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Abstract: Learning a foreign/second language is a dynamic and complicated process that benefits from learners taking strategic steps to facilitate their own learning. Accordingly, the current study investigates the differences between Iranian high and low English vocabulary learners in terms of vocabulary learning strategies. Two hundred and eighteen university students in Iran took the vocabulary level test and filled out a vocabulary learning strategies survey. In fact, it was an attempt to examine if high/low learners differ significantly in using vocabulary learning strategies. To this end, 218 EFL, 111 high, and 107 low English vocabulary learners were selected to answer Schmitt’s Vocabulary Learning Strategies Questionnaire (VLSQ). The findings showed significant differences between high and low English vocabulary learners’ usage of determination, memory, cognitive, and metacognitive strategies. However, there was no significant difference in their use of social strategies.
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PUBLIC INTEREST STATEMENT

Vocabulary learning strategies are specific thoughts or behaviors that learners apply to help them understand, learn, or maintain new information. Examining the vocabulary learning strategies use of English language learners reflects the individual differences in vocabulary learning among students, and encourage EFL teachers and curriculum developers to design materials and activities that would help the learners improve their vocabulary learning. The present study examines a sample of 218 high/low EFL learners of English language at an Iranian university. The results revealed significant differences between high and low English vocabulary learners’ usage of determination, memory, cognitive, and metacognitive strategies. However, there was no significant difference in their use of social strategies.
1. Introduction
Vocabulary is considered essential to successful second/foreign language learning (Schmitt, 2000). Offering a valuable foundation for both language learning at later stages and real-life communication, vocabulary knowledge assists learners to communicate effectively and perform successfully in all related skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The more vocabulary, therefore, a learner understands the more skillful expressions he/she can make. Language professionals, moreover, diagnose the close association of vocabulary knowledge and reading abilities (Gardner, 2013; Nation, 2013). Second and foreign language learners are the first to acknowledge the importance of vocabulary. However, regarding the learning of vocabulary, the situation in each context is different. Drawing upon the fact that in the context of foreign language learning the opportunities are restricted in terms of target-language input, output, and interaction, what seems necessary for vocabulary learning is the employment of motivational and effective learning strategies (Tseng & Schmitt, 2008). Regarding both foreign and second contexts of language learning, it was revealed that the lack of vocabulary knowledge can be an important reason for making learners reluctant to be exposed to the skills of reading and listening. In addition, a wide range of notable features are usually subsumed under the category of the challenge of vocabulary learning (and teaching) such as word frequency, saliency, learning burden, and learners’ particular vocabulary needs and wants (Grabe & Stoller, 2018).

It has been acknowledged that the successful learners are those who develop techniques and disciplines for learning vocabulary (McCarthy, 1988). In the light of providing opportunities for learners to be firstly exposed to the new words and their meanings and to be secondly placed in conditions under which they try to retrieve, recall, and use the target vocabulary items across different settings and contexts, the process of vocabulary development will occur (Cook, 2013). However, it should be noted that vocabulary development has a multi-faceted nature which includes the knowledge of not only word meanings but also pronunciation, spelling, grammatical properties, connotations, morphological options, as well as semantic associates of the words. Being scaffolded and assisted, English learners can develop vocabulary successfully (Kayi-Aydar, 2018). In the other words, what learners need during the process of vocabulary development is to be directed and guided by their teachers to manage study time in order to optimize the learning both inside and outside of the classroom (Rogers, 2018).

Language learning strategies (LLS) have been of interest to researchers since 1970s when researchers tried to track the types of learning strategies used by successful second language (L2) learners (e.g., Rubin, 1975). In the history of LLS studies, a flourishing shift, between the 1980s and 1990s, occurred toward the categorization of them (e.g., Chamot et al., 1999; Cohen, 1998; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990, 1996; Wenden, 1991; Wenden & Rubin, 1987). O’Malley and Chamot (1990), for instance, proposed three types of strategies including cognitive, metacognitive, and social/affective strategies. At about the same time, Oxford (1990) introduced the classical taxonomy that classifies LLS into six categories of cognitive, metacognitive, mnemonic, compensatory, affective, and social strategies.

