Language Learning Strategies and English Proficiency of Chinese University Students

Deanna L. Nisbet
Regent University

Evie R. Tindall
Regent University

Alan A. Arroyo
Regent University

Abstract: *This study investigated the relationship between language learning strategy (LLS) preferences and English proficiency among Chinese university students. Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and an institutional version (ITP) of the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) were administered to 168 third-year English majors. Multiple regression analysis revealed that SILL strategies accounted for only 4% of the variation in ITP-TOEFL score. Results of a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) indicated no significant differences between males and females on eight measures of learning strategy preferences and proficiency. Findings suggest a need for further research examining other factors that may account for variation in proficiency among Chinese learners. The authors recommend a closer examination of the relationship between learning strategies and proficiency, and the possible interplay of learner autonomy, across diverse cultural settings.*

Introduction

Language teachers and researchers have long observed that some learners acquire English as a second or foreign language more quickly and effectively than others (Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Lightbown & Spada, 1999; Vance, 1999). The nature of this marked discrepancy among learners has captured the attention of practitioners and researchers worldwide. Over the past four decades, researchers have identified a number of cognitive, affective, and sociocultural factors as significantly contributing to this variation in second language acquisition (SLA) (Brown, 2000). From this body of research, language learning strategies (LLSs) consistently have emerged as a particularly significant variable.

LLSs are defined as "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations" (Oxford, 1990, p. 8). Stated another way, learning strategies are "measures that students can take to promote their own learning success" (Franklin, Hodge, & Sasscer, 1997, p. 24).

Although other scholars within the field of SLA have conceptualized and classified learning strategies in a variety ways, Oxford (1990) developed the most comprehensive model to date.

Deanna L. Nisbet (EdD, Regent University) is Assistant Professor of Education at Regent University, Virginia Beach, Virgina.

Evie R. Tindall (EdD, College of William and Mary) is Associate Professor of Education at Regent University, Virginia Beach, Virgina.

Alan A. Arroyo (EdD, Northern Illinois University) is Dean of the School of Education at Regent University, Virginia Beach, Virgina.

Oxford's classification includes six groups of strategies: memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies.

Oxford (1990) also designed a strategy assessment survey based on her classification system. This assessment tool, the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), is currently recognized as the most comprehensive and widely used instrument for identifying strategy preferences of language learners throughout the world (Bremner, 1999; Foong & Goh, 1997, Green & Oxford, 1995). The SILL has been extensively checked for reliability and validated in multiple ways. As of 1995, it had been used in over 45 major studies involving approximately 8,500 learners worldwide (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995). Research findings from these studies involving SILL learning strategies have recurrently indicated significant variation in learning strategy preferences based on a number of learner variables, including gender, motivation, setting (i.e., English-as-a-second language [ESL] vs. English-as-a-foreign-language [EFL]), cultural background, attitudes/beliefs, learning styles, and language proficiency (Oxford, 2001; Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995).

Because proficiency is the ultimate goal of all language learning, the following discussion will address findings related to this significant variable from language acquisition research. Results from this body of research have consistently suggested an association between LLS use and English proficiency among learners of English as a second or foreign language worldwide. In fact, both frequency and patterns of strategy use have been found to be significantly related to English proficiency (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995).

At the same time, numerous studies have indicated that strategy use varies considerably based on a variety of factors related to the individual, the cultural setting, the instructional context, and the type of language performance required (Brown, 2000; Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995). Moreover, findings from several prominent research studies (e.g., Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Green & Oxford, 1995; Mullins, 1992) have indicated a need for additional research to examine the relationship between learning strategies and English proficiency using valid and reliable instruments, consistently administered in a variety of settings worldwide. In response to this recommendation, Park (1997) investigated the relationship between LLSs and proficiency in an Asian context.

