Effects of Majors and Levels of Proficiency on Foreign Language Learning Strategies by University Students

Hyo-Woong Lee*

This study was designed to (a) investigate general pattern of strategy use by college freshman students, (b) find out any differences in the use of language learning strategies three different majors (management, engineering, and transportation), and (c) identify any differences in the strategy use by different proficiency levels of the above-mentioned three majors. The data collected from more than 200 hundred university students were based on a questionnaire which consisted of 58-question items dealing with six categories of strategies: cognitive, memory, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social. In addition to the questionnaire, a cloze test was undertaken for determining levels of language proficiency. Analysis of the data revealed that (a) the students in this study used language learning strategies less frequently than those of ESL settings, (b) the two of the most frequently used strategies by the students were compensation and metacognitive strategies, (c) management majors used all of the six categories of strategies more often than their engineering and transportation counterparts, and (d) more proficient language learners tended to use almost all of the six categories of strategies far more frequently than less successful language learners.

1. Introduction

In second language learning theory and research have shown that there has been a steadily growing interest in taking into account language learning tasks from the learner's point of view and in changing the focus of classroom

---

*한국해양대학교 교양과정부 부교수

instruction from a teacher-centered method to a learner-centered one. In particular, there has been an increasing interest in second and foreign language learning strategies. Language learning strategies have been broadly defined as any set of operations or steps used by a learner that will facilitate the acquisition, storage, retrieval, or use of information (Rigney, 1978). A considerable body of research (Chamot and Kupper, 1989; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; O'Malley et al., 1985-1990; Oxford, 1989; Oxford et al., 1988; Oxford and Ehrman, 1990; Oxford and Nyikos, 1989; Politzer and McGroaty, 1985; Reid, 1987; Reiss, 1984; Skehan, 1989; Wenden and Rubin, 1987) strongly suggests that effective second and foreign language learners use a variety of appropriate strategies for both receptive and productive tasks, while less effective students not only use strategies less frequently, but have a smaller repertoire of strategies and often do not choose appropriate strategies for the task.

Use of appropriate learning strategies enables students to take responsibility for their learning by enhancing learner autonomy, independence, and self-direction. These factors are important because learners need to keep on learning even when they are no longer in a formal classroom setting (Oxford and Crookall, 1988). Furthermore, unlike most other characteristics of the learner, such as aptitude, attitude, motivation, personality, and general cognitive style, learning strategies can be readily teachable.

Oxford (1989) suggests that factors related to the choice of language learning strategies can include: 1) language being studies; 2) level of language learning, proficiency, or course; 3) degree of metacognitive awareness; 4) sex; 5) affective variables such as attitudes, and language learning goals; 6)

specific personality traits; 7) overall personality type; 8) learning styles; 9) career orientation or field of specialization; 10) national origin; 11) aptitude; 12) language teaching method; 13) task requirements; 14) type of strategy training.

The study reported in the current article investigated two of the factors listed above and general pattern of strategies by university students. The study is primarily concerned with finding out if there are any differences in the use of language learning strategies among three different majors (management, engineering, and marine transportation). The study is also concerned with investigating any differences in the strategy use by different proficiency levels of the above-mentioned three majors. In addition to examining the two research questions, the study is also concerned with general tendency of strategy use of Korean university students.

II. Research Background

1. Two Major Schemes of Strategy Classifications

There still remains the issue of the classification of strategies, but the current situation manifests a fair amount of agreement with the proposed two major schemes of classifications. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) proposed three global categories of language learning strategies: metacognitive, cognitive, and social. Each of these major strategies is subdivided extensively:

Figure 1

O'Malley and Chamot's strategy classification system

Metacognitive strategies   Cognitive strategies

1. Planning
2. Directed attention
3. Selective attention
4. Self-management
5. Self-monitoring
   a. Comprehension monitoring
   b. Production monitoring
   c. Auditory monitoring
   d. Visual monitoring
   e. Style monitoring
   f. strategy monitoring
   g. Plan monitoring
6. Problem Identification
7. Self-evaluation
   a. Production evaluation
   b. Performance evaluation
   c. Ability evaluation
   d. Strategy evaluation
   e. Language repertoire
      evaluation

