The Predictive Relationship between Language Learning Strategy Use and Speaking Proficiency: The Case of Pre-service EFL Teachers' in Ethiopia

Mohammed Hassan Ali
Hawassa University, Ethiopia

Mebratu Mulatu Bachore*
Hawassa University, Ethiopia
*Corresponding author

Felekech G/Egziabiher Abdi
Hawassa University, Ethiopia

Hialu Wubshet Degefu
Hawassa University, Ethiopia

Abstract

This study examined the association between pre-service EFL teachers' language learning strategies use and their speaking proficiency. It was an explanatory correlational study which was conducted on 94 pre-service EFL teachers enrolled in the academic year of 2023 at two teacher education colleges in Ethiopia. A comprehensive sampling method was used to choose the participants. Data was collected using language learning strategies questionnaire and speaking proficiency test. Using SPSS Version 26, different statistical out puts such as mean, standard deviations, Pearson correlation and simple regression out puts were computed to determine the status and relationship between the variables. Consequently, the findings showed that pre-service EFL teachers employed language learning strategies at a moderate level with an overall mean score of 3.09. Likewise, the descriptive output for speaking proficiency is 62.93, indicating a medium degree of proficiency. The correlation analysis indicated that four dimensions of language learning strategies (memory strategies r=414, p<.001), (cognitive strategies r=503, p<.001), (metacognitive strategies r=436, p<.001), and (compensation strategies (r=.555, p<.001) had a moderate positive correlation with the teachers' speaking proficiency. On the other hand, affective strategies (r=.223, p<.005), and social strategies (r=247, p <.005) have a low positive significant correlation with the speaking proficiency. Furthermore, the regression analysis indicated that the R Square was .632, which in turn indicates that 63.2% of the variance in speaking proficiency total scores was explained by the EFL teachers' language strategy use. This shows that EFL teachers speaking skills can be enhanced if the lessons are designed in the light of language learning strategies.

Keywords

Language learning strategy, speaking proficiency, Pre-service EFL teachers, Teacher Education

1. Introduction

1.1 The Concept of Language Learning Strategies

Language learning strategies are derived from the wider concept of learning strategies which are common in the discipline of education, particularly in the classroom teaching and learning context where learners are the center. Regarding their definitions, Ortega (2009) states that learning strategies are deliberate mental and behavioral processes students use to take charge of their education. Likewise, Oxford (2018) further explained that learning strategies are intricate, dynamic activities that learners choose and employ in particular situations to complete tasks and advance their learning. To suit their learning demands, these strategies, which dare influenced by various contextual and personal factors (R. Oxford, 2018), are often integrated and managed differently.

On the other hand, as language learning strategies emerged from learning strategies, it is somehow difficult to set a clear demarcation between the two. However, language learning strategies (LLSs) are conceptualized from the perspective of language teaching and learning. For example, Chamot (2005a) conceptualizes LLSs as deliberate actions

or cognitive abilities that support students' comprehension, acquisition, and retention of new knowledge. Similarly, R. Oxford (2018) described LLS as "approaches or techniques that learners use to enhance their progress in developing second language (L2) skills". They are generally employed in speech or writing to understand, synthesize, store, retrieve, and use information (Chamot, 2005a). Thus, LLS can be described as deliberate actions taken to address specific language learning obstacles. In addition, in recent times, processes that aid in learning tasks have been widely characterized as learning strategies which are typically deliberate and purpose-driven.

1.2 The Studies on Language Learning Strategies and Speaking Proficiency

Scholars have investigated the connection between language learners' usage of learning strategies and their competency in the target language. These studies show that the use of learning strategies by language learners is directly correlated with their competency (Gustanti & Ayu, 2021; Agustin et al., 2021). Through the use of standardized English proficiency assessments, Wharton (2000) found that students at Korean universities select different learning strategies based on their language skills. The findings showed a strong relationship between each of the six strategy categories evaluated by the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and the participants' TOEFL scores.

Similar results have also been discovered by other studies that look into the patterns of language learning strategies use by Asian EFL learners. For instance, Anggarista & Wahyudin (2022) compared Taiwanese students' use of strategies with their English test results on the Technology-Based College admission exam. Anggarista & Wahyudin (2022) found that there was a clear linear relationship between the learners' proficiency and their usage of strategies, favoring more skilled language learners. The reported use of language learning strategies by learners and their ability were shown to be strongly correlated by the researchers. Wharton (2000) looked into the relationship between the usage of strategies and the self-rated language competency of university students. The study discovered a high correlation between the students' self-rated performance and the strategies they employed.

