

A Contrastive Study of Vocabulary Learning Beliefs and Strategies by High School and College Learners

LIU Leilei^{[a],*}

[a]College of Foreign Language Education , China West Normal University, Nanchong, China.

*Corresponding author.

Received 29 July 2016; accepted 16 September 2016
Published online 26 September 2016

Abstract

This study aims to provide an empirical study about vocabulary learning beliefs and strategies possessed by high school and college learners in the Chinese context. In addition, it analyses the similarities and differences of vocabulary learning strategies adopted by the two groups of learners. 100 students from Guanghan high school and the other 100 from China West Normal University responded to the questionnaire. Data are collected and processed by means of SPSS14.0. Based on the results, this paper suggests that teachers should help learners to build positive motivation, integrate more strategy training into English classes and encourage students to systematize their own learning strategies instead of using these strategies unconsciously or unsystematically.

Key words: Vocabulary learning beliefs; Vocabulary learning strategies; Metacognitive strategies; Cognitive strategies, Social/affective strategies

Liu, L. L. (2016). A Contrastive Study of Vocabulary Learning Beliefs and Strategies by High School and College Learners. *Canadian Social Science*, 12(11), 124-132. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/css/article/view/9085> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/9085>

1. SOME BASIC CONCEPTS OF THE STUDY

1.1 Language Learning Strategies

Oxford defined Language learning strategies are “behaviors or actions which learners use to make language

learning more successful, self-directed and enjoyable.” Chamot defined Learning strategies are “techniques, approaches or deliberate actions that students take in order to facilitate the learning, recall of both linguistic and content area information.” While Rubin named learning strategies are “strategies which contribute to the development of the language system which the learner constructs and affect learning directly.”

1.2 Models of Language Learning strategies

According to the various definitions of language learning strategies, there exists diversity of classifying learning strategies. O’Malley and Chamot (1990) distinguished three major types of learning strategies on the basis of information processing theory: metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies and social/affective strategies.

Metacognitive strategies which are described as high order executive skills that may entail planning for learning, thinking about learning process, monitoring of one’s production or comprehension and evaluating of learning after an activity. It can be divided into advance organization, direction attention, selective attention, self-management, advance preparation, self-monitoring, delayed production and self-evaluation.

Cognitive strategies are more limited to particular learning tasks and closely connected to cognitive process which includes repetition, resourcing, directed physical response, translation, grouping, note-taking, deduction, recombination, imagery, auditory representation, keyword, contextualization, elaboration, transfer and guessing. This kind of strategy operates directly on incoming information, manipulating it in ways that enhance learning.

Social strategies are also called affective strategies which involve either interaction with another person or ideational control over affect. In a word, this kind of strategy deals with social mediating activity and transacting with others and it includes cooperation, question for classification and self-talk.

1.3 Vocabulary Learning Strategies

In the process of identifying and categorizing language strategies, many studies dealt indirectly with strategies specifically applicable to vocabulary learning, as O'Malley and Chamot (1990) note: Training research on learning strategies with second language has been limited almost exclusively to cognitive applications with vocabulary tasks."

Vocabulary learning strategies refer to any kind of approaches or techniques that learners adopt to cope with vocabulary learning both consciously and subconsciously. Therefore, vocabulary learning strategies could be any factors which affect this broadly-defined process. Hereby, in this paper, vocabulary learning strategies can refer to a wide spectrum of strategies used as part of on-going process of vocabulary learning. It contains Rote-learning, Keyword, Association, Grouping, Context, Guessing, Dictionary, Application, Affixation and so on.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research Questions

The current study attempts to find answers to the following questions:

(a) What are the major vocabulary learning beliefs and strategies adopted by high school learners and college learners respectively?

(b) Are there any similarities and differences between the two groups of students in the use of vocabulary learning strategies?

(c) If there do exist some similarities and differences, how can we to explain them?

2.2 Subjects

In total, 200 students participated in this study, 100 high school students are in grade two from Guanghan High School and other 100 students are sophomores from different departments (except English apartment) in China West Normal University.

