). The relationship of learner variable to score on CET Band-4. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 28(4), 33-39.
- Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning*, 50(2), 203-243.
- Young, D. J., & Oxford, R. (1997). A gender-related analysis of strategies used to process input in the native language and a foreign language. *Applied Language Learning*, 8, 43-73.

=====

Appendix A

QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is part of a study to find out *the similarities and differences in the use of language learning strategies by male and female first-year-students in general English classes at HoChiMinh City University of Natural Resources and Environment*. Please complete it. Remember that there are no right or wrong answers

to any question, your confidentiality is secured, and your response will be used for the research purposes only.

Please state your: **Gender:** **Male** **Female**

Please mark only one response category:

1. Never or almost never true of me.
2. Usually not true of me.
3. Somewhat true of me.
4. Usually true of me.
5. Always or almost always true of me.

Part A: MEMORY STRATEGIES

1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

7. I physically act out new English words.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

8. I review English lessons often.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Part B: COGNITIVE STRATEGIES

10. I say or write new English words several times.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
12. I practice the sounds of English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
14. I start conversations in English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
15. I watch English language TV shows or go to movies spoken in English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
16. I read for pleasure in English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
17. I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
18. I first skim an English passage (read it quickly) then go back and read carefully.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
20. I try to find patterns in English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
22. I try not to translate word-for-word.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Part C: COMPENSATION STRATEGIES

24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
27. I read English without looking up every new word.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Part D: METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES

30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
38. I think about my progress in learning English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Part E: AFFECTIVE STRATEGIES

39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Part F: SOCIAL STRATEGIES

45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or to say it again.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

47. I practice English with other students.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

48. I ask for help from English speakers.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

49. I ask questions in English.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

**THE END
THANKS FOR YOUR HELP!**

=====

Appendix B

BẢNG CÂU HỎI KHẢO SÁT

Bảng câu hỏi này là một phần của nghiên cứu nhằm tìm ra *những sự giống và khác nhau trong việc sử dụng chiến thuật học ngôn ngữ giữa tân sinh viên nam và nữ tại trường ĐH Tài nguyên và Môi trường Tp. HCM*. Không có câu trả lời nào là sai do đó bạn chỉ cần chọn đáp án chính xác nhất đối với bạn. Sự trả lời của bạn chỉ được sử dụng cho mục đích nghiên cứu và danh tánh của bạn sẽ được giữ bí mật.

Làm ơn chỉ ra giới tính của bạn: **Nam** **Nữ**

Làm ơn chỉ chọn một trong những lựa chọn sau đây:

1. Không bao giờ đúng hay gần như không bao giờ đúng với tôi.
2. Thường không đúng với tôi.
3. Gần đúng với tôi.
4. Thường đúng với tôi.
5. Thường xuyên hay gần như thường xuyên đúng với tôi.

PHẦN A: NHÓM THỦ THUẬT TRÍ NHỚ

1. Tôi nghĩ đến mối quan hệ giữa những cái tôi đã biết và những cái tôi mới học bằng tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
2. Tôi nhớ từ mới bằng cách dùng chúng trong một câu.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
3. Tôi nhớ từ mới bằng cách liên hệ âm của từ với hình ảnh của từ đó.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
4. Tôi nhớ từ mới bằng cách vẽ ra trong đầu một tình huống trong đó từ mới được sử dụng.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
5. Tôi nhớ từ mới bằng cách dùng vần điệu.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
6. Tôi nhớ từ mới bằng các thẻ ghi chú từ vựng.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
7. Tôi biểu diễn từ mới bằng hành động.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
8. Tôi thường xuyên ôn bài.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
9. Tôi nhớ từ vựng bằng cách nhớ vị trí của chúng trên trang giấy, trên bảng hoặc trên biển báo trên đường.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

