Cross-Cultural Differences in Language Learning Strategies: A Comparative Study of Thai and Japanese University Students

Nisakorn Prakongchati
Kamphaeng Phet Rajabhat University
Shirley M. Ando
Otemae University

Abstract

Studies in language education have paid attention to the effect of individual and cultural features of language learners' learning strategy use. The present study aims to compare the language learning strategy choice of students from two different cultures: Thai and Japanese university students studying English as a foreign language in their native countries. To have an insightful picture and understanding, the use of a multi-data collection method was employed to gather both quantitative and qualitative data through the questionnaire of Oxford (1990) and semi-structured interviews designed by the researchers. The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) Version 7.0 for EFL/ESL (50 items) was designed for non-native English speaking students who use English as a second or foreign language. It comprised 50 questions divided into six parts: memory, cognitive, compensation, meta-cognitive, affective, and social strategies. Students answered each item statement using a five-point Likert-scale ranged from 1 (never or almost never use) through 5 (always or almost always use). Interview question items were written based on the purpose of the study and related to the questionnaire items, textbooks, and journals. The interview question form consisted of two main sections: background information and open-ended questions regarding language learning strategy use together with information of factors affecting individual language learning. To investigate the differences in language learning strategy choice and learners' individual factors, learning strategy use as reported by 20 Thai and 4 Japanese university students was compared. The quantitative results will be reported and further discussed using support from qualitative data. The implications for learning and teaching are insightfully discussed in this paper.

Keywords: Cross-cultural differences, language learning strategies, Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

ความแตกต่างข้ามวัฒนธรรมในกลวิธีการเรียนรู้ภาษา : การศึกษาเปรียบเทียบระหว่างนักศึกษาไทยและนักศึกษาญี่ปุ่นในระดับมหาวิทยาลัย

นิศากร ประคองชาติ
มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏกำแพงเพชร
เชอร์รี่ เอ็ม แอนโด
มหาวิทยาลัยโอเตมาเอะ

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยเกี่ยวกับการศึกษาด้านภาษาได้ให้ความสนใจในการศึกษาผลกระทบของลักษณะบุคคลและวัฒนธรรมในการใช้กลวิธีการเรียนรู้ของผู้เรียนภาษา งานวิจัยนี้มีจุดประสงค์เพื่อเปรียบเทียบการเลือกใช้กลวิธีการเรียนรู้ภาษาของนักศึกษาจากสองวัฒนธรรม คือนักศึกษาไทยและนักศึกษาญี่ปุ่นซึ่งเรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศในประเทศของตนเอง เก็บรวบรวมข้อมูลทั้งข้อมูลเชิงปริมาณและเชิงคุณภาพโดยการใช้แบบสอบถามของ Oxford (1990) และการสัมภาษณ์แบบกึ่งโครงสร้างที่ออกแบบโดยผู้วิจัยเพื่อให้ได้ภาพที่ชัดเจนและความเข้าใจเกี่ยวกับการใช้กลวิธีในการเรียนรู้ภาษาของนักศึกษาทั้งสองประเทศ แบบสอบถามของ Oxford คือ The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) Version 7.0 for EFL/ESL จำนวน 50 ข้อ ที่ได้รับการออกแบบเพื่อเก็บรวบรวมข้อมูลจากผู้เรียนภาษาที่ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาที่สองหรือภาษาต่างประเทศ แบบสอบถามนี้แบ่งเป็น 6 ส่วน ได้แก่ กลวิธีการจดจำ กลวิธีพุทธปัญญา กลวิธีการเสริมและการทดแทน กลวิธีอภิปัญญา กลวิธีด้านจิตใจ และกลวิธีด้านสังคม นักศึกษาระบุระดับการใช้กลวิธีการเรียนรู้ภาษา ซึ่งใช้มาตรวัดของลิเคิร์ท 5 ระดับ โดยเริ่มจากระดับ 1 หมายถึง ไม่เคยหรือแทบจะไม่เคยใช้ ถึงระดับ 5 คือใช้สม่ำเสมอหรือเกือบสม่ำเสมอ คำถามสัมภาษณ์สร้างขึ้นตามวัตถุประสงค์ของงานวิจัย และมีความสอดคล้องกับแบบสอบถาม หนังสือเรียนที่นักศึกษาใช้ และการจดบันทึกการเรียนรู้ของนักศึกษา คำถามสัมภาษณ์ประกอบด้วยสองส่วนคือ คำถามเกี่ยวกับข้อมูลส่วนตัว และคำถามปลายเปิดเกี่ยวกับกลวิธีการเรียนรู้ภาษาและข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับปัจจัยที่ส่งผลถึงการเรียนรู้ภาษาของแต่ละบุคคล เพื่อศึกษาความแตกต่างในการเลือกใช้กลวิธีการเรียนรู้ภาษา งานวิจัยนี้ได้เปรียบเทียบการใช้กลวิธีการเรียนรู้ภาษาของนักศึกษาไทยจำนวน 20 คน และนักศึกษาญี่ปุ่นจำนวน 4 คน และบทความวิจัยนี้ได้รายงานผลการศึกษาจากข้อมูลเชิงปริมาณ และเสริมด้วยการอภิปรายด้วยข้อมูลเชิงคุณภาพเพื่อสนับสนุนผลวิจัยจากข้อมูลเชิงปริมาณ รวมทั้งอภิปรายข้อเสนอแนะในการนำผลวิจัยไปใช้ในการเรียนการสอนภาษาอังกฤษต่อไป

