

**Vocabulary learning strategies and vocabulary levels of Grade 11 students
of Salinungan Stand-Alone Senior High School**

Allan D. Guieb*

University of La Salette, Inc., Santiago City, Isabela, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This descriptive-correlational study examined the vocabulary learning strategies and vocabulary levels of Grade 11 students at Salinungan Stand-Alone Senior High School during the first semester of School Year 2024-2025. From a population of 289 Grade 11 students, 166 participants were selected through stratified random sampling. Data were gathered using a 44-item modified Vocabulary Learning Strategies Questionnaire based on Gu and Johnson, which obtained a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .955, and the Vocabulary Levels Test covering the 1000-, 2000-, 3000-, 4000-, and 5000-word levels. Weighted means, frequency counts, percentages, mean scores, and Spearman's rho were used in the analysis. The participants used vocabulary learning strategies from a moderate to a great extent. Oral repetition obtained the highest grand mean ($M = 5.27$), followed by dictionary use ($M = 4.96$), technology use ($M = 4.88$), contextual strategies ($M = 4.81$), and note-taking ($M = 4.80$). Despite this reported strategy use, the mean scores at all five vocabulary levels were below the adopted mastery cut-offs. Most participants did not master the 1000-, 2000-, 3000-, and 5000-word levels, while 51.20% met the reported mastery criterion at the 4000-word level. Most correlations between strategy use and vocabulary level were not statistically significant. Significant weak positive relationships were found between affective strategies and the 4000-word level ($\rho = .17$, $p = .028$), dictionary use and the 5000-word level ($\rho = .16$, $p = .043$), and affective strategies and the 5000-word level ($\rho = .23$, $p = .003$). The findings support a structured vocabulary intervention emphasizing foundational word knowledge, dictionary skills, self-regulation, contextual practice, and sustained monitoring.

Keywords: Vocabulary learning strategies, vocabulary levels, Grade 11 students, dictionary use, affective strategies.

Date Submitted: June 30, 2026

Date Accepted: July 13, 2026

Date Published: July 19, 2026

INTRODUCTION

Vocabulary is a central component of language proficiency because it supports comprehension and expression across listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Learners may know grammatical rules yet remain unable to communicate effectively when they do not possess enough words or cannot retrieve and use them appropriately. For senior high school

*Corresponding author / Email: allan.guieb@deped.gov.ph

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05031376>

Recommended citation:

Guieb, A. D. (2026). Vocabulary learning strategies and vocabulary levels of Grade 11 students of Salinungan Stand-Alone Senior High School. *Pantao (International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)* 5 (2), 1986-1997. <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05031376>

students, vocabulary knowledge is especially important because academic texts require increasingly precise, abstract, and discipline-specific language.

English continues to serve as a major language of education, business, science, and international communication. In the Philippines, it is taught throughout basic education and is widely used as a medium of instruction. Recent curriculum reforms continue to emphasize English competence as part of preparation for higher education, employment, and participation in a globally connected society (Crystal, 2021; Department of Education, 2022; OECD, 2023).

Despite sustained exposure to English, many learners still experience difficulty in speaking, sentence construction, reading comprehension, and appropriate word use. These difficulties have been associated with limited vocabulary knowledge, inconsistent practice, low confidence, and reduced engagement in remote or technology-mediated learning environments (Simamora et al., 2022; Wahyudin et al., 2021). The continuing weakness in Philippine reading performance reported in PISA 2022 further indicates the need for instruction that develops both basic comprehension and the language resources required for more complex interpretation (OECD, 2023).

One approach to addressing vocabulary difficulty is the explicit development of language learning strategies. Language Learning Strategies refer to the deliberate actions, thoughts, and self-regulatory behaviors that learners use to make language learning more efficient and independent. Strategy frameworks commonly include memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies (Oxford, 2021). In vocabulary learning, these may include repetition, word lists, contextual guessing, dictionary consultation, note-taking, semantic grouping, morphological analysis, imagery, use of technology, and active application of newly learned words.

Research consistently identifies vocabulary knowledge as a strong contributor to reading comprehension and communicative competence (Nation, 2022; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2022). Effective vocabulary learning requires more than memorizing isolated definitions. Learners need repeated exposure, retrieval practice, contextual use, attention to word form and meaning, and opportunities to apply vocabulary in speaking and writing (Webb & Nation, 2021). Digital dictionaries, mobile applications, multimedia materials, and spaced-repetition systems have also expanded the range of strategies available to learners (Chiew & Ismail, 2021; Yu & Trainin, 2021).