2.3 Instruments

2.3.1 Questionnaire Design

This questionnaire is mainly from the following two sources: Studies on the classification of learning strategies from O'Malley and Chamot (1990) and Wen (1996). Some quantitative and qualitative research on vocabulary learning, including Polizter & McGroart (1985), Ahmed (1989), Gu (1994), Wu (1998).

It contains four sections: Section 1 involves instructions in the questionnaire and asked about every respondent's demographic information including gender; age and how many years they have learned English. Section 2 deals with learners' beliefs on vocabulary learning. It only lists three statements which represent three dimensions of beliefs: (a) Words should be learned by rote; (b) Words

should be acquired through context; (c) Words should be learned through application. The aim of this section is to explore what the participants' general beliefs on vocabulary learning on the nature of vocabulary learning. Participants are expected to indicate their opinions in terms of a five-point Likert scale ranging from "1" stands for "Strongly disagree" to "5" stands for "Strongly Agree". Section 3 constitutes the main body of the questionnaire that involves various English vocabulary learning strategies. It contains 58 behaviors clustered into three major parts: metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies and social strategies. Metacognitive strategies include: Organizational Planning, Self-monitoring, Self-evaluation and Selective Attention. Cognitive strategies were divided into Rote-learning, Grouping, Context (Contextual Encoding), Dictionary, guessing (Contextual Guessing), Doing-exercises, Application, Association, Wide-reading and Passage-reciting, each of which was again subdivided into several specific micro strategies. To each statement, the participants are also asked to rate on a five-point Likert scale with "1" stands for "Never or almost never true for me", "2" stands for "Usually not true for me", "3" stands for "somewhat true for me", "4" stands for "Usually true for me" and "5" represents "Always or almost true for me". Metacognitive strategies include four items, the first two items "Organizational planning" and "Self-monitoring" refer to organize vocabulary study, make, monitor the study plan, check and review regularly what has learned. "Self-evaluation" means to judge and evaluate how well you have carried out your plan and "selective attention" means pay special attention to some words, especially some key words, interesting words and high frequency words. Cognitive strategies involve 10 items and each of these items contains some subcategories. Social/ affective strategies include two categories: "Affective control" and "Cooperation". Section 4 consists of two open-ended questions relating to their vocabulary learning strategies: 1. What kind of strategies works best for you? 2. Besides the above strategies, do you use any other ones?

2.3.2 Reliability and Validity of the Questionnaire

The reliabilities of the questionnaire are made in the following table, which included the major dimension in the questionnaire, the subcategories contained in the questionnaire, the number of items under each category and the internal consistency of the items within a variable by using the Statistics Package for Social Science (SPSS) after a pilot study.

As indicated in Table 1, overall reliability of the questionnaire is generally high; therefore, this questionnaire is reliable. As far as the validity of the questionnaire is concerned, it can be guaranteed for it was mainly adapted from O'Malley and Chamot's work, which enjoys a relatively high validity since it reflects previous quantitative and qualitative research in this field.

Table.1
Reliability of the Questionnaire

Dimensions and Categories	No. of items	Alpha
Beliefs about Vocabulary Learning	3	
Word should be learned by rote	1	
Word should be acquired through context	1	
Word should be learned through application	1	
Metacognitive Strategies	10	
Organization Planning	1	
Self-planning	4	0.7375
Self-evaluation	2	0.8239
Selective Attention	3	0.6967
Cognitive Strategies	44	
Context	3	0.7142
Wide reading	5	0.7343
Guessing	4	0.6973
Dictionary	7	0.6540
Grouping	4	0.7330
Rote-learning	8	0.6631
Doing-exercise	3	0.6850
Association	3	0.6310
Passage-reciting	2	0.6895
Application	5	0.7250
Social/affective strategies	6	
Affective control	4	0.6869
Cooperation	2	0.8437