In addition to documenting and classifying LLS being employed by language learners, another important line of LLS research is concerned with the relationship of LLS to L2 performance. Providing support, some studies revealed that implementing an effective strategy is well anchored in listening comprehension (Carrier, 2003; McGruddy, 1999; Rost & Rost, 1991; Vandergrift, 2003), reading comprehension (Ikeda & Takeuchi, 2003), writing (Macaro, 2001), and oral production (Cohen et al., 1998; Macaro, 2001; Nakatani, 2005). There has also been an upsurge of interest in how learners employ vocabulary learning strategies (e.g., Cohen & Aphek, 1981; Hulstijn, 1997; O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Schmitt, 1997). Drawing on the review of literature, it has been found that the most frequently used vocabulary learning strategies by learners are using a bilingual dictionary, verbal and written repetition, studying the spelling, guessing from context, and asking classmates for meaning (Schmitt, 1997). Moreover, it was revealed that learners use more types of strategies for learning vocabulary than for reading, listening, speaking, and writing (Chamat, 1987). Consequently, the present study is designed to address the following research questions:
(1) Is there any significant difference between high and low Iranian English vocabulary learners in terms of vocabulary learning strategies?

(2) Is there any significant difference between high and low Iranian English vocabulary learners considering the most and the least vocabulary learning strategies?

By addressing these questions in this study, we hope to contribute to a fuller understanding of English vocabulary learning strategies.

2. Review of literature

There is a consensus among scholars on the definition of learning strategies which is “the process by which information is obtained, stored, retrieved, and used” (Rubin, 1987, p. 29). For the vocabulary learning, for instance, Brown and Payne (1994, as cited in Hatch & Brown, 1995, p. 373) have identified five phases: (a) finding sources for encountering new words, (b) drawing a clear image of the forms of the new words, either visual or auditory or both, (c) learning the meaning of the words, (d) getting a strong memory connection between the forms and the meanings of the words, and (e) using the words. Accordingly, all strategies for learning L2 vocabulary are, to a certain extent, related to these five stages.

Going through the review of literature, a number of attempts have been made to classify language learning strategies (e.g., Naiman et al., 1978; Rubin, 1981). O’Malley and Chamot (1990), for example, introduced metacognitive, cognitive, and social/affective as the most basic three types of learning strategies (pp. 44–45). Consistent with this insight, Oxford (1990) proposed two broad categories of strategies including direct and indirect. The former includes memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies while the latter subsumed metacognitive, affective, and social strategies (p. 17). Recently, Gu and Johnson (1996) pointed to metacognitive regulation and cognitive strategies as the two main dimensions of vocabulary learning strategies which covers six subcategories of guessing, using a dictionary, note taking, rehearsal, encoding, and activating, all of which were further subcategorized. Compatible to the mainstream of those studies, Schmitt (1997, 2000) suggested two categories of L2 vocabulary learning strategies including discovery and consolidation strategies which the former referred to determination and social strategies whereas the latter included social, memory, cognitive, and metacognitive strategies, with 40 strategies in all.

In an attempt to particularly analyze the findings of general learning research and vocabulary learning studies, three general conclusions have been made by Schmitt (1997) which are respectively as follows: first, the significance of vocabulary learning by most students prompt them to employ more strategies for this aspect of language learning than others; second, the students overuse some mechanical strategies such as memorization, note-taking, and repetition in contrast to deep processing strategies such as guessing, imagery, and the keyword technique; and finally, they use a variety of strategies which is one of the vital characteristics of an effective learner who takes the initiative to manage her/his vocabulary learning. Schmitt also highlighted the importance of drawing students’ attention to the frequency of the target words meanwhile they are being recommended about the vocabulary learning strategies. Following this insight, Nation (1990) and Schmitt (2000) pointed to the appropriate incorporation of high-frequency during the process of vocabulary teaching and learning due to the fact that they mainly demand strategies for review and consolidation, whereas low-frequency words will mostly be met incidentally in reading or listening requiring, therefore, strategies for determining their meanings, such as guessing from context and using word parts (p. 133). However, these assumptions have not been supported by empirical data.