Statement of the problem

This study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent did the participants use the different vocabulary learning strategies?
2. What was the vocabulary level of the Grade 11 students at the 1000 word, 2000 word, 3000 word, 4000 word, and 5000 word levels?
3. Was there a significant relationship between the participants' extent of use of vocabulary learning strategies and their vocabulary levels?
4. What plan of action could be proposed to improve the participants' vocabulary levels?

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational design. The descriptive component determined the extent to which the participants used selected vocabulary learning strategies and described their vocabulary performance at five word-frequency levels, while the correlational component tested the direction and strength of the relationship between each strategy category and each vocabulary level without manipulating the variables. This design

was appropriate because the study examined naturally occurring learner behaviors and test scores (Dullas et al., 2021).

The study was conducted at Salinungan Stand-Alone Senior High School under the Schools Division Office of Isabela. The school offered the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM); Accountancy, Business, and Management (ABM); Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS); and Technical-Vocational-Livelihood (TVL) strands, and it recorded 660 learners in the first semester and 640 learners in the second semester of School Year 2024-2025. The Grade 11 population covered by the study consisted of 289 students enrolled in core English subjects. A sample of 166 was determined using the Raosoft sample-size calculator at a 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error, and stratified random sampling was used to represent the strands and sections proportionately. Within the STEM strand, Section Galileo Galilei had a population of 40 and a sample of 23, while Section Einstein had a population of 39 and a sample of 22. Within the ABM strand, Section Pacioli had a population of 49 and a sample of 29. Within the HUMSS strand, Section Plato had a population of 39 and a sample of 22, Section Socrates had a population of 35 and a sample of 20, and Section Confucius had a population of 38 and a sample of 22. Within the TVL strand, Section Babbage had a population of 25 and a sample of 14, and Section Guerrero had a population of 24 and a sample of 14. Across all strands and sections, the total population was 289 and the total sample was 166.

Two instruments were used to gather data. The first was a modified Vocabulary Learning Strategies Questionnaire based on the instruments of Gu and Johnson (1996) and Gu (2005), as adopted in the manuscript from Gaboy (2018). The modified form contained 44 items grouped into 15 strategy categories, namely word lists, oral repetition, written repetition, association, imagery, visualization, semantics, contextual learning, word structure, dictionary use, note-taking, guessing, activation, technology use, and affective strategies. Responses were recorded on a six-point scale, and pilot testing produced a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .955, indicating excellent internal consistency for the administered form. The second instrument was the Vocabulary Levels Test associated with Webb, Sasao, and Ballance, which assessed vocabulary knowledge at the 1000-, 2000-, 3000-, 4000-, and 5000-word levels, with each level containing 30 items. The original manuscript reported reliability estimates of .96 and separation estimates of 4.72 or higher. Scores were interpreted by level rather than combined because each band represented a different layer of lexical knowledge.

The strategy questionnaire was interpreted using the following ranges: a weighted mean of 5.60-6.00 was interpreted as very great extent, 4.50-5.59 as great extent, 3.50-4.49 as moderate extent, 2.50-3.49 as some extent, 1.50-2.49 as small extent, and 1.00-1.49 as no extent. The upper boundary of the "great extent" category was written as 5.59 in the revised manuscript to remove the gap present in the original scale. For the Vocabulary Levels Test, the reported results classified scores of 29-30 as mastered for the 1000-, 2000-, and 3000-word levels, with scores below 29 classified as not mastered at these same levels. For the 4000- and 5000-word levels, scores of 26-30 were classified as mastered, while scores below 26 were classified as not mastered. These cut-offs were used consistently in the revised Results section because they were the criteria applied in the original frequency table.

In gathering the data, the researcher first requested approval from the Dean of the Graduate School and the Schools Division Superintendent of Isabela. After approval was secured, permission to administer the instruments was obtained from the school principal. The identified participants and their parents or guardians received information about the study and the required consent and assent forms. The questionnaires and tests were then administered and

retrieved within a uniform data-collection period, after which responses were checked, organized, encoded, and prepared for statistical analysis.

Data were processed using SPSS version 22. Weighted means described the extent of use of each vocabulary learning strategy, while frequency counts, percentages, and mean scores described vocabulary mastery at each word level. Spearman's rho tested the relationship between strategy-use scores and vocabulary scores because the analysis focused on ranked or nonparametric associations, and statistical significance was evaluated at $\alpha = .05$. The proposed action plan was developed from the identified low-mastery areas, the least-developed strategies, and the statistically significant relationships.