Other studies, however, discovered a negative relationship between L2 proficiency and the use of strategies. For instance, Altunay (2014) used the results of an English placement test and an admission exam to determine the level of English ability among 10 Thai students. The findings indicated that language ability did not significantly correlate with the overall use of strategies and that there was a negative relationship between the use of successful strategies and English competency. In other words, the students with higher English proficiency showed lower scores on strategy use, especially in affective strategy use.

Still, other studies on language learning strategies have shown that using these strategies improves performance or competency when learning a language (Griffiths, 2015; R. Oxford, 2018). A different study came to the same conclusion (Wahyuni, 2022), indicating that more proficient students used a greater variety of language learning methods. According to Habók & Magyar (2018), there is a significant correlation between language proficiency and the application of learning strategies. These findings also demonstrated that more proficient students reported employing learning strategies more frequently than less proficient students. Therefore, language teachers should consider the different learning strategies that their students employ and make an effort to identify these strategies to assist less successful students in succeeding and mastering the target language.

One important aspect that the research point out for language teachers is the necessity of comprehending and identifying the tactics that their students employ. Sensitivity to the unique characteristics of each learner and the capacity to modify education to assist less successful pupils are prerequisites for this work. This method, in my opinion, highlights a basic educational principle: teaching is about giving students the skills and mentality they need to succeed, not merely about imparting facts. Teachers may foster a more inclusive and productive learning environment by proactively encouraging less skilled students to experiment with and use a variety of approaches.

Thus, though scholars have conducted a number of studies to see the relationship between LLSs and language proficiency of students, the results are not only consistent but also seem not conclusive. This calls for the need to conduct a study from a different perspective and context as well.

1.3 Rationale of the Study

English is the primary language of instruction for teaching and learning in higher education institutions. Students often use English for academic purposes such as reading books related to their studies, attending lectures, working on assignments, and giving oral presentations. According to Chapple (2015), as most scientific journals and online resources are in English, the skills of English are essential for students to succeed in university. This means that English language proficiency, which speaking skill is its sub-component, is an important factor in determining learners' performance at universities. Nonetheless, although the Ethiopian education policy prioritizes it, students' competency in the English language is decreasing at all educational levels (Tessera & Kassa, 2024). Thus, students hardly ever practice speaking or other macro- and micro-language skills outside of the classroom. The existence of such problems with language training has been confirmed by several regional investigations. Eshetie (2010), for example, claimed that students in colleges and universities have difficulty in expressing themselves in English.

Particularly in relation to speaking skills, the students could encounter challenges because certain course evaluations require them to present their assignments orally. In particular, a variety of issues have been linked to students' speaking ability. These are the sociocultural, affective, and cognitive traits of the learners and have a substantial correlation with the speaking ability of EFL learners. Language learning strategies (LLSs), according to Habók and

Magyar (2018), have consistently been raised as a particularly relevant variable which should further be investigated. Similarly, R. L. Oxford (1990b) noted LLSs as specific actions that the learner performs to improve the efficacy, speed, enjoyment, self-direction, and transferability of their learning to various contexts. This shows that LLSs are somehow linked with overcoming speaking difficulties. They consist of methods such as practicing with classmates, employing mnemonic devices, and reflecting on oneself to pinpoint areas that want work. This in turn shows that LLs help learners to enhance the ability to transfer language abilities to different situations which can be improve their confidence and decrease their anxiety.

Moreover, study found a significant correlation between the use of language learning strategies (LLS) and the level of language proficiency, indicating that the use of LLSs increase language learning ability (Habók & Magyar, 2018). Similarly, research findings have consistently shown a positive relationship between the use of LLS and English proficiency among EFL students worldwide. For example, Alrashidi (2022a) asserted that the frequency and manner of using strategies are closely related to English language proficiency.