Additionally, the way by which an individual employs the strategy is contingent upon her/his both cognitive approach to learning and her/his attitude toward that task (Kolb, 1984). O’Malley et al. (1985), for instance, found that Asian students are reluctant to use strategies for imagery
and grouping to learn vocabulary, yet they outperformed the experimental groups merely applying rote memorization strategies. To address the categorization of students on the basis of the strategies being employed, Schmitt (1997) surveyed a sample of 600 Japanese students and indicated that using dictionary and repetition strategies is more demanded and implemented by learners who regard them as being most useful strategies for vocabulary learning and consider imagery and semantic grouping strategies as the least useful. There was also some evidence to support that more advanced learners tended to use more complex and meaning-focus strategies than less advanced learners.

In support of the proposition regarding the association between vocabulary learning strategies and learners’ language proficiency and vocabulary knowledge, Gu and Johnson (1996) carried out a study to confirm both the metacognitive strategies of self-initiation and selective attention as significant predictors of English proficiency. Moreover, analyzing the findings on this subject indicated that there is a positive relationship between several types of vocabulary learning strategies and vocabulary breadth knowledge, including contextual guessing, skillful use of dictionaries, note-taking, paying attention to word formation, contextual encoding, and activation of newly learned words. The efforts have been also made to show how employing certain types of vocabulary learning strategies may facilitate vocabulary acquisition. The findings of those studies can be treated as evidence that exerting efforts by learners to practice newly learned vocabulary items outside the classroom make them to be more successful in acquiring vocabulary (Kojic-Sabo & Lightbown, 1999; Moir & Nation, 2002).

On the other hand, some studies’ focus has been drawn on the influential factors making students prefer to use a particular vocabulary learning strategy. Fan (2003), for instance, found that learners used strategies they perceived as useful more frequently than those they perceived as less useful. Regarding learning vocabulary strategies, another mainstream of studies have also examined them in the context of the classroom. Grenfell and Harris (1999) provide insights into the effectiveness of implementing awareness raising activities to familiarize and aware learners to metacognitive strategies directing them to more willing to use new vocabulary mnemonic strategies which were found to be helpful not only for learning vocabulary but also for improving test performance.

Consistent with previous studies and in support to the significance of instruction of vocabulary learning strategies in the classroom, Mizumoto and Takeuchi (2009) found effective teaching of strategies can even alter the learners’ frequent use of mnemonic strategies which were positively related to participants’ language performance. Reviewing the literature, considerable studies have been carried out to provide useful insight into the relationship between vocabulary learning strategies and both vocabulary breadth and vocabulary depth knowledge (Gu & Johnson, 1996; Kojic-Sabo & Lightbown, 1999; Moir & Nation, 2002; Nation, 2001; Qian, 2002; Schmitt, 2008, 2010). Nassaji (2006), for example, sought to indicate the relationship between the depth of vocabulary knowledge and lexical inference strategies (i.e., strategies for inferring the meaning of unknown words). He found that learners with greater depth of vocabulary knowledge were more successful in employing lexical inference strategies as well.

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants
The sample was predominantly female (75.7%) with participants’ ages ranging from 18 to 36 years. The students were in their undergraduate years of study (60%), with the remainder of the sample being in either their MA (32%), or PhD years (8%). There were 148 teaching students, 39 translation students, and 31 Linguistics and literature. They were recruited from departments of foreign languages in Bushehr Islamic Azad University, Bushehr Payame Noor University, Bushehr Khalij Fars University, and Farahangian University of Bushehr. They were invited to complete the questionnaires in the classroom environment or they could give it back within one week. Before
completing the questionnaire and the voc test, students were informed about the study aims, and the general form of the questionnaires, and that their participation was completely voluntary and anonymous. It took respondents approximately 20–25 mins to complete the questionnaire and 25–30 mins to answer the voc questions. All participation was voluntary and participants were willing to share truthfully during the research. They also understood that the results of the data collection were intended only for research purposes.

3.2. Instruments

3.2.1. Oxford placement test (2007)
To ascertain the participants level of English vocabulary, we used the vocabulary part of OPT. The vocabulary part consisted of 25 items with an estimated time of 25 minutes for completion. They were instructed to read the stem and choose the right choice. Scores above the mean were considered as high and below the mean were labelled low English vocabulary learners.