With regard to ethical considerations, formal authorization was obtained before data collection began. Participation was voluntary, and participants were informed of the purpose, procedures, and expected use of the data. Because the participants were students, parental or guardian consent and learner assent were obtained, and participants could withdraw without penalty. Individual responses were kept confidential, reported in aggregate form, and handled in accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012. The researcher also used consistent administration procedures to reduce avoidable variation in testing conditions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents and discusses the findings of the study based on data gathered from 166 Grade 11 students enrolled in core English subjects at Salinungan Stand-Alone Senior High School, drawn through stratified random sampling from a total population of 289 students distributed across the STEM, ABM, HUMSS, and TVL strands. The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational design, and data were obtained using a modified Vocabulary Learning Strategies Questionnaire and the Vocabulary Levels Test associated with Webb, Sasao, and Ballance. Weighted means were used to describe the extent of strategy use, frequency counts, percentages, and mean scores described vocabulary mastery at each word level, and Spearman's rho was used to test the relationships between strategy use and vocabulary scores, with statistical significance evaluated at $\alpha = .05$. The discussion that follows is grounded strictly in the data gathered and interprets the results in direct relation to the objectives of the study, namely to determine the extent of vocabulary learning strategy use, to describe vocabulary mastery across five word-frequency levels, to examine the relationship between strategy use and vocabulary level, and to propose an action plan responsive to the findings.

Extent of use of vocabulary learning strategies

The participants reported using the fifteen strategy categories to a moderate to great extent. Oral repetition ranked first with a grand mean of 5.27, interpreted as great extent, indicating that saying words aloud or repeating them mentally was the most frequently used strategy among the respondents. This pattern is consistent with vocabulary research that treats repetition as useful for maintaining word forms in memory, especially when it is combined with meaning and application (Webb & Nation, 2021). Dictionary use ranked second with a grand mean of 4.96, followed by technology use at 4.88, contextual strategies at 4.81, note-taking at 4.80, and activation at 4.78, all interpreted as great extent. Visualization followed with a grand mean of 4.74, guessing with 4.60, written repetition with 4.55, and semantics with 4.50, all likewise interpreted as great extent, although written repetition, which involved rewriting target words together with translations, was reported slightly less frequently than the simple rewriting of target words alone. The frequent use of dictionary, technology, contextual, note-taking, and activation strategies, which involve verification, self-directed resource use,

contextual interpretation, and production of newly learned vocabulary, is consistent with findings that digital tools and dictionaries support autonomous learning when learners consult definitions, examples, pronunciation, and usage information rather than copying meanings mechanically (Chiew & Ismail, 2021; Yu & Trainin, 2021; Zuhairi & Musthar, 2023).

The lowest grand means were recorded for imagery at 4.46, association at 4.40, word structure at 4.34, affective strategies at 4.26, and word lists at 4.05, all interpreted as moderate extent. At the item level, carrying vocabulary cards received the lowest mean of 3.36, suggesting that traditional word-list practices may have been displaced by mobile tools, while silently repeating new words received the highest mean of 5.30, reinforcing the primacy of rehearsal noted above. A complete item-level presentation is provided in Appendix G. The moderate use of prefixes, roots, suffixes, and meaning-based associations indicates a need for more explicit instruction in morphology and semantic organization, approaches that can help learners move beyond recognition toward deeper lexical knowledge (Feng et al., 2023; Patel & Singh, 2022). The affective category requires cautious interpretation because one item in this category was negatively worded. The reported grand mean of 4.26 indicates moderate use, but the source manuscript does not provide raw data that would allow independent confirmation of whether the negative item was reverse-scored before the category score was computed. The significant correlations involving this category, discussed later in this chapter, should therefore be interpreted together with this scoring limitation.