Recent studies (Norazah Khamis et al.; 2024; Wong Foong Yoong & Harwati Hashim, 2023; Haifa Al-Buainain et al.; 2021; Harwati Hashim et al. (2022) into the relationship between language learning strategies (LLSs) and speaking proficiency has made significant progress, but there are several concerns which need further investigation. The first suggested gap, which this study has considered is the underexplored strategy type-affective strategy. The study has explored the extent its use and its relation with the learners' speaking performance. The other gap of the recent studies is related to the context where such type of studies have been conducted. Much of the current literature focuses on EFL learners in Asian countries (e.g., China, Japan, Indonesia). Other regions, such as Sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America, are underrepresented. Thus, the findings of this study are aimed to bridge such gaps as the study was conducted in the context of the Sub-Aaharan Africa, Ethiopia. On top of this, there is no context based empirical data available to ascertain the level of associations between the variables and the predictive potential of LLSs to EFL teachers' speaking performance.

1.4 Research questions
The following are the research questions which were explored in this study:
1. What are the specific language learning strategies that the EFL teachers use more often?
2. To what extent do the sub-dimensions of language learning strategies and speaking proficiency of the EFL teachers correlate?
3. What is the extent of the predictive potential of the language learning strategy use in to determine the EFL teachers' speaking proficiency?

1.5 Hypotheses of the study
Based on the purpose and the research questions of the study, the following hypothesizes have been formulated.
H0: There are no significant relationships between the EFL teachers' language learning strategy use and their speaking proficiency.
H1: There are significant relationships between the EFL teachers' language learning strategy use and their speaking proficiency.

2. Materials and Methods
2.1 Research Design
The study employed a quantitative research approach, more specifically the explanatory correlational research design. The goal of a correlational design, also known as an explanatory research design, is to ascertain the degree to which two or more variables co-vary, or how changes in one variable are reflected in changes in the others (Creswell, 1999). Explanatory correlational study has been referred to as "explanatory" research (Wallen & Fraenkel, 2013) or "relational" research (Coe et al., 2021) by various authors. In correlational study designs, researchers use correlation statistical tests to describe and measure the strength of the relationship between two or more variables which clearly aligns with the concern of the present study.

2.2 Participants and sampling techniques
The study was carried out at two Teacher Education colleges in Ethiopia. The participants were English language majors pre-service EFL teacher who were enrolled in training program in 2023. Using comprehensive sampling technique, ninety-four pre-service EFL teachers who were available in the two colleges were included as participants to obtain the data for the study. To ensure the validity and dependability of the results, the researcher collected data using comprehensive (or whole population) sampling. According to Stockemer et al. (2019), comprehensive (or whole population) sampling is a method that looks at a case or instance of a given population that demonstrates particular features, such as qualities, experience, or knowledge, that a researcher is interested in for her/his study. The demographic information of the participants is displayed below.

2.3 Instruments of Data Collection

Table 1 Characteristics of the respondents

Category	Descriptions	Frequency	Percentage (100%)
Gender	Male	62	65.95
	Female	32	34.04
	Total	94	100
Age	18-20	30	31.91
	21-25	45	47.87
	26-30	19	20.21
	Total	94	100

The study employed language learning strategies questionnaires, and a speaking proficiency test to gather data from the participants.

2.3.1 Language Learning Strategies Questionnaire

The EFL Learning Strategies Questionnaire (EFL-LSQ), developed by R. L. Oxford (1990a) was utilized in this study to collect quantitative data from the participants. The purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain information regarding the participants' language learning strategies. It was a 5-point Likert questionnaire, having scales ranging from 5 ("always true of me") to 1 ("never true of me"), and has a total of 37 items. The items are grouped into six main categories of the language learning strategy. There were seven items for memory strategies, seven for cognitive strategies, five for compensating strategies, seven for metacognitive strategies, six for affective strategies, and five for social strategies. The reliability test for LLS indicated a Cronbach's alpha value ranging from 0.72 to 0.87 which has been rated as good.

2.3.2 Speaking Proficiency Test

The speaking proficiency test was modified from the TOEFL IBT (Pierce & Kinsell, 2012). The test was given to the students in the classroom as an interview between the examiners and each student. The test consists of four sections where candidates are required to converse/ interact with the examiners. The candidate must complete a variety of language tasks in response to either personal or general inquiries, including expressing opinions, offering suggestions, reflecting on potential future events, and describing visuals.

As far as EFL teachers' proficiency assessment was concerned, fluency and coherence, lexical resources, grammatical accuracy, pronunciation, and comprehension are the basis for the test grading standards (Silva, 2012). The test was piloted on 45 pre-service EFL teachers who shared the same characteristics as the study sample. This was done to assess the reliability of the test using the test-retest approach. To ensure accuracy of the data, the responses were audio recorded to help the raters check the speaking performance of pre-service EFL teachers.