Table 2
Beliefs and Strategies Adopted by Two Groups of Learners

Items	High school learners		College learners	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Word should be learned by rote	2.50	1.07	2.76	1.11
Word should be acquired through context	3.82	0.68	3.51	1.22
Word should be learned through application	4.34	0.78	3.69	1.34
Metacognitive strategies				
Organizational planning	2.78	0.73	3.28	0.92
Self-monitoring	2.46	0.71	3.07	0.87
Check vocabulary learning methods to find the weak points	2.52	1.01	3.11	1.00
Adapt to effective vocabulary learning methods	3.01	1.09	3.27	0.96

To be continued

2.3.3 Interview

The interview consists of five questions related to the students' response to the questionnaire such as "Have you ever made any vocabulary study plan?", "What kind of strategies do you usually adopt in learning words?" 10 subjects are selected among the 200 investigated students, 5 are high school learners and 5 are college learners.

Data Collection

The study was conducted from May to June in 2015. The questionnaires were delivered in Chinese to avoid the possibility of misunderstanding. Students were informed that the purpose of the survey was just to collect useful and reliable data for a study in VLS and their choices had no connection with their English examination scores, they should give their choice conscientiously, which really reflect their vocabulary learning. All the questionnaires were distributed during the participants' regular English classes and their teacher was also informed of the procedures of distribution before the survey. Students were given 30 minutes to finish the questionnaire. During the process, teachers had emphasized the written instructions, especially for the five-points rating scales stands for. All the questionnaires were collected within the set time.

The data for this study were collected through a questionnaire survey on both students' beliefs and their reports on actual use of vocabulary learning strategies. After all the data were collected, they were put into computer and processed by SPSS.

3. RESULTS AND ANALYSES

3.1 Results

Table 2 provides statistics on each category of vocabulary learning beliefs and strategies, together with some specific microstrategies adopted by two groups of learners.

Continued

Items Belief	High school learners		College learners	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Review newly-learned words in a set time	2.77	0.95	3.20	1.10
Check the mastery of the words	3.00	1.07	3.02	0.97
Self-evaluation	2.65	0.91	3.16	0.97
Evaluate through vocabulary learning methods' analyses	2.42	0.90	2.98	0.93
Evaluate through self-summarizing	2.76	1.05	3.01	0.86
Selective attention	3.66	0.94	3.47	0.71
Pay attention to key words	3.87	0.82	3.55	0.92
Pay attention to high-frequency words	3.89	0.89	3.52	0.96
Pay attention to interesting words	3.69	1.05	3.36	0.97
Cognitive strategies				
Context	3.26	0.69	3.56	0.75
Memorize emotional coloring of the words in the context	2.96	1.03	3.23	1.08
Memorize related sentences in the context	2.98	1.09	3.37	1.11
Memorize related phrases in the context	3.22	0.98	3.41	0.97
Wide-reading	2.40	0.98	3.24	1.01
Read newspapers and magazines	2.37	1.09	3.56	1.12
Read original words	2.12	1.04	3.07	1.13
Read simplified words	2.26	1.12	3.25	1.04
Read on lines	2.00	1.11	3.11	1.12
Watch movies and songs	3.32	1.12	3.33	1.17
Guessing	3.65	0.76	3.67	1.00
Guess by analyzing word parts or structures	3.27	1.17	3.38	1.05
Guess according to the meaning of the related sentence	3.62	0.95	3.52	0.99
Guess by interrelationship of sentence	3.15	1.07	3.28	1.09
Combine guessing with looking-up dictionary	3.35	1.10	3.00	1.13
Dictionary	3.44	1.20	3.09	1.18
Use English-Chinese Dictionary	3.42	1.25	3.14	1.08
Use English-English Dictionary	2.73	1.10	2.43	0.93
Use English-English-Chinese Dictionary	2.78	1.14	2.82	1.00
Use Electronic Dictionary	3.34	1.29	3.04	1.27
Look up the dictionary to know the meaning of the word in the related passage	3.31	1.06	3.15	1.02
Look up the dictionary to know various meaning of this word	3.26	0.93	2.94	1.06
Look up the dictionary to know the usage of this word	2.79	1.05	2.89	1.02
Grouping	2.31	0.98	2.64	1.02
Group by affixes and roots	2.47	0.93	2.82	1.06
Group by semantic feature	2.61	0.98	2.55	1.04