คำสำคัญ : ความแตกต่างข้ามวัฒนธรรม กลวิธีการเรียนรู้ภาษา แบบสอบถามกลวิธีการเรียนรู้ภาษา (SILL)

Introduction

Previous studies in the areas of language education have paid attention to the effect of individual and cultural features of foreign language learners' learning strategy use. Such an issue necessarily needs to be addressed because, as Stern (1983) contended, language learners' uses of language learning strategies (LLSs) are largely manipulated by different factors, including learners' individual characteristics, social contexts, and teachers' characteristics. Agreeing with Stern (1983), Cohen (1992) called for more studies dealing with the relationship between language learners' uses of LLSs and individual learner-related variables. Consequently, numerous research studies have tried to identify LLSs adopted by successful language learners together with learners' related variables such as motivation, gender, levels of proficiency, different cultures and contexts that may associate with differences in LLS use among EFL learners. Their results have shown that LLS use is related to both individual differences (Altan, 2003; Bruen, 200; Ehrman, Leaver, & Oxford, 2003) and the contexts in which learners acquire the language (Garcia, 2005; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2017; Parks & Raymond, 2005; Takeuchi, 2003; Wharton, 2000). Since language is socially mediated and context dependent, it would follow that learners' use of language learning strategies could vary with the environment; for example, in Wharton's study (2000), it was found that bilingual Singaporean students preferred to use social strategies in studying a foreign language. In 2003, Takeuchi (2003) used biographies to identify characteristics of good language learners in Japan and found that Japanese EFL learners would create opportunities to practice English, apply specific strategies for different tasks, and use different kinds of memory and cognitive strategies to help with their internalization and practical use of the language. More recently, LLS uses of monolingual Korean and bilingual Korean-Chinese university students were investigated and compared by Hong-Nam and Leavell (2017). They reported that learners' use of language learning strategies varies with the environment. Monolinguals and bilinguals employed preferred LLSs to learn English variously.

In terms of cultural background differences in relation to strategy use, in the contexts of Thailand and Japan, the results of some studies showed

that learners of different ethnicity demonstrated preferred use of LLSs (e.g. Takeuchi, 2003; Lengkanawati, 2004). From these studies, culture is, nevertheless, too broad a term with too many factors involved; therefore, caution should be taken when any generalization is to be drawn in terms of ethnically preferred LLSs. The current study thus aims at examining LLSs commonly employed by language learners in EFL contexts like Japan and Thailand. Through the identification of EFL learners' LLSs, and how they have applied these strategies in the process of English learning, some understandings, useful suggestions, and tips may be drawn in helping other EFL learners improve their strategy use and consequently advance their English language proficiency. That would invariably provide insights to facilitate pedagogical implications for instruction and curriculum development to some extent.

Research Methodology

The purposes of the study were to examine LLSs commonly employed by Japanese and Thai students and to clarify how the variables (nationality and levels of English language proficiency) relate to their use of LLSs. Based on the research purposes, this study is directed at testing the following null hypotheses:

> H0 1: There is no significant difference in the use of LLSs between Thai and Japanese students.

> H0 2: There is no significant relationship between the use of overall LLSs and the variables (nationality and levels of language proficiency).