2.4 Data Analysis

Since the study is purely quantitative, various statical methods were employed to generate the out puts which show the extent of the relationship between the variables and their sub-components. Accordingly, using SPSS Version 26, a simple linear regression was computed to see the predictive potential of the language learning strategies on the EFL teachers speaking proficiency level. This means that the simple linear regression analysis was performed to look at to what extent the participants' language learning strategy predicts their speaking proficiency. On the other hand, Pearson's Correlation, mean, percentage, and standard deviation (SD) were generated to see the extent and the relationship between LLSs that EFL teachers have used and their speaking proficiency. Specifically, correlation coefficient analysis was used to assess the relationship between the six dimensions of language learning strategies and speaking proficiency of pre-service EFL teachers. The mean scores, which determine the extent of the LLSs use, were interpreted as 1.0–2.49 as low use, 2.5–3.49 represents a medium use, and 3.5–5.0 represents a high use (R. L. Oxford & Burry-Stock,1995).

2.5 Ethical Considerations

The researchers have received approval for human research ethics from the university. The inquiry was conducted in accordance with the ethical standards set by Hawassa University. Consequently, the study protocol was accepted by the Hawassa University Ethics Review Committee (CRERC) with reference number C5514/302/2024. After being fully informed about the purpose, nature, and potential outcomes of the study, each participant provided their informed consent. Participants' identities and confidentiality have been precisely preserved throughout the research process, and any identifiable information has been appropriately safeguarded.

3. Results

3.1 Language Learning Strategy Use

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics of the Language Learning Strategy use in the six dimensions

Categories	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Speaking proficiency		48.00	76.00	62.93	1.12
Memory strategy	94	2.14	4.00	3.35	.414
Affective strategy	94	2.33	4.00	3.27	.326

Cognitive strategy	94	2.00	3.86	3.12	.363
Compensation strategy	94	2.00	4.00	2.91	.402
Meta-cognitive strategy	94	2.29	3.86	3.08	.328
Social Strategy	94	2.00	3.80	2.83	.530
The overall mean score of LLS	94	2.58	3.58	3.09	.2037

Table 2 shows the statistical result of the EFL teachers on their extent to use different LLSs. Accordingly, the results indicate that they rely on the memory techniques dimension more frequently, as indicated by the highest dimension mean score (M=3.35, SD=0.41). In addition, next other memory strategy, it is revealed that the participants used affective strategy (M= 3.27, SD=0.32) followed by cognitive (M=3.12, SD=0.36), Meta-cognitive (3.08, SD=0.32), compensation (M=2.91, SD=0.4) and social strategy (2.83, SD=0.53) respectively. On the other hand, the overall mean score (3.09, SD=0.2) shows that EFL pre-service teachers often demonstrate a medium usage of language learning strategies. Likewise, the table illustrates that all six dimensions of language learning strategies - memory, affective, metacognitive, cognitive, compensatory, and social uses are rated as "medium level" as the mean scores fall from 2.50 to 3.49.

3.2 Relationship between Language Learning Strategy Use and Speaking Proficiency

The study employed Pearson correlation analysis to examine the association between pre-service EFL instructors' language learning strategies and their speaking proficiency. The findings show that the link between speaking ability and the use of language learning techniques are shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3 Correlations between language learning strategy use and speaking performance of pre-service EFL teachers

Learning Strategies	Speaking proficiency	Social Strategy	Metacognitive Strategy	Compensation Strategy	Cognitive Strategy	Affective Strategy	Memory Strategy
Speaking proficiency	1	.247*	.436**	.555**	.503**	.223*	.414**
Social	.247*	1	.079	.281**	.232*	-.161	-.137
Meta-cognitive	.436**	.079	1	.343**	-.053	.021	.043
Compensation	.555**	.281**	.343**	1	.193	.045	.196
Cognitive	.503**	.232*	-.053	.193	1	.097	.318**
Affective	.223*	-.161	.021	.045	.097	1	.242*
Memory	.414**	-.137	.043	.196	.318**	.242*	1

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The above table (table 3) shows the level of correlations between speaking proficiency and each of the six categories of language learning strategies. According to the table, memory strategies (r=414, p<.001), cognitive strategies (r=503, p<.001), metacognitive strategies (r=436, p<.001), and compensation strategies (r=.555, p<.001) have demonstrated a moderate positive significant relationship with speaking proficiency. However, the affective strategies (r=.223, p <.005), and social strategies (r=247, p<.005) have weak relationship with speaking proficiency. In general, the results revealed a moderately positive association between speaking proficiency and the four dimensions of language learning strategies: memory strategies, cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, and compensation strategies.