Vocabulary levels of the Grade 11 students

At the 1000-word level, 69 participants (41.57%) met the mastery criterion while 97 (58.43%) did not, yielding a mean score of 26.18, interpreted as not mastered. At the 2000-word level, 62 participants (37.35%) were classified as mastered and 104 (62.65%) as not mastered, with a mean score of 24.77, also interpreted as not mastered. Non-mastery increased further at the 3000-word level, where only 26 participants (15.66%) met the mastery criterion and 140 (84.34%) did not, producing the lowest proportion of mastery in the entire distribution and a mean score of 22.39, interpreted as not mastered. At the 4000-word level, 85 participants (51.20%) met the mastery cut-off while 81 (48.80%) did not, resulting in a mean score of 21.48, and at the 5000-word level, 80 participants (48.19%) met the cut-off while 86 (51.81%) did not, resulting in a mean score of 20.70; both levels were likewise interpreted as not mastered despite the apparently higher proportions of mastery. This apparent inconsistency arises because the 4000- and 5000-word levels used a lower mastery cut-off of 26-30 compared with 29-30 at the lower levels, while the mean scores continued to decline steadily from 26.18 at the 1000-word level to 20.70 at the 5000-word level. The more consistent conclusion, therefore, is that average performance remained below the mastery threshold at every level assessed.

These results reveal substantial gaps at the foundational and intermediate levels of vocabulary knowledge. More than half of the participants did not meet the mastery criteria at the 1000- and 2000-word levels, and more than four-fifths did not meet the criterion at the 3000-word level, the band that recorded the largest proportion of participants classified as not mastered. These word bands contain vocabulary that supports basic comprehension and the transition to more varied academic language, and weakness at these levels may limit the speed and accuracy with which learners process texts, follow classroom discussion, and express ideas. Nation (2021, 2022), Read (2021), and Schmitt and Schmitt (2022) emphasize that vocabulary develops cumulatively, so that gaps in high-frequency words can restrict further growth and comprehension at higher levels. These findings support systematic progression rather than isolated vocabulary activities, with instruction prioritizing frequent words, recycling them

across texts and tasks, and gradually extending learners toward more advanced word families, while attending to both breadth, or knowledge of more words, and depth, including form, meaning, collocation, grammatical behavior, and appropriate use.

Relationship between strategy use and vocabulary level

Spearman's rho was computed between each of the fifteen strategy categories and vocabulary scores at each of the five word levels. For word lists, the correlations were $\rho = 0.05$, $p = 0.547$ at the 1000-word level; $\rho = -0.02$, $p = 0.802$ at the 2000-word level; $\rho = 0.02$, $p = 0.823$ at the 3000-word level; $\rho = 0.06$, $p = 0.442$ at the 4000-word level; and $\rho = 0.05$, $p = 0.534$ at the 5000-word level, none of which were significant. For oral repetition, the correlations were $\rho = -0.12$, $p = 0.118$ at the 1000-word level; $\rho = -0.05$, $p = 0.493$ at the 2000-word level; $\rho = -0.06$, $p = 0.441$ at the 3000-word level; $\rho = 0.06$, $p = 0.432$ at the 4000-word level; and $\rho = -0.02$, $p = 0.815$ at the 5000-word level, none of which were significant. For written repetition, the correlations were $\rho = -0.12$, $p = 0.128$ at the 1000-word level; $\rho = -0.11$, $p = 0.174$ at the 2000-word level; $\rho = -0.13$, $p = 0.106$ at the 3000-word level; $\rho = 0.02$, $p = 0.834$ at the 4000-word level; and $\rho = -0.11$, $p = 0.163$ at the 5000-word level, none of which were significant. For association, the correlations were $\rho = -0.04$, $p = 0.574$ at the 1000-word level; $\rho = -0.02$, $p = 0.802$ at the 2000-word level; $\rho = -0.01$, $p = 0.877$ at the 3000-word level; $\rho = 0.03$, $p = 0.682$ at the 4000-word level; and $\rho = 0.01$, $p = 0.969$ at the 5000-word level, none of which were significant. For imagery, the correlations were $\rho = -0.05$, $p = 0.506$ at the 1000-word level; $\rho = -0.03$, $p = 0.736$ at the 2000-word level; $\rho = -0.03$, $p = 0.713$ at the 3000-word level; $\rho = 0.01$, $p = 0.952$ at the 4000-word level; and $\rho = -0.02$, $p = 0.793$ at the 5000-word level, none of which were significant.