Participants

There were two groups of participants in this study: Japanese university students and Thai university students. They were all undergraduate students. In the first group, four students volunteered among 25 Japanese students of a private university located in the southern-central region of Japan's main island. In the second group, 20 Thai students out of 24 students were volunteer participants whose university is located in the lower northern

part of Thailand. Both groups of participants were students majoring various disciplines (e.g. Graphic Design, Mass Media, Social Sciences, Humanities, Sciences). They ranged in age from 20 to 22. At the time of the study, it was in Semester 1/2017. Both Japanese and Thai students were similarly required to enroll and complete the English Foundation Programs in their universities. It is important to note that the number of the participants was small as the researchers recruited the participants based upon a voluntary basis, with research ethics in mind. Although only a few students participated in this study, it could be said that the data collected were valid as they were derived from those who agreed to take part in this research, thus providing true information about their strategy use.

For one purpose of the study, TOEIC scores were used and classified students' levels of English language proficiency under three levels: advanced (above 655), intermediate (405-650), and elementary (10-400) according to TOEIC scores (Rogers, 2003:5).

Data collection

To have an insightful picture and understanding, the use of a multi-data collection method was employed to gather both quantitative and qualitative data through the questionnaire of Oxford (1990) and semi-structured interviews designed by the researchers. The data were collected as follows.

1. The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) Version 7.0 for EFL/ESL (50 items) was designed for non-native English speaking students who use English as a second or foreign language. LLSs were classified into direct strategies and indirect strategies. For direct strategies, the three categories were: 1) memory strategies, 2) cognitive strategies, and 3) compensation strategies. As for indirect strategies, they included: 1) metacognitive strategies, 2) affective strategies, and 3) social strategies. The questionnaire comprised 50 questions divided into six parts: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. Students answered each item statement using a five-point Likert-scale ranged from 1 (never or almost never use) through 5 (always or almost always use). For reliability and validity of

SILL, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was computed to determine an internal consistency reliability of the SILL (50 items) for each group. The reliability for Japanese students was .82 on 10 cases, and for Thai students, it was .85 on 30 cases.

The responses were categorized based on the following reporting scale designed by Oxford (1990) to inform students which groups of strategies they used the most in learning English:

1) **High Usage**
   Always Used with a mean of 4.5-5.0 or
   Usually Used with a mean of 3.5-4.4;

2) **Medium Usage**
   Sometimes Used with a mean of 2.5-3.4); and

3) **Low Usage**
   Generally Not Used with a mean of 1.5-2.4 or
   Never Used with a mean of 1.0-1.40.

2. In order to assist with interpretation of the results, interview question items were written based on the purpose of the study and related to the questionnaire items, textbooks, and journals. The interview question form consisted of two main sections: background information and open-ended questions regarding language learning strategy used together with information of factors affecting individual language learning. The validity of the interview questions in this structure were also checked by experts, then piloted. With comments from those participating in pilot interviews and with a discussion with the experts, the interview questions were then re-worded and re-arranged before their actual use.

Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) for Microsoft Windows 11.5 was used to analyze the quantitative data:

1. To examine the use of LLSs, descriptive statistics including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations

2. To evaluate the differences in the use of LLSs between Thai and Japanese students, t-test was used
3. To investigate the effect of LLSs on students' nationality and levels of language proficiency, chi-square was employed

Regarding the interview data analysis, the researchers went through this with an assistance of experts who had experiences in this type of qualitative data analysis. As Robson (2002) states, in qualitative data analysis, the experienced people like professional lecturers in the same field can help the researcher analyze this type of qualitative data. To increase the reliability and validity of the interview transcripts, three strategies were used: 1) comparing researcher's handwritten notes with tape transcripts; 2) repeatedly listening and transcribing the tape records; and 3) equating the literal meanings of transcripts through careful back-translations with the co-researcher who is now teaching English in Japan in order to check the researcher's translated data by doing Japanese-English translations.

Results

The results displayed are for hypothesis testing. The study fails to reject two null hypotheses. As illustrated in the following tables, there is no difference in the overall strategy and strategy class between Japanese and Thai students, and there is no significant relationship between the use of overall LLSs and the two variables (nationality and levels of language proficiency).