3.3 The Predictive Potential of Language Learning Strategies on Speaking Proficiency

Table 4 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.795a	.632	.607	.17564	1.733

a. *Predictors: (Constant), Social strategy, Meta-cognitive strategy, Memory strategy, Affective strategy, Cognitive strategy, Compensation strategy*

b. *Dependent Variable: Speaking proficiency*

According to the result of the regression analysis, the R Square was .632, and the Multiple R was .795. This shows that 63.2% of the variance in speaking proficiency total scores was explained by the EFL teachers' language strategy use. Morgan et al. (2004) state that this effect is more than usual. This analysis also implies that pre-service EFL teachers' speaking proficiency is strongly predicted by cognitive, meta-cognitive, compensating, and memory strategies. This result also implies that there are substantial relationships between speaking proficiency and the usage of language learning strategies, according to the result of correlational analysis.

In general, according to the above model summary table, the combined impacts of the predictor variables of language learning strategy use could account for 63.2% of the changes in students' speaking proficiency.

Table 5 The predictive effects of each language learning strategy usage category in explaining the dependent variable's variance (speaking proficiency).

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	Collinearity Statistics

		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	-.198	.309		-.642	.523	-.813	.416		
	Memory strategy	.142	.050	.209	2.855	.005	.043	.240	.788	1.270
	Affective strategy	.115	.058	.134	1.977	.051	-.001	.231	.919	1.088
	Cognitive strategy	.277	.056	.360	4.959	.000	.166	.389	.803	1.245
	Compensation strategy	.205	.052	.295	3.955	.000	.102	.308	.762	1.312
	Metacognitive strategy	.284	.060	.333	4.772	.000	.166	.403	.867	1.153
	Social Strategy	.055	.038	.105	1.445	.152	-.021	.132	.802	1.246

a. Dependent Variable: Speaking proficiency

The variable that has the largest beta value, as indicated in the Beta column under the standardized coefficient, helps the most to explain the variance of the dependent variable, which is influenced by every other variable in the model. In the standardized beta coefficients column, the most significant factor is the cognitive strategy (0.360), which is followed by the meta-cognitive strategy (0.333), compensatory strategy (0.295), memory strategy (0.209), and affective strategy (0. 134).

Table 6 Model fit test

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	73.763	6	12.294	24.907	.000[b]
	Residual	42.942	87	.494		
	Total	116.705	93			

a. *Dependent Variable: Speak proficiency Mean*
b. *Predictors: (Constant), Social Mean, Meta Mean, Memory Mean, Affective Mean, Cognitive Mean, Compensation Mean*

As can be seen from the above Table, the result of the P-value in the ANOVA table is (p<.001); as a result, the Null hypothesis was rejected.

4. Discussion

The study has identified the relationship between pre-service EFL teachers' language learning strategies use in the six categories and their speaking proficiency. The results disclosed that the EFL teachers are using language learning strategies in a moderate level. The results is aligned with other studies like Altunay (2014) and Kunasaraphan (2015) that looked at how frequently pre-service EFL teachers used LLS under various conditions. Both studies revealed that EFL teachers have employed language learning strategies at a medium level which is equivalent with the moderate status of the current study output. Likewise, recent studies such as Hanifa et al. (2024) and Al-Jaro, Akkarapon, & Tayeb (2024) further strengthen the aforementioned findings by stating that while many EFL teachers use language learning strategies, they do not always use or teach them. In the same vien, regarding the level of the usage, Hanifa et al. (2024) discloses that aalthough exact usage levels vary among the EFL teachers, the teachers have a moderate awareness but limited explicit strategy instruction (especially in public schools) which the current study explicitly shares.