For visualization, the correlations were $\rho = -0.05$, $p = 0.528$ at the 1000-word level; $\rho = -0.04$, $p = 0.592$ at the 2000-word level; $\rho = -0.07$, $p = 0.358$ at the 3000-word level; $\rho = -0.01$, $p = 0.916$ at the 4000-word level; and $\rho = -0.03$, $p = 0.687$ at the 5000-word level, none of which were significant. For semantics, the correlations were $\rho = -0.06$, $p = 0.463$ at the 1000-word level; $\rho = -0.01$, $p = 0.971$ at the 2000-word level; $\rho = -0.01$, $p = 0.966$ at the 3000-word level; $\rho = 0.08$, $p = 0.326$ at the 4000-word level; and $\rho = 0.03$, $p = 0.734$ at the 5000-word level, none of which were significant. For contextual strategies, the correlations were $\rho = -0.08$, $p = 0.335$ at the 1000-word level; $\rho = 0.13$, $p = 0.101$ at the 2000-word level; $\rho = 0.13$, $p = 0.092$ at the 3000-word level; $\rho = 0.14$, $p = 0.064$ at the 4000-word level; and $\rho = 0.11$, $p = 0.152$ at the 5000-word level, none of which reached significance, although the values at the 3000- and 4000-word levels approached the conventional threshold. For word structure, the correlations were $\rho = -0.04$, $p = 0.626$ at the 1000-word level; $\rho = -0.03$, $p = 0.682$ at the 2000-word level; $\rho = -0.01$, $p = 0.894$ at the 3000-word level; $\rho = 0.03$, $p = 0.714$ at the 4000-word level; and $\rho = -0.02$, $p = 0.763$ at the 5000-word level, none of which were significant.

For dictionary use, the correlations were $\rho = 0.13$, $p = 0.096$ at the 1000-word level; $\rho = 0.11$, $p = 0.173$ at the 2000-word level; $\rho = 0.11$, $p = 0.166$ at the 3000-word level; $\rho = 0.13$, $p = 0.091$ at the 4000-word level; and, notably, $\rho = 0.16$, $p = 0.043$ at the 5000-word level, a weak but statistically significant positive relationship at $\alpha = .05$. For note-taking, the correlations were $\rho = 0.03$, $p = 0.740$ at the 1000-word level; $\rho = -0.05$, $p = 0.556$ at the 2000-word level; $\rho = -0.02$, $p = 0.781$ at the 3000-word level; $\rho = 0.07$, $p = 0.356$ at the 4000-word level; and $\rho = 0.06$, $p = 0.481$ at the 5000-word level, none of which were significant. For guessing, the correlations were $\rho = -0.02$, $p = 0.758$ at the 1000-word level; $\rho = 0.01$, $p = 0.982$ at the 2000-word level; $\rho = -0.01$, $p = 0.895$ at the 3000-word level; $\rho = 0.06$, $p = 0.455$ at the 4000-word level; and $\rho = 0.01$, $p = 0.905$ at the 5000-word level, none of which were significant. For activation, the correlations were $\rho = 0.02$, $p = 0.764$ at the 1000-word level; $\rho = 0.02$, $p = 0.764$ at the 2000-word level; $\rho = 0.08$, $p = 0.312$ at the 3000-word level; $\rho = 0.09$,

$p = 0.240$ at the 4000-word level; and $p = 0.06$, $p = 0.457$ at the 5000-word level, none of which were significant. For technology use, the correlations were $p = 0.04$, $p = 0.596$ at the 1000-word level; $p = 0.04$, $p = 0.596$ at the 2000-word level; $p = 0.04$, $p = 0.633$ at the 3000-word level; $p = 0.04$, $p = 0.614$ at the 4000-word level; and $p = 0.07$, $p = 0.385$ at the 5000-word level, none of which were significant.

For affective strategies, the correlations were $p = 0.07$, $p = 0.355$ at the 1000-word level; $p = 0.07$, $p = 0.355$ at the 2000-word level; $p = 0.13$, $p = 0.103$ at the 3000-word level; $p = 0.17$, $p = 0.028$ at the 4000-word level, a weak but statistically significant positive relationship; and $p = 0.23$, $p = 0.003$ at the 5000-word level, the strongest significant relationship recorded in the entire correlation matrix, although still weak in magnitude. Taken together, no strategy category was significantly related to vocabulary scores at the 1000-, 2000-, or 3000-word level. At the 4000-word level, only affective strategy use showed a significant relationship ($p = 0.17$, $p = 0.028$). At the 5000-word level, both dictionary use ($p = 0.16$, $p = 0.043$) and affective strategy use ($p = 0.23$, $p = 0.003$) showed significant relationships. On this basis, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship was rejected only for affective strategies at the 4000- and 5000-word levels and for dictionary use at the 5000-word level, while the null hypothesis was retained for all other tested relationships across the five word levels.