Continued

Items Belief	High school learners		College learners	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Group by usage	2.65	1.02	2.36	0.95
Group by word form and pronunciation	2.78	1.06	2.78	1.04
Do exercises	3.52	1.01	2.71	0.82
Do multiple-choice vocabulary exercise	3.38	0.96	3.19	1.25
Use words to make up sentences	3.46	1.02	1.97	0.92
Use words to write diaries or compositions	3.20	1.00	2.92	1.08
Rote-learning	3.42	0.84	2.71	0.82
Use both oral and visual repetition	3.35	1.28	3.19	1.25
Use visual repetition	1.97	1.02	1.97	0.92
Use oral repetition	2.18	1.21	2.92	1.08
Memorize high-frequency words	2.91	1.12	3.04	1.03
Memorize interesting words	3.05	1.21	2.88	1.14
Memorize word-lists in the textbook	2.17	1.08	2.18	0.99
Memorize self-made word-lists	2.82	1.21	2.62	1.03
Memorize the words from the dictionary	1.60	0.74	1.97	1.01
Association	2.95	1.03	2.67	0.94
Associate by word structure	2.60	0.93	2.63	1.01
Associate by using keyword method	2.99	1.14	2.43	0.93
Associate by form and spelling	2.79	0.98	2.49	1.11
Passage-reciting	2.55	0.93	3.11	1.06
Recite well-written passages	2.86	1.08	3.09	1.13
Recite sentences	2.86	1.04	2.97	1.10
Application	3.19	1.05	2.87	0.90
Talk with native speakers	1.96	1.13	2.76	0.90
Participate in English corners	1.78	1.03	2.61	0.80
Participate in group-discussion in class	3.07	0.96	1.82	0.84
Use words to make up a story	1.79	0.97	1.95	0.99
Apply words in conversation and composition	3.18	1.09	3.35	1.20
Affective/social strategies				
Affective control	3.00	1.05	2.80	1.10
Regulate emotion through talking with teachers	1.76	0.89	1.77	1.03
Regulate emotion through talking with parents or relatives	2.42	1.24	2.36	1.32
Regulate emotion through talking with friends	3.46	1.12	3.12	1.29
Encourage myself when meeting with troubles in vocabulary learning	3.78	1.09	3.56	1.16
Cooperation	2.40	0.73	1.76	0.85
Communicate with classmates to practice new words	2.17	0.89	1.87	0.92
Listen to and imitate words used by high-proficiency classmates	1.86	1.10	1.66	1.06

3.2 Contrastive Analyses Between High School Learners and College Learners

To determine whether there exist significant differences

between the two groups, Independent T-test is carried out with each category of vocabulary learning beliefs and strategies, the result is presented in Table 4

Table 4
Independent-Sample T-Test of Vocabulary Learning Beliefs and Strategies Between High School Learners and College Learners

Variables	High school learners		College learners		T-test	
	M	SD	M	SD	T	P
Rote-learning1	2.5	1.07	2.76	1.11	0.778	0.46
Context1	3.82	0.68	3.51	1.22	0.08	0.988
Application1	4.34	0.78	3.69	1.34	-1.579	0.128
Organizational planning	2.78	0.73	3.28	0.92	2.164	0.035
Self-monitoring	2.46	0.71	3.07	0.87	3.247	0.002
Self-evaluation	2.65	0.91	3.16	0.97	-1.647	0.005
Selective attention	3.66	0.94	3.47	0.71	-0.466	0.643
Context 2	3.26	0.69	3.56	0.75	2.656	0.023
Wide-reading	2.4	0.98	3.24	1.01	4.688	0
Guessing	3.65	0.76	3.67	1	-1.109	0.061
Dictionary	3.44	1.2	3.09	1.18	-0.408	0.395
Grouping	2.31	0.98	2.64	1.02	0.939	0.586
Rote-learning 2	3.42	0.84	2.71	0.82	2.279	0.002
Doing exercises	3.52	1.01	2.67	0.94	2.207	0.001
Association	2.95	1.03	3.11	1.06	0.131	0.241
Passage-reciting	2.55	0.93	2.54	0.68	1.941	0.402
Application	3.19	1.05	2.87	0.9	-0.292	0.087
Affective control	3.78	1.09	3.56	1.16	-0.548	0.79
cooperation	2.4	0.74	1.76	0.85	-0.367	0.43