Table 1: Differences in the overall strategy and strategy class

Strategy Class	Japanese		Thai		t-test	df	P-Value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD			
Direct	3.38	.42	3.14	.35	1.23	22	.232
Indirect	3.47	.52	3.12	.43	1.46	22	.16
Overall strategy	3.43	.38	3.13	.34	1.59	22	.127

Table 1 shows that there is no significant difference in the use of overall LLSs between Japanese and Thai students. The findings indicate that Japanese students used overall LLSs more frequently than Thai students.

Table 2: Differences in the language learning strategy (LLS) group use

Strategy Class	Japanese		Thai		t-test	df	P-Value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD			
Memory	3.28	.35	3.02	.33	1.40	22	.176
Cognitive	3.54	.63	3.11	.48	1.55	22	.136
Compensation	3.33	.41	3.29	.54	.144	22	.886
Meta-cognitive	3.67	.86	3.24	.39	1.605	22	.123
Affective	3.08	.75	3.08	.67	.000	22	1.000
Social	3.67	1.06	3.03	.62	1.686	22	.106

The information in Table 2 illustrates the differences in the LLS group between Japanese and Thai students. There is no significant difference. The findings indicate that Japanese students used most of LLS groups more frequently than Thai students.

Table 3: Rank order of strategy group use

Frequency	Rank	Strategy Group		$\bar{x}$	SD
		Direct	Indirect		
Medium Use	1		Metacognitive	3.31	.50
	2	Compensation		3.30	.52
	3	Cognitive		3.18	.52
	4		Social	3.13	.72
	5		Affective	3.08	.67
	6	Memory		3.06	.34

Table 3 shows the most frequent used strategies by Japanese and Thai students. All six specific strategies, of which the mean values are between 2.5 and 3.4, fall into the medium-use range. The data indicate that direct strategies were used as frequently as indirect ones.

Table 4: Rank order of the most frequency of specific use

Rank	Strategy Group		Specific Strategy	$\bar{x}$	SD
	Direct	Indirect			
1		Social	45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other persons to slow down or say it again.	4	1.06
2	Cognitive		12. I practice the sounds of English.	3.83	.70
3		Affective	40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	3.83	1.01
4	Compensation		29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	3.79	.83
5		Metacognitive	33. I try to find out ho w to be a better learner of English.	3.79	.72
6	Compensation		24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	3.75	.85
7	Compensation		25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	3.71	.86
8	Cognitive		18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	3.67	.82
9		Metacognitive	32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	3.67	.96
10		Affective	39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	3.63	.86
11		Metacognitive	30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	3.54	.72
12		Metacognitive	31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	3.54	.59
13	Cognitive		11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	3.5	1.02

Table 4 shows the most frequent used strategies by Japanese and Thai students. Among all fifty strategies in six LLS groups, thirteen specific strategies, of which the mean values are 3.5-4.4, fall into the often-use range. There are three cognitive, three compensation strategies in direct strategy group and four metacognitive, two affective, and one social strategy in indirect strategy group.

Table 5: Rank order of the least frequency of specific use

Rank	Strategy Group		Specific Strategy	$\bar{x}$	SD
	Direct	Indirect			
50		Metacognitive	34. I plan my schedule, so I will have enough time to study English.	2.38	.82

The results from Table 5 indicate the least frequently used strategies, of which the mean values are between 1.0-2.4, fall into the low strategy use level. Only one strategy in the metacognitive strategy group is used with the least frequency. It is item 34, "I plan my schedule, so I will have enough time to study English." ($\bar{x}$ = 2.38, SD = .82)

Relationship between students' use of LLSs and two variables

Chi-square tests were performed to determine the relationships between the students' use of LLSs and two variables: nationality (Japanese and Thai) and levels of English language proficiency (advanced, intermediate, and elementary). In illustrating the results of data analysis, the students' use of overall LLSs was examined to ascertain whether these variables had the effect on the use of LLSs by Japanese and Thai university students.

Table 6: Relationship between the overall LLS use and nationality

Nationality	N	Overall LLS use			x^2	P Value
		High	Medium	Low		
Japanese	4	2 (8.33%)	2 (8.33%)		1.600	.206
Thai	20	4 (16.67%)	15 (62.5%)	1 (4.17%)		

Table 7: Relationship between the overall LLS use and levels of English proficiency

Level of English Proficiency	N	Overall LLS use			χ^2	P Value
		High	Medium	Low		
Elementary	16	3 (12.5%)	12 (50%)	1 (4.17%)	3.381	.1.84
Intermediate	7	2 (8.33%)	5 (20.83%)			
Advanced	1	1 (4.17%)				

From Table 6 and Table 7, the results show that there is no significant relationship between the overall LLS use and the two independent variables.