3.2.2. The vocabulary learning strategies questionnaire
The current study used Schmitt’s Vocabulary Learning Strategies Questionnaire (VLSQ) adopted from Bennett (2006). It is a 40-item Likert-scale questionnaire with the reliability coefficient of 0.83 for this study. The learners gave their responses on 5-point Likert scales, with the available answers being never (1), seldom (2), sometimes (3), often (4) and always (5). In fact, the 5-point scale makes it possible to collect more detailed and revealing information. The questionnaire was also piloted using a small group of students with similar characteristics to the participants in the main study. The purpose was to guarantee that the questionnaire covered the strategies related to learning English vocabulary and that the students could understand the questionnaire completely. Although the completion of the questionnaire took approximately 20–25 minutes, the researchers informed the participants that there was no fixed time in completing it.

3.3. Procedure
Data collection started with vocabulary section of Oxford Placement Test (2007). It was administered to assign the participants into two groups of low and high based on their vocabulary knowledge. It took around 25 minutes. In the following week, Schmitt's VLSQ adopted from Bennett (2006) was handed out. They had enough time to answer the questions completely. Some participants answered and returned it on the same day, but others gave it back within 1 week. The researchers were present at the research site to explain the goal and design of the study as well as answering any items in the VLSQ that they might find ambiguous. It was also explained that participation was voluntary and the result would not have any effect on the students' grades in the courses they were taking.

4. Results
Based on the results of OPT test, the participants were divided into two groups of high (above the mean) and low (below the mean) based on their vocabulary score. According to Oxford, (1999), mean score above 3.5 is considered as high strategy user, the mean of 1 to 2.4 was low strategy users and the mean for medium strategy users was between 2.4 and 3.5. The results show that learners with high and low vocabulary knowledge were considered as medium strategy users (Table 1). Moreover, the result of the t-test [t (67.99) = 1.32; p = 0.190] showed there was not

| Table 1. Oxford Placement Test |
|-----------------|------|--------|----------|
| Groups          | N    | Mean   | Std. Deviation |
| High            | 111  | 2.88   | .4018     |
| Low             | 107  | 2.68   | .0485     |
| Total           | 218  |        |           |
a significant difference in using vocabulary language learning strategies among the two groups of EFL learners.

Furthermore, as Table 2 and 3 indicates, low voc learners’ mean score for determination, social, metacognitive, memory, and cognitive strategies are 3.02, 3.03, 2.74, 2.90, and 2.24, respectively. This is while high voc learners’ mean score for cognitive, metacognitive, social, determination, and memory strategies are 4.34, 4.07, 2.80, 2.30, and 1.40, respectively. The results show that high voc learners in the current study were more oriented toward using cognitive and metacognitive strategies than low voc learners, on the other hand, low voc learners seem to be more attracted to use determination and social strategies. The results rejected the first research hypothesis stating that there is no difference between high and low Iranian English vocabulary learners considering the most and the least vocabulary learning strategies.

Moreover, the results of the t-test [t (67.59) = 8.5; p < 0.05] revealed there was a significant difference in using determination strategies by high and low voc learners and the means signaled low voc learners used determination strategies more. For social strategies, the results of the t-test [t (66.7) = 1.29; p = 0.19] indicated there was not any significant difference in using social strategies between high and low voc learners and the means indicated low voc learners used social strategies more. The results of the t-test [t (68) = 6.91; p < 0.05] showed there was a significant difference in using memory strategies between high and low voc learners and the means confirmed that low voc learners used it more often. Regarding cognitive strategies, the result of the t-test [t (66.41) = 11.09; p < 0.05] indicated there was a significant difference in using cognitive strategies between high and low voc learners and the means showed that high voc learners used it more. Concerning metacognitive strategies, the result of t-test [t (66.93) = 9.14; p < 0.05] confirmed there was a significant difference in using metacognitive strategies between high and low voc learners and high voc learners used it more. Accordingly, the findings show that cognitive strategies were the most and memory strategies the least frequent strategies used by high voc learners while determination strategies were the most and cognitive strategies were the least frequent strategies used by low voc learners. The results rejected the second research hypothesis stating that there is no difference between high and low Iranian English vocabulary learners in terms of vocabulary learning strategies.
5. Discussion
As mentioned earlier, the current study investigates the differences between high and low Iranian EFL vocabulary learners in terms of vocabulary language learning strategies. By administering a questionnaire and conducting a vocabulary test, quantitative data were gathered. The findings of this study showed that learners with high and low vocabulary knowledge were considered as medium vocabulary strategy users. In addition, low voc learners’ priority for vocabulary learning strategy was in the following order: determination, social, metacognitive, memory, and cognitive strategies. This is while high voc learners’ priority for vocabulary learning strategy was in the following order: cognitive, metacognitive, social, determination, and memory strategies. In other words, high voc learners in the current study were more attracted to use cognitive and metacognitive strategies than low voc learners, on the other hand, low voc learners seem to be more oriented toward using determination and social strategies.