Note. 1=belief, 2= strategy

3.2.1 Results and Analyses on Learning Beliefs

The results of T-test on beliefs show that there is no significant difference between the two groups. Both favor for the belief that “Word should be learned through application” and they also take negative attitudes towards the belief of Rote-learning. It suggests that neither high school learners nor college learners are not in favor of rote-learning belief, which is contrary to popular beliefs about Asian learners.

3.3.2 Results and Analyses on Metacognitive Strategies

In terms of metacognitive strategies, the mean scores of college learners are all above three; while high school learners only the “Selective Attention” strategy is above three. It indicates that all the metacognitive strategies are frequently employed by college learners and in this category, the two groups do have significant differences ($p=0.035, 0.002, 0.005$) except “Selective Attention”

($p=0.643$). It is known that metacognitive strategies are used by students to control and evaluate their own learning, by having an overview of the learning process in general and metacognitive strategies are also regarded as generally broad strategies concerned with more efficient learning. Therefore, any language learning strategies that are well managed are more likely to lead successful learning outcomes. The findings acquired in this paper suggest that college learners could be well able to make their vocabulary learning plan, know clearly about which strategies should be improved, use some vocabulary strategies consciously and evaluate the outcomes after the practice. In addition, they are more aware of the strategies they use than high school learners and they use strategies more flexibly. As Wen & Johnson (1997, p.39) mentioned that “The effectiveness of all language learning strategies is determined by the learners’ management

of these strategies” and O’Malley and Chamot (1990) stated that students without metacognitive approaches are essentially learners without direction or opportunity to plan their learning, monitor their progress or review their accomplishments and future learning directions.

Rod Ellis (2000) pointed out that the higher language proficiency the learners have, the more frequently they tend to use Metacognitive Strategies. When it comes to China, college students have a better command of English knowledge and stronger ability of macro-management than those in senior high schools. Through the interview, we can easily find the reason: On the one hand, college learners are text-oriented learners who have to pass the CET-4 in order to get their bachelor degree certificate and they should arrange all the preparing process on their own; on the other hand, although high school learners are also text-oriented learners, they depend more on their teachers than themselves, what they need to do is just to do what their teachers ask them to do, so few of them are aware that they should have their organizational plans or they should evaluate themselves. In addition, their general English proficiency is much limited than college learners. Therefore, metacognitive strategies are less employed by them.

3.3.3 Results and Analyses on Cognitive Strategies

As far as cognitive strategies are concerned, the two groups show differences in some categories. In the case of context, as shown in Table 4, there is significant difference between the two groups. The mean score of high school learners is 3.26 while that of college learners is 3.56 ($P=0.023$). It suggests that this strategy is more favored by college learners and most of them prefer to learn and memorizing words in the context. This result is corresponding to Cohen & Aphek’s research (1980) who concluded that the recall of words in context was positively related to the proficiency level of informants. The more advanced learner, the more likely they were to be benefited from learning words in context (Carter & McCarthy, 1988, p.15; Cohen, 1990, p.137). “Words lists proved better for beginning students, but more advanced students benefited more from contextualized words.” (Cohen & Aphek, 1980). Also, Taylor (1983) had described the advantages of learning words through context as “Words which are naturally associated in the text are learnt more easily than those that not so associated.”