Park's (1997) study, conducted among 332 Korean university students, revealed a significant relationship between SILL learning strategies and English proficiency, as measured by a practice version of the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). Additionally, results indicated that cognitive and social strategies were more predictive of TOEFL scores than other strategy categories. Park called

for additional research to be conducted in other Asian cultures to determine whether the aforementioned patterns of strategy use are unique to Korean students or common to other Asian students as well.

In response to Park's (1997) recommendation and the related recommendations from the aforementioned investigations (e.g., Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Green & Oxford, 1995; Mullins, 1992), the current study was designed to explore LLS preferences and proficiency in a Chinese context. Specifically, this investigation addresses the relationship between LLSs and proficiency among Chinese university students majoring in EFL.

While the primary intent of the study is to examine the relationship between learning strategies and proficiency, an additional variable—gender—will be included in the analysis. The rationale for the inclusion of this additional variable stems from the recommendations of several recent studies (Bremner, 1999; Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Foong & Goh, 1997; Green & Oxford, 1995), which indicated a need for further research concerning variation in learning strategy use and proficiency based on gender.

Research Questions
The current study addresses the following research questions:

1. What are the relationships among six categories of learning strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social), total learning strategies, and second language (L2) proficiency?
2. Which categories of learning strategies are predictive of (i.e., significantly correlated with) L2 proficiency?
3. Is there a difference in learning strategy preferences and proficiency by gender?

Methodology
Setting, Population, and Sample
Participants in this study were 168 third-year English majors at Henan University in Kaifeng, China. The sample consisted of a volunteer pool of 139 females and 29 males, whose ages ranged from 19 to 27 at the time of data collection. All participants had received at least seven years of English instruction at the high school and college levels by the time of this study.

Study Design and Treatment
A quantitative, correlational research design was utilized for this study. LLS preferences and English proficiency of the sample population were measured through the administration of the SILL and the Institutional Testing Program TOEFL (ITP-TOEFL).

Instrumentation
The SILL Version 7.0 was used to measure learning strategy preferences. The SILL is a 50-item self-report, paper-

and-pencil survey designed to assess frequency and patterns of learning strategy use (Oxford, 1990). Version 7.0 is the ESL/EFL version of the test, which is written in English. The instrument consists of statements about strategies used by language learners, such as "I say or write new words in English several times," and "I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English." Subjects respond to each item using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("Never or almost never true of me") to 5 ("Always or almost always true of me").

Reliability (Cronbach's α) for the SILL is reported as .93–.98, depending on whether students take the SILL in their own language or in an L2 (Green & Oxford, 1995). Oxford (1990) and Oxford and Burry-Stock (1995) reported high validity of the instrument based on numerous studies in which the SILL has been found to be significantly related to language performance as indicated by grades, scores on other tests, self-ratings, and teacher ratings.

The ITP-TOEFL, a retired version of the TOEFL, was used to measure English proficiency. Reliability of the TOEFL has been reported as .95, and high levels of validity have been reported in over 80 studies (ETS, 1997).

Data Collection Procedures

The ITP-TOEFL and the SILL were administered by the researcher and three trained supervisors. The tests were administered according to the standard guidelines accompanying each instrument. The purpose of the study was explained both verbally and in writing to all subjects, and written consent to participate in the study was obtained from each individual. In accordance with guidelines for informed consent, participants were notified that they were free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. Additionally, benefits to participants, potential uses of the research data, and procedures for maintaining confidentiality were explained.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using Pearson product–moment correlations, stepwise multiple regression, and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Pearson product–moment correlations were used to examine the first research question: "What are the relationships among six categories of learning strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social), total learning strategies, and L2 proficiency?"

Stepwise multiple regression was the method of data analysis for the second research question: "Which categories of learning strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, or social strategies), are predictive of (i.e., significantly correlated with) L2 proficiency?" Through this procedure, influence (or predictor) variables were used to predict the criterion variable of English proficiency. Multiple regression analysis was selected

because it provides estimates of both the magnitude and statistical significance of relationships between variables (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).