The predominance of weak and non-significant relationships does not mean that the strategies were useless. The questionnaire measured how often learners reported using them, not whether they used them accurately, consistently, or in combination, and learners with weaker vocabulary may also use certain strategies more often because they encounter greater difficulty, a pattern that can itself produce weak or negative correlations. Because the design was correlational, the data cannot establish the direction of influence between strategy use and vocabulary score. The significant relationships that did emerge, limited to affective strategies at the 4000- and 5000-word levels and dictionary use at the 5000-word level, were all weak in magnitude, so their practical effects should not be overstated. Still, this pattern suggests that persistence, emotional regulation, and careful consultation of reference tools may become increasingly relevant as vocabulary demands increase, an interpretation consistent with studies emphasizing motivation, self-regulation, and informed dictionary use in advanced vocabulary learning (Xu, 2021; Zuhairi & Musthar, 2023). Overall, the results point to a gap between reported strategy frequency and measurable vocabulary mastery, suggesting that learners may know or use many techniques without receiving enough guidance on when to use them, how to evaluate their effectiveness, or how to transfer newly learned words into authentic reading and communication. Explicit strategy instruction should therefore focus on strategic quality, monitoring, and combined use, for example guiding a learner to first guess from context, analyze word parts, verify the meaning in a dictionary, record an example sentence, and retrieve the word through spaced review.

Proposed plan of action

In response to the low vocabulary mastery results, the moderate use of several strategy categories, and the significant relationships involving dictionary use and affective strategies, a proposed plan of action was developed emphasizing systematic instruction, repeated practice, learner self-regulation, and monitoring across the school year. The first target area, a literacy intervention program, aims to raise mastery across the five vocabulary levels through collaborative planning among language teachers, LAC sessions on vocabulary instruction, and the implementation of a school literacy program with level-based targets, to be carried out year-round by the school head, department head, reading coordinator, and language teachers using

a projector and printed or digital materials, with an approved literacy program and periodic vocabulary progress reports as the expected output. The second target area addresses foundational vocabulary and dictionary skills, aiming to improve mastery at the 1000- to 3000-word levels and to strengthen accurate dictionary use by integrating dictionary skills, personalized word lists, word-family analysis, contextual examples, and short retrieval practice into lesson plans from July 2025 to May 2026, to be implemented by the department head and language teachers, with SQAT-approved activities, lesson plans, and learner vocabulary portfolios as the expected output.

The third target area, application and retention, seeks to increase the meaningful use and long-term retention of newly learned words through spaced-repetition cards or applications, sentence creation, short writing, oral practice, peer teaching, games, and quizzes, also spanning July 2025 to May 2026, to be carried out by teachers and learners using mobile or printed learning tools, with integrated vocabulary tasks and improved periodic VLT scores as the expected output. The fourth target area focuses specifically on the word-list strategy, aiming to make word-list practice portable and regular by having learners and parents create compact vocabulary cards or digital lists as a performance task, with weekly review and retrieval checks scheduled from the beginning of the school year onward, to be facilitated by teachers, parents, and learners, with a submitted vocabulary card set or digital deck and an accompanying review log as the expected output. The fifth target area provides affective and self-regulation support, intended to strengthen persistence, confidence, and coping during difficult vocabulary tasks through regular brief consultations, goal setting, self-monitoring, break-and-return routines, positive self-instruction, and recognition of progress, conducted monthly and as needed by teachers, advisers, and parents in collaboration with learners, with anecdotal records, learner goals, and self-monitoring sheets as the expected output. The sixth target area addresses association and word structure, aiming to improve meaning-based connections and morphological analysis through semantic maps, word families, cognate comparisons where appropriate, prefixes, roots, suffixes, and association games, to be implemented year-round by language teachers and learners, with lesson plans incorporating association and morphology activities as the expected output.

This action plan combines teacher collaboration, level-based vocabulary targets, dictionary and morphology instruction, contextual practice, spaced review, peer learning, and affective support, a structure that directly reflects the study's central finding that broad exposure to strategies alone was insufficient to produce vocabulary mastery. The plan therefore requires observable products such as lesson plans, vocabulary portfolios, progress tests, consultation records, and periodic review of mastery rates, measures that can help the school determine whether implementation leads to meaningful improvement rather than increased activity without measurable gains.