1. Repetition
2. Resourcing
3. Grouping
4. Note-taking
5. Deduction/Induction
6. Substitution
7. Elaboration
   a. Personal elaboration
   b. World elaboration
   c. Academic elaboration
   d. Between parts elaboration
   e. Questioning elaboration
   f. Self-evaluative elaboration
   g. Creative evaluation
   h. Imagery
8. Summarization
9. Translation
10. Transfer
11. Inferencing

Social and affective strategies

1. Questioning for clarification
2. Cooperation
3. Self-talk
4. Self-reinforcement

    While O'Malley and Chamot(1990) proposed three major categories of strategies, Oxford (1989) discussed the six global strategies (three direct and three indirect):

Figure 2

Oxford's strategy classification system

Direct strategies

1. Memory strategies

    a. Creating mental linkages

        1) Grouping

        2) Associating/elaborating

        3) Placing new words into a context

    b. Applying images and sounds

        1) Using imagery   2) Semantic mapping

        3) Using keywords   4) Representing sounds in
                                      memory

    c. Reviewing well

        1) Structured reviewing

    d. Employing action

        1) Using physical response or sensation

        2) Using mechanical techniques

2. Cognitive strategies

    a. Practicing

        1) Repeating   2) Recombining

        3) Formally practicing with sounds and writing systems

        4) Recognizing and using formulas and patterns

        5) Practicing naturalistically

    b. Receiving and sending messages

        1) Getting the idea quickly

        2) Using resources for receiving and sending messages

    c. Analyzing and reasoning

        1) Reasoning deductively   2) Analyzing expressions

        3) Analyzing contrastively (across languages)

        4) Translating   5) Transferring

    d. Creating structure for input and output

    1) Taking notes   2) Summarizing   3) Highlighting

3. Compensatory strategies

  a. Guessing intelligently

    1) Using linguistic clues   2) Using other clues

  b. Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing

    1) Switching to the mother tongue 2) Getting help

    3) Using mine or gesture   4) Selecting the topic

    5) Avoiding communication partially or totally

    6) Adjusting or approximating the message

    7) Coining words

    8) Using a circumlocution or synonym

Indirect strategies

1. Metacognitive strategies

  a. Centering your learning

    1) Overviewing and linking with already known material

    2) Paying attention

    3) Delaying speech production to focus on listening

  b. Arranging and planning your learning

    1) Finding out about language learning

    2) Organizing   3) Setting goals and objectives

    4) Identifying the purpose of a language task (purposeful

      listening/reading/speaking/writing)

    5) Planning for a language task

    6) Seeking practice opportunities

  c. Evaluating your learning

    1) Self-monitoring   2) Self-evaluating

2. Affective strategies

  a. Lowering your anxiety

    1) Using progressive relaxation, deep breathing or meditation

    2) Using music   3) Using laughter

    b. Encouraging yourself

       1) Making positive statements   2) Taking risks wisely

       3) Rewarding yourself

    c. Taking your emotional temperature

       1) Listening to your body   2) Using a checklist

       3) Writing a language learning diary

       4) Discussing your feelings with someone else

3. Social strategies

    a. Asking questions

       1) Asking for clarification or verification

       2) Asking for correction

    b. Cooperating with others

       1) Cooperating with others

       2) Cooperating with proficient users of the new language

    c. Empathizing with others

       1) Developing cultural understanding

       2) Becoming aware of other's thoughts and feelings

    The questionnaire employed in this study was based on Oxford's strategy classification system because it was much more easier to make question items of each strategy.