Results

Descriptive Data

Results from the SILL indicated that participants used learning strategies at a medium to high level. As displayed in Table 1, mean scores for three of the strategy categories (metacognitive, cognitive, and social) fell in the range of 3.5 to 5.0. According to Oxford's (1990) classification, this range represents high strategy use. Three categories of strategies (affective, memory, and compensation) fell in Oxford's medium strategy use range of 2.4 to 3.4. The total learning strategies score was 3.45, indicating medium to high strategy use overall (Oxford, 1990).

Table 1				
SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANTS' SILL AND ITP-TOEFL SCORES				
Score	**Min.**	**Max.**	**M**	**SD**
Memory	1.78	4.56	3.03	.53
Cognitive	2.21	4.71	3.52	.48
Compensation	1.83	4.67	3.44	.54
Metacognitive	2.44	5.00	3.85	.59
Affective	2.00	4.83	3.25	.60
Social	1.67	5.00	3.55	.63
Total Learning Strategies	2.36	4.48	3.45	.42
ITP-TOEFL	440.00	633.00	532.99	37.21

As Table 1 indicates, metacognitive strategies ($M = 3.85$, $SD = .59$) were the most frequently used strategies, followed by social ($M = 3.55$, $SD = .63$) and cognitive ($M = 3.52$, $SD = .48$) strategies. Memory strategies ($M = 3.03$, $SD = .53$) were the least frequently used by participants in this study. Results of the ITP-TOEFL indicated a mean score of 532.99. The average score for all undergraduate students who took this version of the TOEFL test worldwide was 519 (ETS, 1997). Thus, current study participants scored higher than average.

Results by Research Question

Research Question #1

Relationships among six categories of learning strategies, total learning strategies, and ITP-TOEFL score were examined using Pearson product–moment correlations. The following assumptions of correlational research were evaluated and found tenable prior to conducting the data analysis: (a) normal distribution of each variable; (b) linearity; and (c) homoscedasticity. Results of a one-sample,

Table 2

PEARSON *r* CORRELATIONS AMONG STRATEGY SCORES AND ITP-TOEFL SCORES

Strategy	A	B	C	D	E	F	TOT	ITP-TOEFL
Memory (A)	1.00**							
Cognitive (B)	.623**	1.00**						
Compensation (C)	.367**	.512**	1.00**					
Metacognitive (D)	.541**	.628**	.331**	1.00**				
Affective (E)	.430**	.391**	.276**	.462**	1.00**			
Social (F)	.536**	.567**	.450**	.603**	.402**	1.00**		
Total learning strategies (TOT)	.788**	.866**	.613**	.813**	.624**	.773**	1.00**	
ITP-TOEFL	.023	.147	.125	.168**	-.055	.026	.109	1.00**

Note. * Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Kolmogorov–Smirnov test indicated approximately normal distribution of all variables. Analysis of scatterplots demonstrated linearity and bivariate normal distribution of variables. Examination of boxplots revealed no extreme outliers (i.e., scores that fall more than 3 box lengths from the lower or upper edge of the box). All assumptions were found to be tenable, and Pearson *r* correlation coefficients were computed.

Results of the analysis presented in Table 2 show that the six categories of learning strategies were significantly correlated with one another and with the total learning strategies score. Only one category of learning strategies (metacognitive strategies) was significantly correlated with ITP-TOEFL score, $r(166) = .17$, $p = .03$; effect size was minimal, $r^2 = .03$.

Research Question #2

A stepwise multiple regression was performed to determine which learning strategies were most strongly correlated with English proficiency. Six categories of learning strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social) were specified as predictor variables, with proficiency as the criterion variable.

The regression model revealed that a combination of two variables (metacognitive strategies and affective strategies) was significantly correlated with proficiency, $R^2 = .05$, $F(2, 265) = 4.41$, $p = .02$. The metacognitive strategy variable entered the regression equation first, with a standardized regression coefficient (β of .25; next, the affective strategy variable entered the equation, (β = −.17). The stepwise regression procedure terminated after these two factors were added into the model (i.e., the contribution of all remaining variables became insignificant after the inclusion of metacognitive and affective strategies in the model). The multiple regression analysis using the least squares solution yielded the following equation:

$$Y' = 507.20 + 15.50\,(x_1) - 10.53\,(x_2)$$

where Y' represents the predicted ITP-TOEFL score; x_1 represents metacognitive strategy score; and x_2 represents affective strategy score.