Taken together, the findings indicate that the 166 Grade 11 participants employed the fifteen vocabulary learning strategy categories at moderate to great extents, with oral repetition, dictionary use, technology use, contextual strategies, note-taking, activation, visualization, guessing, written repetition, and semantics rated as great extent, and imagery, association, word structure, affective strategies, and word lists rated as moderate extent, while vocabulary mastery remained below the adopted threshold at every one of the five word-frequency levels examined, with mean scores declining steadily from 26.18 at the 1000-word level to 20.70 at the 5000-word level and non-mastery reaching as high as 84.34% at the 3000-word level. The Spearman correlation analysis revealed that strategy use, as reported, bore little statistically significant relationship to vocabulary performance overall, with the notable exceptions of affective strategy use at the 4000-word level ($\rho = 0.17$, $p = 0.028$) and at the 5000-word level ($\rho = 0.23$, $p = 0.003$), and dictionary use at the 5000-word level ($\rho = 0.16$, $p = 0.043$), all weak but significant at $\alpha = .05$. These results directly address the study's objectives by establishing

both the extent of strategy use and the level of vocabulary mastery among the participants, and by clarifying that frequent strategy use, on its own, does not reliably predict stronger vocabulary outcomes except in these limited and specific instances. The findings contribute to the field by reinforcing that vocabulary strategy instruction must move beyond exposure and frequency toward guided, monitored, and purposefully combined strategy use, particularly in the areas of dictionary consultation and affective self-regulation, and by demonstrating the value of examining strategy use and vocabulary knowledge separately across discrete frequency levels rather than as a single aggregate measure. These conclusions directly informed the six-part proposed plan of action described above, and they set the stage for the concluding chapter, which synthesizes the study's findings into summary statements, draws formal conclusions relative to each research objective, and offers recommendations for classroom practice, school-level implementation, and future research.

CONCLUSION

Grade 11 students at Salinungan Stand-Alone Senior High School reported moderate to great use of a broad range of vocabulary learning strategies. They relied most strongly on oral repetition, dictionary consultation, technology, contextual learning, note-taking, and activation. However, their mean vocabulary scores did not meet the adopted mastery criteria at any of the five word levels. The largest concentration of non-mastery occurred at the 3000-word level, while the declining mean scores indicated increasing difficulty across higher word bands.

Most vocabulary learning strategy categories were not significantly related to vocabulary scores. Significant weak positive relationships were limited to affective strategies at the 4000- and 5000-word levels and dictionary use at the 5000-word level. The findings indicate that the frequency of reported strategy use alone did not account for vocabulary mastery. Strategy quality, correct application, learner persistence, and systematic instruction require greater attention.

The proposed plan of action therefore prioritizes foundational vocabulary development, explicit dictionary and word-analysis skills, contextual application, spaced retrieval, self-regulation, and continuous monitoring. Its implementation should focus on measurable gains in vocabulary scores and classroom language performance.

REFERENCES

- Agustin, M. R., Cruz, J. P., & Santos, L. M. (2021). Language learning strategies and English performance among EFL learners. *Journal of Language Education Research*, 12(3), 45–60.
- Ahmed, A., Khan, S., & Omar, R. (2024). Mixed-method approaches in second language vocabulary research. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 11(2), 55–72.
- Ahmed, S., & Omar, R. (2022). Incidental vocabulary learning through digital reading and multimedia exposure. *Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 14(2), 88–101.
- Al-Khatib, M., & Omar, S. (2023). Vocabulary learning strategies and lexical development in EFL contexts. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(1), 45–60.
- Bai, X., & Guo, Y. (2021). Gender differences in language learning strategy use among EFL learners. *System*, 102, 102–115.