Findings and Discussions

The purposes of the study were to examine LLSs commonly employed by Japanese and Thai students and to clarify how the variables (nationality and levels of English language proficiency) relate to their use of LLSs. The findings and discussions are summarized as follows:

1. Japanese students used overall LLSs more frequently than Thai students. In terms of strategy group, the results reveal that Japanese students employed cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies at a high level, while memory, compensation, and affective strategies were at a medium level. LLSs used by Thai university students were compensation and metacognitive language learning strategies that were employed more frequently than other strategies. The results support previous studies in Japan and Thailand (e.g. Grainger,1997; Tirabulkul, 2005; Sootsuwan, 2005; Sumamarnkul, 2006; Pawapatcharaudom, 2007).

2. The most frequently used specific strategies by Japanese and Thai students involved asking for clarification, self-practice, and self-encouragement. These findings were in line with the findings of Tirabulkul (2005), Sootsuwan (2005), and Yutaka (1996). It could be explained that this strategy was highly used by non-native speakers of English (Japanese and Thai students) to support and continue their English language learning both inside and outside the classrooms.

From the main findings above, the study displayed that the learners' levels of English language proficiency and nationalities do seem not to influence the frequency of strategy use of Thai and Japanese learners. The data from students' strategy interviews of the study provided a much more detailed and comprehensive picture of what was being explored by the strategy questionnaire. Based on the interview results of the study, LLS uses of Japanese and Thai students could be attributed to some influential factors. First, it dealt with learner-related factors influencing the success at learning English. Japanese and Thai students reported their individual learner differences. For example, Japanese students seemed to be more self-regulated and active. Most of them said that they pushed themselves hard to improve their English competence both inside and outside the classroom, while Thai students relied on classroom-based learning, such as teachers' instructions, textbooks, and classroom activities. Moreover, more than half of Thai student participants mentioned that their success in learning English was mainly from following teachers' lectures intentionally in class, and most thought that learning English in class was enough for them. However, both Japanese and Thai students shared common characteristics as social (interpersonal) learners. They reported that teachers and classmates helped enhance their learning motivation significantly. They liked interactions with their teachers and classmates in the classes. For example, interactive classroom activities such as group work and prepared presentations were their preferred classroom activities. In addition, both groups reflected their positive thoughts regarding being corrected and interrupted right away when they make errors, provided that the correction was offered with politeness and sensitivity. Interestingly, they both reported that they would continue to practise their English further independently after graduation.

Pedagogical Implications

Based upon the results of this study, the following practical implications are offered.

Firstly, learners of English as a foreign language should learn to recognize the strategies they are using and be advised to select more

appropriate techniques for the instructional environment. Advanced language learners may serve as informants for other students who are experiencing less success in language learning regarding strategies, techniques, and study skills. Through monitoring each other, students can take an active part in not only learning but also teaching.

Secondly, teachers should become more aware of the learner strategies that their students are (and are not) using so that teachers can develop their teaching styles and strategies to serve their students' ways of learning.

Thirdly, language curricula, materials and instructional approaches should incorporate diversified activities to accommodate the various characteristics of the individual learners found in the foreign language classroom. Moreover, the use of appropriate learning strategies can enable students to take responsibility for their own learning by enhancing learner autonomy, independence, and self-direction (Dickinson, 1987). These factors are important because learners need to keep on learning when they are no longer in a formal classroom setting (Oxford, Crookall, & Lavine, 1989).

Limitations of the Study

In this study, there are certain limitations as follows.

Firstly, the main problem that the researchers faced in carrying out the study was the short period of time (one month) for data collection in Japan, so it would be more reliable and have more Japanese participants if it was done during a longer period of time.

Secondly, it would be more useful if more students are recruited from other universities in Japan and Thailand or other contexts, then compared their choices of LLSs.

Finally, a variety of data collection methods: surveys, classroom observations, diaries, think-aloud data or other means should be conducted to find out more in-depth data of language learning strategy use, so as to increase the reliability of the research and validity of the data. For example, LLS use and levels of English language proficiency can change over time;

therefore, longitudinal case studies should be continuously carried out to determine the reasons for their choices of LLS use.

Acknowledgements

References

Altan, M.A. (2003). Language learning strategies and foreign language achievement. **Education and Science**, 28, 25-31.