PHẦN B: NHÓM THỦ THUẬT NHẬN THỨC

10. Tôi nói hoặc viết từ mới ra nhiều lần.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
11. Tôi cố nói chuyện như người bản xứ.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
12. Tôi luyện tập phát âm.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
13. Tôi sử dụng những từ tôi biết bằng nhiều cách.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
14. Tôi bắt chuyện bằng tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
15. Tôi xem những chương trình TV hoặc những bộ phim nói bằng tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
16. Tôi đọc tiếng Anh để giải trí.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
17. Tôi viết ghi chú, tin nhắn, thư từ, hoặc báo cáo bằng tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
18. Tôi đọc lướt một đoạn văn tiếng Anh rồi sau đó mới đọc lại một cách cẩn thận.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
19. Tôi tìm những từ trong tiếng Việt giống với những từ tiếng Anh mới học.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
20. Tôi cố gắng tìm những mẫu câu bằng tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
21. Tôi tìm nghĩa củ một từ tiếng Anh bằng cách chia nó ra từng phần mà tôi hiểu.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
22. Tôi cố gắng không dịch từng từ một.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
23. Tôi tóm lược những thông tin tôi nghe được hoặc đọc được ra tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

PHẦN C: NHÓM THỦ THUẬT ĐÈN BÙ

24. Để hiểu những từ tiếng Anh lạ, tôi suy đoán.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
25. Khi nói chuyện mà không thể nghĩ ra từ tiếng Anh nào đó thì tôi dùng cử điệu.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
26. Tôi tự tạo ra những từ mới nếu tôi không biết từ chính xác bằng tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
27. Tôi không tra mọi từ mới khi đọc tiếng Anh.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
28. Tôi cố đoán xem người khác sắp nói gì bằng tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
29. Nếu tôi không nghĩ ra được một từ bằng tiếng Anh thì tôi sẽ dùng một từ hoặc một cụm từ cùng nghĩa.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

PHẦN D: NHÓM THỦ THUẬT SIÊU NHẬN THỨC

30. Tôi cố gắng mọi cách để dùng được tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
31. Tôi lưu ý mọi lỗi tiếng Anh mình mắc phải để giúp mình học tốt hơn.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
32. Tôi để ý khi có ai đó nói tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
33. Tôi cố tìm hiểu xem làm thế nào để học tốt tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
34. Tôi lên thời khóa biểu để có đủ thời gian học tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
35. Tôi tìm những người biết nói tiếng Anh để nói chuyện.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
36. Tôi tìm mọi cơ hội để được đọc tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
37. Tôi có một mục tiêu rõ ràng cho việc cải thiện, nâng cao các kỹ năng tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
38. Tôi suy nghĩ về sự tiến bộ trong việc học tiếng Anh của mình.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

PHẦN E: NHÓM THỦ THUẬT CẢM XÚC

39. Tôi cố gắng thư giãn khi tôi cảm thấy sợ dùng tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
40. Tôi tự động viên mình nói tiếng Anh ngay cả khi tôi sợ nói sai.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
41. Tôi tự thưởng cho mình khi tôi học và dùng tốt tiếng Anh.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
42. Tôi để ý xem mình có căng thẳng hay lo lắng khi học hoặc sử dụng tiếng Anh không.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
43. Tôi viết ra những cảm xúc của mình trong một cuốn nhật ký học tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
44. Tôi nói chuyện với người khác về việc tôi cảm thấy thế nào khi tôi học tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

PHẦN F: NHÓM THỦ THUẬT GIAO TIẾP XÃ HỘI

45. Nếu tôi không hiểu cái gì đó bằng tiếng Anh, tôi yêu cầu người khác nói lại hoặc nói chậm lại.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
46. Tôi nhờ những người bản ngữ sửa lỗi cho tôi khi tôi nói.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
47. Tôi luyện tập tiếng Anh với các bạn sinh viên khác.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
48. Tôi nhờ người biết nói tiếng Anh giúp mình.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
49. Tôi đặt câu hỏi bằng tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
50. Tôi cố gắng tìm hiểu về văn hóa của những người nói tiếng Anh.
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

HẾT
CẢM ƠN!

=====

Nguyen Trong Nhan, M.A.
English Department
Ho Chi Minh City University of Transport
No. 2, D3 Street, Van Thanh Bac Site, Ward 25, Binh Thanh District
Ho Chi Minh City
Vietnam

nguyentrongnhan120784@gmail.com

Ho Thi Lai, M.TESOL

English Department

Ho Chi Minh City University of Natural Resources and Environment

236B, Le Van Sy Street, Ward 1, Tan Binh District

Ho Chi Minh City

Vietnam

lai6af.ho@gmail.com