On the other hand, the study has also depicted the most common type of language learning strategy to be used by the EFL teachers. Accordingly, the results show that memory strategies (M=3.35) are more frequently used by pre-service EFL teachers followed by affective strategies (M=3.27), cognitive strategies (M=3.12), meta-cognitive strategies (M=3.08), compensation strategies (M=2.91), and social strategies (M=2.83). This indicates that the pre-service EFL teachers mostly prefer memory strategies which include categorizing new words into synonyms, antonyms, nouns, and verbs, mentally visualizing scenarios in which the word could be used. Unlike the findings of the present study which claims memory strategy, recent studies have uncovered that the metacognitive strategies are commonly used by EFL teachers. For example, through it is a qualitative study which is different in approach from the present one, Talok et al. (2023) indicates the widespread use of metacognitive strategies among EFL learners. Similarly, Theyab (2024) discovered that EFL students predominantly prefer metacognitive strategies among other language learning strategies, particularly in speaking and writing. Perhaps, the variations among the results of the present and other studies have emerged due to the differences the research approaches, the level of the learners and the individual's preferences of learning strategy.

The current study also demonstrated a moderate positive relationship between speaking proficiency and the use of LLS among pre-service EFL teachers, with a Pearson correlation coefficient of r=.756, p<.001). The correlation analysis indicated that of four dimensions of language learning strategies, memory strategies, cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies, and compensation strategies had a moderate positive correlation with the teachers' speaking proficiency whereas, affective strategies and social strategies had a low positive correlation with the speaking proficiency. In line with this finding, Kartika, R. (2024) discovered a positive moderate correlation between the subcomponents of the language learning strategies and speaking performance of the EFL teachers apart from the variations in the correlation value. On the other hand, regarding the predictive potential of the strategies, 63.2% of the EFL teachers speaking proficiency is determined by their language learning strategy use.

5. Conclusions

The current study indicated that pre-service EFL teachers employed moderate frequency use of language learning strategies at two colleges of teacher education, with an overall mean score of 3.09. Their speaking proficiency was also found to be moderate, with an overall mean score of 62.9. The language learning strategies of pre-service EFL teachers and their speaking proficiency were found to be significantly positively correlated. The findings of the study also show that the six categories of language learning strategy utilization and the speaking proficiency of pre-service EFL teachers exhibited several significant connections. Findings from statistical analysis demonstrate a strong relationship between pre-service EFL teachers' language learning strategies and their speaking ability.

Moreover, the findings of the regression analysis demonstrated that speaking proficiency total scores were significantly predicted by each of the six language learning strategy dimensions—memory, cognitive, metacognitive, affective, compensatory, and social—with varying degrees of influence. They predicted the total speaking proficiency scores and explained 63.2% of the variance in the speaking proficiency overall scores. The regression analysis results also show positive and significant connections between speaking proficiency and the use of language learning strategies. These indications can be used as useful developmental milestones in addition to being predictive of speaking ability. Therefore, enhancing students' use of language learning strategies, for instance, will make them more fluent speakers.

In addition, it is important to emphasize explicit instruction on language learning strategies, especially higher-order ones in language education programs. It is also important for EFL teachers to emphasize the creation of interactive language learning settings by training students in social and affective skills that will help them manage the process of learning a foreign language. Furthermore, the findings of this investigation support previous findings that learners use a variety of strategies to learn English to varying degrees (Habók & Magyar, 2018; Griffiths, 2015; Rao, 2016).

5.1 Limitations and Areas for Future Study

To ascertain the degree of the association between language learning strategies and speaking proficiency of pre-service EFL teachers at two Colleges of Teacher Education, the study used solely quantitative data that were analyzed using SPSS version 26. In the future, a mixed-method study should be carried out to further examine the possible effects of employing language learning strategies on speaking ability by incorporating some qualitative data.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

The authors received no direct funding for this study.

Data availability statement

All data supporting this study are available from the corresponding author.