With regard to Wide-reading, there exists a significant difference between the two groups ($p=0.000$). College learners ($M=4.24$) tend to use this strategy more than high school learners ($M=2.40$). High school learners tend to watch movies and songs ($M=3.33$) while college learners prefer to read newspapers and magazines ($M=3.56$). In addition, mean scores in all microstrategies of wide-reading are all above 3.0 while that of high school learners

are lower than 3.0 except watching movies and songs which suggest that high school learners do not use this kind of strategy frequently.

As to Rote-learning strategies, two groups differ from each other ($P=0.02$), with high school learners getting a mean score of 3.42 and college learners only 2.71. Because college learners are more skillful than high school learners and with the improvement of their language proficiency, they can find other effective ways to acquire words while high school learners are more limited in their language proficiency so they have not found other effective strategies to acquire words instead of rote-learning strategies which seem to be the easiest way. In sum, in China, learning is still largely regarded as the digestion of a body of knowledge, and progress is seen by how much one can memorize and reproduce. As a natural consequence, a vast majority of students have to learn by means of memorization and rote learning, which are considered by the whole society as basic acquisition techniques. Under such a cultural circumstance they gradually become traditional, hard-working learners who believe in effort regardless of their study approach. For another, memorization only involves a direct mother-tongue equivalent with very little semantic coding and it proves quite useful for a short-time memory (Carter, 1998, p.93), so it is favored by Chinese high school students who have to sit for various kinds of English examinations once a while.

As far as “doing exercise” strategies are concerned, the two groups show significant differences ($p=0.01$). The mean score of high school learners is 3.52 while that of college learners is only 2.67. The result indicates that high school learners much adopted to use these strategies than college learners. It is according to the current situation of Chinese education, which high school learners are heavy burden. High school students have so many exercises and tests to do with the purpose of getting a high mark in the college entrance examination. According to the interview, many high school learners reported that they believe that doing many exercises is the most helpful way to improve their scores, just as the old saying goes that practice makes perfect.

Meanwhile, as shown in the table above, the two groups exhibit some similarities in the using of cognitive strategies.

The most popular cognitive strategies employed by the two groups are “Guessing strategies” ($M1=3.65$, $M2=3.67$). The reason why both the groups report to use ‘Guessing strategies’ most frequently since they come across too many new words in the process of English learning, and because of the limited time, it is impossible for them to discover the meaning of each word, so they have to guess its meaning. Moreover, on account of some years’ experiences of English study, they have formed the habit of guessing and acquired some effective methods of guessing, which are easily found in some reference books

accessible to them. If they do not know a word, they may discover its meaning by guessing from their structural knowledge of the language, from a first language cognate, from context, or from other resources.

The “grouping” strategies are helpful in committing a new word into memory by connecting the new words with the old one(s) to build up a personal word web. However, in this study, the mean scores of “grouping” strategies are rather low among all the ten strategies for the both groups ($M1=2.31$, $M2=2.64$). Among the three items, no item has the value of mean higher than 3.

In addition, there are eight cognitive strategies whose mean scores above 3.00 for high school learners, while there are only six for college learners. It consists with O'Malley and Chamot' research (2001) that beginning level students were able to identify more strategies than intermediate level students. Students with beginning level proficiency in English identified almost twice as many cognitive strategies as students with intermediate level proficiency.

4.3.4 Results and Analyses on Social/Affective Strategies

According to the table 3.1, there exists no difference in vocabulary learning strategies at social/affective level between the two groups. In general, “affective control” ranks much higher than “cooperation” for both the two groups ($M1=2.80$, $M2=3.00$).¹ The high value affective control demonstrates that learners are generally more positive with regard to developing self-confidence, self-encouragement, and reducing anxiety when encountering difficulties or failures in English vocabulary learning process. “cooperation activities” rank rather low ($M1=2.40$, $M2=1.76$), which indicates that learners seldom communicating with others to practice new words. Through the interview, we have found the reasons: for one thing, these learners are from one-child families in China and most of them have developed a self-centered personality. They do not have much interest in cooperating with others and they consider that ask others help in the study will lose face, especially for college learners who think they are adults now and want to keep dignity. For another, they think memorizing vocabulary is their own business or learning is an activity best performed individually and it is foolish to ask teachers or others about learning vocabulary. Instead, they resort dictionaries if they need any help.