The significance of the regression model was tested using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistics generated as part of the regression procedure. Findings indicated that the predictors (i.e., learning strategy variables) included in the model were significantly associated with the dependent variable, ITP-TOEFL score, $F(2, 165) = 4.71$, $p = .014$.

The multiple correlation coefficient for the regression analysis as a whole was .23, and R^2 was .05. Because R^2 tends to provide a somewhat inflated estimate of population values in multiple regression (Green, Salkind, & Akey, 2000), adjusted R^2 was calculated. Based on the adjusted R^2 statistic, approximately 4% of the variance in ITP-TOEFL scores can be accounted for by the learning strategy variables specified in this model.

Semipartial correlation (*sr*) analysis revealed that only one variable—metacognitive strategies—was significantly correlated with proficiency when the effects of other variables were partialed out. The zero order correlation between metacognitive strategies and proficiency was .25, $p < .01$, and the correlation between these two variables partialing out the effects of all other variables was .22, $p < .01$.

While the overall regression model includes an inverse relationship between affective strategies and proficiency, the partial correlation for affective strategies was not statistically significant. Thus, when taken individually, the affective strategies score was not significantly correlated with ITP-TOEFL score.

In evaluating the data, the researcher examined the following assumptions for the regression model: (a) normal distribution of the dependent variable for each combination of levels of the independent variables; (b) linearity; (c) independence of scores; and (d) homoscedasticity (Green et al., 2000). Based on examination of a histogram, a normal

probability plot (P-P Plot), and scatterplots of the residuals, all assumptions were found to be tenable.

In addition, the researcher examined the data set for multicollinearity (i.e., intercorrelations among the predictor variables). The variance inflation values (VIFs) were examined and were found to be within an acceptable range (1.12–1.69). Thus, no variables were deleted from the model due to multicollinearity.

Research Question #3

A one-way MANOVA was conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in learning strategy scores or proficiency by gender. For this analysis, gender was configured as the independent variable, and eight learning strategy and proficiency scores were configured as dependent variables. The dependent variables were: (a) memory strategies; (b) cognitive strategies; (c) compensation strategies; (d) metacognitive strategies; (e) social strategies; (f) affective strategy strategies; (g) total learning strategies; and (h) ITP-TOEFL score.

The following assumptions were evaluated and found tenable prior to conducting the data analysis: (a) normal distribution of dependent variables; (b) population variances and covariances among the dependent variables are the same across all levels of the factor; and (c) independence of scores. Box's M test revealed homogeneity of variance–covariance matrices (i.e., the variances were the same for males and females), $F(21, 9254) = 1.23$, $p = .22$.

Results of the MANOVA revealed no significant differences among males and females on any of the eight dependent variables, Wilks's $\Lambda = .96$, $F(6, 61) = 1.11$, $p = .36$; $\eta = .06$. Based on this finding, no follow-up analyses were conducted.

Discussion

The current study generated three significant findings. First, Pearson r correlations revealed that one category of learning strategies—metacognitive strategies—was significantly correlated with ITP-TOEFL score ($r = .17$). Second, results of a multiple regression analysis indicated that a combination of two variables (metacognitive strategies and affective strategies) was significantly correlated with English proficiency, jointly accounting for only 4% of the total variation in ITP-TOEFL score. Finally, variations in learning strategy scores and proficiency did not appear to be influenced by gender, but by other factors. Thus, results of the present investigation did not confirm the role of social and cognitive strategies in predicting TOEFL scores among Asian students, as presented by Park (1997).