References

1. Al-Buainain, H., Hassan, F., & Abdalla, M. (2021). *Speaking Proficiency and the Use of Language Learning Strategies Among Arab EFL Learners*. International Journal of English Linguistics, 11(1), 82–90. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349056505
2. Al-Jaro, M., Akkarapon, N., & Tayeb, A. A. (2024). *English language teaching methods: Applicability and challenges from EFL teachers' perspectives.* Frontiers in Language and Society, 4(2), 1–15.https://journals.bilpub.com/index.php/fls/article/view/7218
3. Alqarni, N. (2023). Language learning strategies and learning engagement as predictors of language learning achievement: An investigation of Saudi EFL learners. *Saudi Journal of Language Studies*, 3(3), 129–143. https://doi.org/10.1108/SJLS-12-2022-0084
4. Agustin, W., Wahyudin, A. Y., & Isnaini, S. (2021). Language Learning Strategies And Academic Achievement Of English Department Students. *Journal of Arts and Education*, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.33365/jae.v1i1.34
5. Al-Qahtani, M. F. (2013). Relationship between English Language, Learning Strategies, Attitudes, Motivation, and Students' Academic Achievement. *Education in Medicine Journal*, 5(3).
6. Alrashidi, O. (2022). Assessing language learning strategies employed by university English major students in Saudi Arabia. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), 2074935.
7. Altunay, D. (2014). Language learning strategies used by distance learners of English: A study with a group of Turkish distance learners of EFL. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 15(3), 291–305.
8. Anggarista, S., & Wahyudin, A. Y. (2022). A correlational study of language learning strategies and English proficiency of university students at EFL context. *Journal of Arts and Education*, 1(2).
9. Chamot, A. U. (2005a). Language learning strategy instruction: Current issues and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 112–130. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190505000061
10. Chamot, A. U. (2005b). Language learning strategy instruction: Current issues and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 112–130.

11. Chapple, J. (2015). Teaching in English is not necessarily the teaching of English. *International Education Studies*, *8*(3), 1–13.
12. Charoento, M. (2017). Individual learner differences and language learning strategies. *Contemporary Educational Research Journal*, *7*(2), 57–72.
13. Coe, R., Waring, M., Hedges, L. V, & Ashley, L. D. (2021). *Research methods and methodologies in education*. Sage.
14. Cohen, A. D. (2014). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Routledge.
15. Creswell, J. W. (1999). Mixed-method research: Introduction and application. In *Handbook of educational policy* (pp. 455–472). Elsevier.
16. Eshetie, A. (2010). Language policies and the role of English in Ethiopia. *A Presentation Paper at the 23rd Annual Conference of IATEFL BESIG (19-21 Nov. 2010), Bielefeld, Germany*.
17. Foster, S., Sriphrom, C., & Nampanya, R. (2017). An investigation of language learning strategies used, gender and language proficiency among first-year students at Rajamangala University of Technology Isan. *RMUTI Journal Humanities and Social Sciences*, *4*(1), 91–92.
18. Ghavamnia, M., Kassaian, Z., & Dabaghi, A. (2011). The Relationship between Language Learning Strategies, Language Learning Beliefs, Motivation, and Proficiency: A Study of EFL Learners in Iran. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, *2*(5).
19. Grainger, P. (2012). The impact of cultural background on the choice of language learning strategies in the JFL context. *System*, *40*(4), 483–493.
20. Griffiths, C. (2015). Language learning strategies: An holistic view. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *3*, 473–493.
21. Gustanti, Y., & Ayu, M. (2021). THE CORRELATION BETWEEN COGNITIVE READING STRATEGIES AND STUDENTS'ENGLISH PROFICIENCY TEST SCORE. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, *2*(2), 95–100.
22. Habók, A., & Magyar, A. (2018). The effect of language learning strategies on proficiency, attitudes and school achievement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 293044.
23. Hanafiah, A. D., Abdul Kadir, F., Kamaruddin, S. M., Hussin, S. N. L., & Hashim, H. (2021). Language learning strategies employed by successful language learners. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *11*(6), 1363–1378.
24. Hanifa, R., Anggraini, D. D., Fadhilah, R., & Mahmudah, F. N. (2024). *Exploring the influence of EFL teachers' informal digital learning on creative classroom instruction.* Language Testing in Asia, 14, Article 15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00268-7
25. Hashim, H., Yunus, M. M., & Embi, M. A. (2022). *Language Learning Strategies for Primary School Pupils in Learning Speaking Skills*. Creative Education, 13(7), 213–225. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/364939332
26. Haufiku, H. N., Mashebe, P., & Abah, J. (2023). *Strategies used by English Second Language teachers to cope with teaching challenges in Namibian schools.* ELT Reviews: English Language Teaching and Education, 6(1), 49–58. https://ejournal.uinsaid.ac.id/index.php/ele-reviews/article/view/6886
27. Kartika, R. (2024). *The relationship between language learning strategies and speaking achievement*. *International Journal of Innovation and Education Research*. Retrieved from https://ejournal.unib.ac.id/ijier/article/view/34107
28. Kieu Giang, B. T., & Tuan, V. Van. (2018). Language Learning Strategies of Vietnamese EFL Freshmen. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume*, *9*.
29. Kunasaraphan, K. (2015). English learning strategy and proficiency level of the first year students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *197*, 1853–1858.
30. Lestari, M., & Wahyudin, A. Y. (2020). Language learning strategies of undergraduate EFL students. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, *1*(1), 25–30.
31. Lin, C.-H., Zhang, Y., & Zheng, B. (2017). The roles of learning strategies and motivation in online language learning: A structural equation modeling analysis. *Computers & Education*, *113*, 75–85.
32. Morgan, G. A., Leech, N. L., Gloeckner, G. W., & Barrett, K. C. (2004). *SPSS for introductory statistics: Use and interpretation*. Psychology Press.
33. Norazah, K., Hashim, H., & Yunus, M. M. (2024). *The use of language learning strategies in enhancing speaking performance among ESL learners in Malaysia*. EduLearn Journal, 18(2), 75–88. https://edulearn.intelektual.org/index.php/EduLearn/article/view/21144
34. Ortega, L. (2009). Sequences and processes in language learning. *The Handbook of Language Teaching*, 81–105.
35. Oxford, R. (2018). Language learning strategies. *The Cambridge Guide to Learning English as a Second Language*, 81–90.
36. Oxford, R. L. (1990a). Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know. *(No Title)*.
37. Oxford, R. L. (1990b). Missing link: Evidence from research on language learning styles and strategies. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*, 438–458.