Bruen, J. (2001). Strategies for successes: Profiling the effective learner of German. **Foreign Language Annals,** 34(3), 216-225.

Dickinson, L. (1987). **Self-Instruction in language learning**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garcia, E. E. (2005). **Teaching and learning in two languages: Bilingualism and schooling in the United States**. New York: Teachers College Press.

Grainger, P. R. (1997). Language-learning strategies for learners of Japanese: investigating ethnicity. **Foreign Language Annals**, 30(3), 378-385.

Hong-Nam, K. & Leavell, A. G. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. **System,** 34, 99-415.

Lengkanawati, N. S. (2004). How learners from different cultural background learn a foreign language. **Asian EFL Journal**, 6(1). Retrieved from http://asian-efl-journal.com

Oxford, R. L. (1990). **Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.** New York: Newbury House Publications.

Oxford, R. L., Crookall, D., & Lavine, R. (1989). Language learning strategies, the communicative approach, and their class implications. **Foreign Language Annals**, 22(1): 29-39.

Parks, S., & Raymond, P. (2004). Strategy use by nonnative English-speaking students in an MBA program: Not business as usual! **Modern Language Journal**, 88(3), 374-389.

Pawapatcharaudom, R. (2007). **An investigation of Thai students' English language problems and their learning strategies in the international program at Mahidol University.** Master's thesis. Mongkut's Institute of Technology North Bangkok.

Rogers, B. 2003. **Complete Guide to the TOEIC® Test 2nd ed.** Singapore: Thomson Asia Pte Ltd.

Sootsuwan, W. (2005). **Learning strategies: A case study of third year students from Mahidol University International College and King Mongkut's Institute of Technology North Bangkok Majoring in Scientific Field**. Master's thesis, Department of Languages, Graduate College, King Mongkut's Institute of Technology North Bangkok.

Stern, H. H. (1983). **Foundation concepts of language teaching**. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Sumamarnkul, W. (2006). **A survey study on L2 learning strategies of science and technology students at Thammasat University**. Unpublished master's thesis, Language Institute, Thammasat University.

Takeuchi O. (2003). What can we learn from good language learners? A qualitative study in the Japanese foreign language context. **System**, 31, 385-392.

Tirabulkul, N. (2005). **A study of language learning strategies of students in the MA Program for the TEFL Program, Thammasat University**. Unpublished master's thesis, Language Institute, Thammasat University.

Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. **Language Learning**, 50(2): 203-243.

Yutaka, T. (1996). **Japanese learners' language learning strategies: The relationship between learners' personal factors and their choices of language learning strategies.** Retrieved from: http://www.eric.ed.gov/sitemap/html_0900000b8012c6b2.htm

Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1986). Development of a structured interview for assessing student use of self-regulated Learning Strategies. **American Educational Research Journal**, 23(4), 614-628.

Appendices
Consent Form for Online Survey

You are invited to participate in an online survey on Cross-Cultural Differences in Language Learning Strategies: A Comparative Study. The study focuses on investigating language learning strategy use of Thai and Japanese university students engaged in learning English as a foreign language**.** This is a research project being conducted by Nisakorn Prakongchati, Thai visiting scholar at Otemae University. It should take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Your participation in this survey is voluntary. You may refuse to take part in the research or exit the survey at any time without penalty. You are free to decline to answer any particular questions you do not wish to answer for any reasons.

You will receive no direct benefits from participating in this research study. However, your responses may help us learn more about how Thai and Japanese university students use their language learning strategies in learning English.

Your survey answers will be sent to me directly, and the data will be stored in a password protected electronic format. The data do not collect identifying information such as your name, email address, or IP address. Therefore, your responses will remain anonymous. No one will be able to identify you or your answers, and no one will know whether or not you participated in the study.

At the end of the survey you will be asked if you are interested in participating in an additional interview by email. If you choose to provide contact information such as your phone number or email address, your survey responses may no longer be anonymous to the researcher. However, no names or identifying information would be included in any publications or presentations based on these data, and your responses to this survey will remain confidential.

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact me via email at nprakongchati@yahoo.com.

Please select your choice below. You may print a copy of this consent form for your records. Clicking on the "Agree" button indicates that

* You have read the above information
* You voluntarily agree to participate

☐ Agree
☐ Disagree

THANK YOU!

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) version 7.0 developed by Oxford (1990). In this study, the SILL is used as a research instrument to have subjects identify students' language learning strategies.