These findings can help teachers choose and design appropriate materials and activities to help and guide learners to improve vocabulary learning strategies. Teachers can apply appropriate methods to introduce cognitive and metacognitive strategies to low voc learners. Metacognition has both direct and indirect benefits to the learning process and is an important component of self-regulated learning. Moreover, in the present study, high voc learners had to some extent an advantage over low voc learners and they used more metacognitive and cognitive strategies which were considered more important and effective ones in learning another language. In line with our study, Craik and Tulvingm, 1975, Ben-Zeev, 1977, and Gu and Johnson 1996 admitted that there are many learners who have used these strategies to reach high levels of proficiency. They preferred to use metacognitive and cognitive strategies more than other strategies. In the same way, Grenfell and Harris (1999) provide insights into the effectiveness of implementing awareness raising activities to familiarize and aware learners to metacognitive strategies directing them to more willing to use new vocabulary mnemonic strategies which were found to be helpful not only for learning vocabulary but also for improving test performance. However, the results of the current study are against Noormohamadi and Amirian (2015) study that indicated there were no significant differences between high and low proficient English students in the case of overall strategy use.

In addition, metacognitive strategy instruction has been argued to be a powerful, if not essential, tool in the teaching and/or development of L2 vocabulary (e.g., Schmitt, 2010). With regard to how metacognition can be utilized in the classroom, it should be emphasized that the aim of metacognitive strategy training is to promote the degree that learners take a more proactive role in the planning, monitoring, and evaluation of their own learning. To this end, there are a number of tools and activities which teachers can use to help achieve this goal, such as the use of vocabulary notebooks, questions for reflection, frequent no-stakes testing, and learning journal (Rogers, 2018).

There are many factors involved in learning a language; what seems prudent is the fact that language teachers should provide and teach the different strategies to the learners as most of them are unaware of these strategies. Many studies have provided proof that strategy instruction has an impact on strategy use and promotes learners’ vocabulary learning. Such findings are one of the reasons why Oxford (2001) stated that the frequency of use of a strategy and its contribution percentage should be determined at the beginning of a class to enable teachers to gain the best outcome from their teaching. She continued that making the students aware of the strategies they use in learning as well as their effectiveness can help them to manage their strategy use and subsequently improve learning.

6. Conclusion
Learning a foreign/second language is a dynamic and complicated process that benefits from learners taking strategic steps to facilitate their own learning. This can be done, among other ways, by seeking out opportunities for developing learners’ language learning strategies. In other words, what learners need during the process of language development is to be directed and guided by their teachers to manage study time in order to maximize the learning both
inside and outside of the classroom (Rogers, 2018). Accordingly, teachers can do much more to design the course textbook in order to facilitate students’ vocabulary development. In fact, to help students develop their vocabulary knowledge, it is important for an instructor to teach them how to use effective strategies so as to learn more efficiently when they build their vocabulary skills. The sort of strategy employed and the manner in which it is used may determine how well a word is learned (Sokmen, 1997). The present study is a small step toward vocabulary learning strategies, in part because of its small sample size, lack of control of extraneous variables, and quantitative nature. But it is hoped that the findings in this study will help future researchers study this issue with more learners in more depth. It should be also admitted that the quantitative data for the present study are only based on the self-report questionnaire. Despite these limitations, it may well be concluded that the findings of this study provide useful information concerning the vocabulary strategy use of Iranian students. More important, the study has identified strategies that may be relevant to success in learning L2 vocabulary by proficient vocabulary learners and encourage nonproficient ones to develop their own effective strategies for learning. The findings of the current study can help teachers choose and design appropriate materials and activities to assist language learners to improve their vocabulary learning strategies. Making the students aware of the strategies they use in learning as well as their effectiveness can help them manage their strategy use and subsequently improve learning.
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