CONCLUSION

This study is designed to explore the vocabulary learning beliefs and strategies by high school students and college students, the overall pattern of vocabulary learning beliefs

¹ Note. $M1$ = mean score of high school learners, $M2$ =mean score of college learner.

and strategies of each group as well as the similarities and differences between the two different proficiency levels in vocabulary learning beliefs and strategies. Based on the questionnaire and interview, we found out that learners at both two levels have the negative attitudes towards rote-learning belief. In addition, they show a general tendency towards employing a large variety of learning strategies including some of metacognitive strategies especially “selective attention”, some of the cognitive strategies are widely adopted such as “guessing”, “context” and “dictionary” while some are the least favored such as “passage-reciting” and “grouping”. With regard to “social/affective” strategies, they prefer to use “affective control” especially “self-motivation to “cooperation”. In general, the two groups of learners are rather mature learners in terms of using “selective attention”, “guessing”, “context” and “dictionary” strategies. In addition, they are rather passive in using “passage-reciting”, “grouping” and “cooperation” strategies.

Furthermore, college learners have a good command of using of metacognitive strategies. They use Organizational Planning Strategy more frequently than high school learners and they are more mature in regulating their learning process. Moreover, contrary to their negative view towards the rote-learning belief, high school learners are in favor of using rote-learning strategy in practice but college learners tend to use association strategies. In addition, wide-reading are widely adopted by college learners while high school learners are much preferred to use doing exercises strategies.

Obviously, applying some learning strategies will be helpful for learners to enhance their confidence and the desire to use more learning strategies in English vocabulary learning. Therefore, teachers need to help learner to build positive motivation, encourage them to systematize their own learning strategies instead of using these strategies unconsciously or systematically, integrate more strategy training into English classes and take responsibility to help them realize the nature of vocabulary as well. Namely, teachers should teach students how, when, and why strategies can be used to facilitate their efforts at learning, help the learners to develop their own individualized approach to learning tasks and encourage them to employ independent learning strategies.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, M. O. (1989). Vocabulary learning strategies. In P. Meara (Ed.), *British studies in applied linguistics: Beyond words* (Vol.4, pp.3-14). London: British Association of Applied Linguistics Center for Language Teaching
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles*. Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brumfit, C. J., & Roberts, J. T. (1983). *A short introduction to language and language teaching*. London: Batsford

- Academic and Educational Ltd.
- Carter, R. (1998). *Vocabulary: Applied linguistic perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Chamot, A. U. (1987). The Learning Strategies of ESL Students. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp.71-83). Engles Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University
- Gu, Y. Q., & Johnson, R. K. (1996). Vocabulary learning strategies and language learning outcomes. *Language learning, 46*, 643-679.
- Krashen, S. (1989). We Acquire Vocabulary and Spelling by Reading: Additional Evidence for the Input Hypothesis, 1989, *Modern language Journal* 73:440—464.
- McCarthy, M. (1990). *Vocabulary*. Oxford University Press
- Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., & A. Todesco, A. (1975). The good language learner. *TESL Talk, 6*(1), 58-75
- Nation, I. S. P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury house
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (2001). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzares, G., Kupper, L., & Russo, R. P. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. *Language Learning, 35*(1), 21-46
- O'Malley, J., & Chamot, A. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Oxford, R, L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House
- Politzer, R. L., & McGroarty, M. (1985). An exploratory study of learning behaviours and their relationship to gains in linguistic and communicative competence. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*, 103-123.
- Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner Strategies: theoretical assumption, research history and typology*. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning*. New York: Prentice Hall
- Wen, Q. F., & Johnson, R. (1997). L2 Learner variables and English achievement: A study of tertiary-level English majors in China. *Applied Linguistics, 18*, 27-48.