It is interesting to note that while participants in the current study reported using SILL learning strategies at a medium to high level and scored higher than average on the ITP-TOEFL, findings revealed minimal correlation between learning strategies and proficiency. Four possible explanations for the low level of correlation between learning strategies and proficiency within the current investigation are as follows: (a) possible use of strategies other than those measured by the SILL; (b) variation in regard to application and/or orchestration of learning strategies; (c) language areas measured by the proficiency test (ITP-TOEFL); and (d) intervening factors, aside from learning strategies, that directly or indirectly affected proficiency (Mullins, 1992).

The four possible explanations for the low level of correlation in this study will be explored in the following discussion. First, learners may have used strategies other than those reported by the SILL. Results of two previous studies conducted among Asian university students (LoCastro, 1994; Mullins, 1992) indicated use of both SILL and non-SILL strategies. However, it should be noted that participants in the current study reported medium to high use of all categories of SILL strategies, with an overall average score of 3.45.

A second possibility is that learners' application of strategies was inappropriate or not well orchestrated. Vann and Abraham (1990) reported that unsuccessful learners were active strategy users but applied strategies inappropriately and in an unorchestrated fashion. Thus, it is possible that the skillful application of strategies may have more to do with proficiency than does reported frequency counts.

A third possibility is that the low correlation was due to the type of instrument selected to measure proficiency. The ITP-TOEFL is designed to assess academic language proficiency, and it includes no direct measures of speaking or writing skills on the part of the individual being tested (ETS, 1997). Thus, it is possible that learning strategies would correlate more strongly with other, more communicative, measures of proficiency, such as an oral interview or a test of spoken English. However, it should be noted that participants in the current study scored higher than average on this test.

A fourth possible explanation is that any number of factors aside from learning strategies directly or indirectly affected proficiency of participants in this study. Intervening factors may have included cognitive, affective, sociocultural, or instructional variables (Brown, 2000; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992). For example, factors that have been identified by researchers as being associated with variation in language learning include the following: self-esteem, inhibition, risk taking, anxiety, ambiguity tolerance, empathy, introversion/extroversion, beliefs, intelligence, field independence/dependence, and motivation (Brown, 2000; Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992).

Additional Considerations

Because the current study was conducted at only one province-level university in Kaifeng, China, participants in this study were therefore not representative of the full spec-

trum of Chinese university students. Thus, the findings reported from the current investigation should not be generalized to all Chinese university students. Nevertheless, findings from the current study point to the need for consideration of two additional topics. The possible influence of cultural context and autonomy on learning strategy use and proficiency will be explored in the next sections.

Cultural Context

Past research has shown significant variation in strategy use based on cultural background and ESL versus EFL setting (Nyikos & Oxford, 1993; Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995). Each of these areas will be explored in light of current study findings. Variation in strategy use based on cultural background and setting has typically been discussed in terms of strategy counts (i.e., students from various cultures have been reported to use certain categories of strategies more frequently than others). However, perhaps it is the application of strategies that plays a larger role in cultural variation. In this regard, a possible explanation for current study findings is that while participants were introduced to LLSs in English classes conducted by American teachers, their application of such strategies in language learning endeavors was shaped by their previous educational experiences and the prevalent educational philosophy within their country.

Campbell and Zhao (1993) reported that Chinese teachers and students shared the following assumptions about L2 learning: (a) "Grammar analysis is crucial to foreign language learning," (b) "Although textbooks and classroom exercises are often tedious, there is no other way to learn a foreign language," and (c) "The teacher should dominate classroom while students listen passively and engage in exercises on command . . . " (p. 5). Thus, student initiative in the learning process has not typically been emphasized in Chinese settings. The use of learning strategies requires active involvement on the part of the individual learner and is consistent with principles of the communicative approach to language learning (Brown, 2000; Oxford, 1990, Scarcella & Oxford, 1992). This approach tends to counter the teacher-centered, grammar-based approach to language instruction that is currently prevalent in China (Campbell & Zhao, 1993; Shih, 1999). In addition to cultural context, learner autonomy may influence the relationship between strategy use and English proficiency.