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

39. Pierce, D., & Kinsell, S. (2012). *Cracking the TOEFL IBT 2013*. Princeton Review.

40. Ranjan, R., & Philominraj, A. (2020). *Language learning strategies, motivation and gender in foreign language context*.

41. Rao, Z. (2016). Language learning strategies and English proficiency: interpretations from information-processing theory. *The Language Learning Journal*, *44*(1), 90–106.

42. Rardprakhon, J. (2016). Language learning strategies used by Thai engineering freshmen with different English academic achievement levels. *Unpublished Master's Thesis). Burapha University, Thailand*.

43. Salih, A. A. M., & Omar, M. A. (2024). *Enhancing EFL learners' engagement through clustered digital materials.* Frontiers in Education, 9, Article 1439104. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1439104

44. Silva, A. L. K. da. (2012). *The use of Cambridge ESOL parameters in oral performance assessment in an english language institut*.

45. Stockemer, D., Stockemer, G., & Glaeser, J. (2019). *Quantitative methods for the social sciences* (Vol. 50). Springer.

46. Tessera, E. M., & Kassa, A. A. (2024). Exploring assessment practices of teachers in Advanced Speech courses. *ELT Forum: Journal of English Language Teaching*, *13*(1), 48–60.

47. Theobald, M. (2021). Self-regulated learning training programs enhance university students' academic performance, self-regulated learning strategies, and motivation: A meta-analysis. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *66*, 101976.

48. Tieocharoen, W., & Rimkeeratikul, S. (2019). Learning strategies and teaching methods in Thai and Vietnamese universities. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume*, *10*.

49. Wahyuni, S. (2022). Language Learning Strategy Use across Gender. *JLA (Jurnal Lingua Applicata)*, *6*(1), 12–22.

50. Wallen, N. E., & Fraenkel, J. R. (2013). *Educational research: A guide to the process*. Routledge.

51. Weinstein, C. E., & Underwood, V. L. (2014). Learning strategies: The how of learning. In *Thinking and learning skills* (pp. 241–258). Routledge.

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

53. Wijaya, A. (2024). *Teaching strategies strengthening EFL learners' self-confidence in speaking.* English Conference (E-Conference) Journal, 6(1), 1–10. https://journal2.upgris.ac.id/index.php/ECL/article/view/440

54. Wong, F. Y., & Hashim, H. (2023). *A Systematic Review on Language Learning Strategies for English Speaking Skills in Today's Learning Conditions*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/376253203

55. Yoong, W. F., & Hashim, H. (2021). *A Systematic Review on Language Learning Strategies for Speaking Skills in a New Learning Environment*. European Journal of Educational Research, 10(3), 1121–1135. https://www.eu-jer.com/a-systematic-review-on-language-learning-strategies-for-speaking-skills-in-a-new-learning-environment