- Brown, T., & Smith, J. (2022). Vocabulary acquisition in digital and gamified learning environments. *Computers & Education*, 176, 104–118.
- Chen, L., & Huang, M. (2022). Vocabulary learning challenges among second language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 56(3), 601–615.
- Chiew, F., & Ismail, H. (2021). Mobile-assisted language learning and vocabulary acquisition. *International Journal of Mobile Learning and Organisation*, 15(1), 45–62.
- Cohen, A. D. (2021). *Strategies in learning and using a second language* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Crystal, D. (2021). *English as a global language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Department of Education (DepEd). (2022). *Basic education curriculum guide: English*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
- Dullas, A., Reyes, J., & Santos, M. (2021). Correlational research designs in educational studies. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 5(3), 12–25.
- Feng, Y., Li, H., & Zhang, Q. (2023). Visualization and semantic mapping in vocabulary learning. *System*, 117, 102–115.
- Garcia, M., & Lee, J. (2023). Research gaps in vocabulary learning strategy studies: A focus on secondary education. *TESOL International Review*, 18(4), 77–92.
- Griffiths, C. (2022). Language learning strategies: Theory and practice in SLA. *Language Teaching*, 55(2), 145–160.
- Hassan, M., & Malik, S. (2021). Vocabulary learning difficulties in second language acquisition. *Language Education Review*, 11(1), 22–35.
- Huang, Y., & Lin, S. (2023). Cognitive and metacognitive strategies in EFL vocabulary acquisition. *System Journal of Language Learning*, 118, 102–115.
- Kelley, P., Gomez, R., & Williams, T. (2022). Effects of vocabulary intervention programs on at-risk learners. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 22(3), 401–420.
- Kim, H., & Park, J. (2022). Effects of explicit vocabulary learning strategy instruction on EFL learners. *English Teaching & Learning*, 46(4), 321–338.
- Khan, A., & Ali, S. (2022). Dictionary use and guessing strategies in independent vocabulary learning. *ELT Journal*, 76(3), 275–287.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2021). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics. Oxford University Press.
- Le, T., & Trinh, H. (2024). Cognitive strategies and vocabulary development in EFL learners. *Language Teaching Research*, 28(1), 33–50.
- Liu, Y., & Reynolds, B. (2023). Strategic flexibility in vocabulary learning. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 14(1), 55–73.

- Lopez, M., & Garcia, R. (2021). Informal digital learning and vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning & Technology*, 25(3), 1–18.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2021). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2022). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- OECD. (2023). PISA 2022 results (Volume I): The state of learning and equity in education. <https://www.oecd.org>
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (2021). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Patel, R., & Singh, K. (2022). Semantic strategies and vocabulary retention in ESL learners. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 76(2), 145–158.
- Rahman, F., & Abdullah, N. (2023). Critical thinking and vocabulary development in ESL learners. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 17(2), 99–112.
- Read, J. (2021). *Vocabulary assessment and learning in second language contexts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2020). Vocabulary learning strategies revisited. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(2), 123–140.
- Schmitt, N., & Schmitt, D. (2022). Vocabulary learning strategies and instructional implications. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(4), 589–605.
- Selinker, L. (2021). Interlanguage theory revisited. *Second Language Research*, 37(2), 123–138.
- Singh, R., & Hashim, N. (2021). Task-based learning and incidental vocabulary acquisition. *ELT Research Journal*, 10(2), 44–58.
- Simamora, R. M., Nasution, N., & Lubis, H. (2022). Student engagement in online English learning environments. *Asian EFL Journal*, 29(2), 78–92.
- Tağa, T., & Kalenderoğlu, A. (2022). Visual learning strategies in vocabulary acquisition. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 17(6), 201–212.
- TCLD. (2023). Evidence-based practices in vocabulary instruction. Teaching and Learning Development Center. <https://www.tclد.org>
- Tran, P., & Nguyen, H. (2021). Contextual guessing and semantic mapping in vocabulary learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 28(3), 60–75.

- Vera, J. M. (2023). Affective filter and language acquisition in ESL classrooms. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(1), 33–47.
- Wahyudin, A., Putra, I., & Lestari, S. (2021). Challenges in remote English language learning during pandemic era. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics*, 6(2), 101–112.
- Wang, Y., & Zhang, L. (2023). Learner autonomy and vocabulary strategy use. *Language Learning Journal*, 51(2), 210–225.
- Webb, S., & Nation, I. S. P. (2021). *Vocabulary acquisition in second language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Xu, L. (2021). Affective strategies and vocabulary learning motivation. *TESL-EJ*, 25(1), 1–15.
- Yu, Q., & Trainin, G. (2021). Digital tools and spaced repetition in vocabulary learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, 25(2), 35–52.
- Zhang, H., & Li, X. (2021). Vocabulary learning strategies and lexical development in digital environments. *System*, 102, 102–119.
- Zhang, H., & Li, X. (2022). Strategic vocabulary learning and lexical development. *System*, 108, 102–119.
- Zubaidah, F., & Hasan, R. (2022). Language learning strategies and EFL achievement. *English Language Teaching Today*, 14(1), 22–35.
- Zuhairi, A., & Musthar, S. (2023). Dictionary use and vocabulary learning in ESL contexts. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33(2), 210–225.