Learner Autonomy

Oxford (2001) stated that learning strategies "are aimed at 'self-management in language learning and self-reliance in language use'—in other words, autonomy" (p. 1). Autonomy was defined by Holec (1979) as "the ability to take charge of one's learning" (p. 3). Similarly, Little (1995) posited that "the basis of learner autonomy is that the learner accepts responsibility for his or her learning" (p.

175). Thus, Oxford's learning strategies do appear to overlap with the conceptualization of learner autonomy.

Benson (1997) proposed that autonomy can be identified at three levels: (a) a technical level, (b) a psychological level, and/or (c) a political level. Benson and Lor (1998) described this phenomenon as follows:

> At the technical level it is concerned with management, strategies, and techniques of learning. At the psychological level, it is concerned with the inner capacity for self-direction or self-regulation of learning. At the political level, it is concerned with control over situational and social contexts of learning. (p. 3)

According to Benson's (1997) classification, use of LLSs would be an example of autonomy at the "technical level." In other words, the SILL measures self-reported behavior on the part of the language learner. However, the SILL does not measure autonomy at the psychological level (i.e., the inner capacity for self-direction or self-regulation of learning) or the political level (control over situational and social contexts of learning) per se. Perhaps autonomy, at all three levels, is an important key to understanding variations in learning strategy use and proficiency.

As stated at the outset of this discussion, previous research has shown that strategy use varies based on both cultural background and type of setting (ESL vs. EFL). In this regard, it is interesting to compare current study findings with those of two studies (Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Park, 1997) which incorporated instrumentation, procedures, population, and/or data analysis similar to those used in the present investigation. Dreyer and Oxford (1996) reported a strong correlation between learning strategies and proficiency among learners in the ESL setting of South Africa, where English is recognized as an official language. Park found a small to moderate correlation between learning strategies and proficiency in the EFL setting of Korea. Finally, the current study, conducted in the EFL setting of China, revealed a statistically significant correlation between learning strategies and proficiency as well. However, current study findings, while statistically significant, were of minimal practical significance. In summary, strong correlations were found in South Africa; small to moderate correlations were found in Korea; and minimal correlations were revealed in the current study conducted in China.

Perhaps such variation can be at least partly explained by considering the effects of autonomy at the three levels posited by Benson (1997): technical, psychological, and political. South Africa exhibits the social and political climate of a Western culture, where individual autonomy is fostered. Korea is an Eastern culture that has adopted some Western philosophies and practices of commerce and education. Finally, China is an example of an Eastern cultural

context, which reflects collectivist values and does not emphasize the role of the individual (Storti, 1999).

Results of the current study, examined in tandem with those of Dreyer and Oxford (1996) and Park (1997), indicate a clear need for further exploration of the concept of learner autonomy in relation to learning strategies and proficiency of learners in diverse cultural contexts.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the major findings of the present study, the researcher recommends the following avenues for future research: First, because the current investigation into LLSs and proficiency of Chinese university students was conducted with participants from one province-level university in northern China, the ability to generalize the data is limited. Further research is needed to more fully explore (a) patterns of learning strategy use, and (b) the nature of the relationship between learning strategies and proficiency among Chinese learners of English in a variety of educational contexts.

Second, the current investigation measured learning strategy preferences using one self-report instrument (i.e., the SILL) at a particular point in time. It is the recommendation of these researchers that future endeavors incorporate a variety of measures (e.g., structured interviews, think-aloud procedures, observations, dialogue journals, etc.) and evaluate the relationship between learning strategies and proficiency over time. Such studies would ideally explore how learners apply strategies in carrying out specific language-related tasks and would draw upon the perceptions of both teachers and learners concerning the effectiveness of various strategies.