There are 50 statements in this questionnaire, please read each statement and choose the response (5, 4, 3, 2, or 1) that tells how true the statement is in terms of what you actually do when you are learning English. The criteria for the response are as follows:

1 = Never true of me or Almost never true of me

2 = Generally not true of me

3 = Somewhat true of me

4 = Generally true of me

5 = Always true of me or Almost always true of me

Please answer in terms of how well the statements describe you. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements.

Part I: General Background Information

1. Gender: [ ] Male   [ ] Female
2. Age: _____
3. Your e-mail address: _____
4. Self-rated English Proficiency: [ ] Beginning   [ ] Intermediate   [ ] Advanced
5. Years of English Study: _____
6. Experiences Taking English Proficiency Test:
   [ ] TOEIC   [ ] TOEFL   [ ] IELTS   [ ] Others (Please specify): _____
   How much scores do you get? _____
7. Experiences Living/Visiting English Speaking Country and Visited Countries:
   [ ] Yes [ ] No

Part II

Language Learning Strategies	Never true of me or Almost never true of me	Generally not true of me	Somewhat true of me	Generally true of me	Always true of me or Almost always true of me
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 screen sign.	1	2	3	4	5
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 spoken in English or to go to movies spoken in English.	1	2	3	4	5

Language Learning Strategies	Never true of me or Almost never true of me	Generally not true of me	Somewhat true of me	Generally true of me	Always true of me or Almost always true of me
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 over the passage 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
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 persons 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
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

Language Learning Strategies	Never true of me or Almost never true of me	Generally not true of me	Somewhat true of me	Generally true of me	Always true of me or Almost always true of me
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 who 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
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 my own feelings in a language learning diary.	1	2	3	4	5
44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when learning English.	1	2	3	4	5
45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other persons to slow down or say it again.	1	2	3	4	5
46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	1	2	3	4	5

Language Learning Strategies	Never true of me or Almost never true of me	Generally not true of me	Somewhat true of me	Generally true of me	Always true of me or Almost always true of me
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 to other students or native speakers of English.	1	2	3	4	5
50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	1	2	3	4	5

Interview Questions

Part I – Background & Previous Knowledge

1) Birthplace
2) Areas of study
3)   Do you consider yourself to be :
   - a. a high language learner
   - b. a moderate language learner
   - c. a low language learner
4) When did you start and how long did you learn English?
5) When you learn English, what did you study? Grammar? Speaking?
6) What kinds of text-books you used e.g. commercial books, or teacher-made handouts if any?
7) Did the teacher speak in English most of the time?
8) Do you remember what kind of homework you had to do?
9) Did you have any contact outside the classroom/your home with English native speakers?
10) Did you listen to the radio or watch films, TV, YouTube, or any media (s) in English?
11) Do you think that your success at learning English is due to the teacher?   Or did it have something to do with the environment? Or would you say that you developed some special study habits? Or do you have some particular personal learning techniques that helped you in learning?

Part II – Language Learning Strategies

1. How often do you study English at university?
2. According to 1., do you think it is enough for you?
3. What have you been doing in your class last semester?
4. Do you do anything to help yourself understand the English lessons better (before/during/after the class)?
5. What do you do to improve your English in general (inside/outside the classroom)?
6. How do you think you get along with your teacher and the other students?
7. How does the atmosphere in the English class compare with that of other classes?
8. Which classroom activities do you most like or dislike? Why?
9. Which classroom activities do you consider to be the most or the least effect and useful? Why?
10. In your opinion, should the teacher speak English only while teaching?
11. Could you please tell me which aspects of learning English are easy or difficult for you? Why?
12. What do you do when you get stuck while responding in English?
13. When you make an error, would you prefer to be interrupted right away or would you rather finish your response?
14. Do you mind being corrected? Why?
15. Do you have any other comments about your language learning experiences?

THANK YOU!

The Authors

Nisakorn Prakongchati, PhD is an Assistant Professor and a faculty member of English Language Program, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Kamphaeng Phet Rajabhat University. Her research interests include language learning strategies, individual learner differences, and classroom-based research. Her email is nprakongchati@yahoo.com.

Shirley M. Ando was an Associate Professor at Otemae University in Hyogo, Japan and the director of the Language Education of Otemae (LEO). Her research interests include culturally familiar material development in English education, learner autonomy, service learning and curriculum development.