Third, the current study also utilized only one measure of proficiency, the ITP-TOEFL. This test is designed to assess academic language proficiency, and it includes no direct measures of speaking or writing skills on the part of the individual being tested (ETS, 1997). Thus, it is recommended that future studies incorporate multiple measures of English proficiency, including assessments that require communicative use of language such as oral proficiency interviews, semistructured writing tasks, etc.

Fourth, the role of autonomy in relation to LLSs and proficiency of learners in diverse cultural contexts is worthy of investigation. Benson's (1997) conceptualization of autonomy at three levels (technical, psychological, and political) may help to enlighten future studies in this regard.

Finally, as the current study revealed that only 4% of the variation in proficiency was explained by SILL learning strategies, additional research is needed to identify other factors that may account for the remaining variation. It may be that these learning strategies, as conceived by Western culture, are not as fruitful in relation to TOEFL proficiency within an Eastern context.

In conclusion, LLSs will, no doubt, continue to be a topic of interest for researchers and practitioners who desire to serve the needs of English language learners. This study reveals the need for closer examination of the relationship between learning strategies and proficiency, and the possible interplay of learner autonomy, across diverse cultural settings. It is the hope of these authors that researchers from both quantitative and qualitative perspectives will further explore the numerous factors that contribute to the success of English language learners worldwide.

References

Benson, P. (1997). The philosophy and politics of learner autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 18–34). London: Addison Wesley Longman.

Benson, P., & Lor, W. (1998). *Making sense of autonomous language learning.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED428570).

Bremner. S. (1999). Language learning strategies and language proficiency: Investigating the relationship in Hong Kong. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 55*(4), 490–514.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching (4th ed.).* White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.

Campbell, K. P., & Zhao, Y. (1993). The dilemma of English language instruction in the People's Republic of China. *TESOL Journal, 2*(4), 4–6.

Dreyer, C., & Oxford, R. L. (1996). Learning strategies and other predictors of ESL proficiency among Afrikaans speakers in South Africa. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 61–74). Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Educational Testing Service (ETS) (1997). *TOEFL test and score data summary [Manual].* Princeton, NJ: Author.

Foong, K. P., & Goh, C. M. (1997). Chinese ESL students' learning strategies: A look at frequency, proficiency, and gender. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics, 2*(1), 39–53.

Franklin, L., Hodge, M. E., & Sasscer, M. F. (1997). Improving retention with strategy-based instruction. *Inquiry, 1*(2), 21–27.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction (6th ed.).* White Plains, NY: Longman.

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

Green, S. B., Salkind, N. J., & Akey, T. M. (2000). *Using SPSS for Windows: Analyzing and understanding data (2nd ed.).* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Holec, H. (1979). *Autonomy and foreign language learning.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED192557).

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Little, D. (1995). Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System, 23*(2), 175–181.

LoCastro, V. (1994). Learning strategies and learning environments. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(2), 409–414.

Mullins, P. Y. (1992). Successful English language learning strategies of students enrolled at the Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53*(06), 1829A. (UMI No. 9223758)

Nyikos, M., & Oxford, R. (1993). A factor analytic study of language-learning strategy use: Interpretations from information-processing theory and social psychology. *The Modern Language Journal, 77*(1), 11–22.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Oxford, R. (2001, March). *Language learning strategies, proficiency, and autonomy: What they mean in the new millennium.* Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Deseret Language and Linguistics Society, Provo, Utah.

Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System, 23*(1), 1–23.

Park, G. P. (1997). Language learning strategies and English proficiency in Korean university students. *Foreign Language Annals, 30*(2), 211–221.

Scarcella, R. C., & Oxford, R. L. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: The individual in the communicative classroom.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Shih, M. (1999). More than practicing language: Communicative reading and writing for Asian settings, *TESOL Journal, 8*(4), 20–25.

Storti, C. (1999). *Figuring foreigners out: A practical guide.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Vance, S. J. (1999). *Language learning strategies: Is there a best way to teach them?* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED438716).

Vann, R. J., & Abraham, R. G. (1990). Strategies of unsuccessful language learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*(2), 177–198.