2. Career Orientation

    Several studies have shown that career orientation has some effects on the choice of language learning strategies. According to Politzer and McGroaty (1985), there was some significant difference in the use of strategies between the engineering/physical and social science/humanities majors. Their study demonstrated that the social science/humanities students used a wider range of strategies than the engineering/physical students. In the largest completed study of language learning strategies, Oxford and Nyikos (1989) also

discovered that university major made a highly significant difference in the use of strategies. Humanities/social science/ education majors used functional practice strategies and resourceful, independent strategies significantly more often than did students majoring in other areas, but not significantly more often than did their business counterparts. Oxford and Ehrman (1989) also found that career choice as an influence on strategy use appeared to be even more strongly supported in their study than in the study of Oxford and Nyikos (1989). Professional language trainers used a wider variety of language learning strategies than did adult language learners and native-speaking language teachers not trained in linguistics.They gave two reasons for these results. First, by virtue of experience and education professional language trainers have become aware of and proficient at learning strategies. Second, this group is overwhelmingly intuitives, and the intuitives of all career groups reported a wider range of strategies than any other preference group. In the study of learners' perceptual learning style preferences, Reid (1987) discovered that visual learning was selected as a major learning style only by students in hard sciences. Surprisingly, humanities majors were the least oriented toward visual learning. Computer science, hard sciences, business, and medicine majors preferred auditory learning as a major learning style. Engineering and computer science majors were significantly more tactile than humanities majors. Oxford (1989) also suggests that many factors can influence language learning strategy choice on the base of several previous language learning strategy studies which focused on the effects of career orientation on the choice of learning strategies.

III. Method

1. Subjects

In the fall semester of 1993 two hundred nineteen students, including approximately equal proportions of majors, participated in the current study. All of the subjects were undergraduate students and were in their second semester of university English reading and conversation classes, having had six-year previous formal English instruction in Junior and Senior High Schools.

The subjects were composed of three different fields: 89 students from management and trade departments of college of social science, 63 students from departments of rdio science and engineering and control and instrumentation engineering of college of science and engineering, and 67 students from department of marine transportation science of college of maritime science.

All of the students in this study had two English reading classes and another two conversation classes every week. Both of the subjects were required subjects. The three different majors were roughly equivalent in terms of the age and gender mix of the students. Each of these three majors, respectively, was divided into three small subgroups (high, middle, and low), depending upon the scores of the cloze tests.

2. Questionnaire

The questionnaire employed in this study consisted of fifty-eight items, based on the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning, or SILL by Oxford (1989). But I revised Oxford' Strategy Inventory which consisted of 50 items because some

of the question items of the SILL by Oxford were not
appropriate for the Korean students. The 58-item
questionnaire asks learners to report the frequency with
which they use certain language learning strategies. In order
to obtain more accurate responses from the students, in each
of the items the respondents are asked to indicate, in a
multiple-choice fashion, the frequency of use (almost always
to almost never, on a five-point scale) of a given strategy,
such as breaking down an expression into parts in order to
understand it, or seeking out native speakers of the target
language as conversation partners. In this study all of the
question items were in the subjects' native language because
the respondents were able to avoid the difficulty in translating
English sentences into Korean.

The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning has been
used around the world for students of second and foreign
languages in universities, schools, and government agencies.
The SILL is believed to systematically covers the four
language skill areas of listening, reading, speaking, and
writing. For the reliability of the questionnaire, the
questionnaire was calculated in terms of Cronbach's alpha.
Internal consistency reliability using Cronbach's alpha is .89,
based on 629 university students.

The questionnaire was administered during regular classes
and it took approximately 15 minutes to answer all the
question items.

Questions about respondents' truthfulness sometimes arise
with self-report instruments like Strategy Inventory for
Language Learning. But in the study respondents seemed
determined to rate their strategies as honestly as possible,
even if these strategies were not optimal. The fact that the

SILL scores were not to be used for performance evaluation (grading), probably contributed to the apparent honesty of the respondents.

3. Cloze test

In order to determine levels of students' English proficiency, all the subjects took cloze test. The cloze test was chosen for dividing three groups (high, middle, low) of each of the three majors because the cloze test seemed to measure students' general proficiency except that of speaking. The test was also selected for the easy and convenient administration for a large number of subjects. But most of the students were not familiar with the cloze test. That was why I revised the cloze test three times. The cloze text was chosen from one of college English textbooks. The test consisted of thirty cloze items which were deleted in every eighth or ninth word. The test was administered by the author himself and one of English professors of this university during the regular English conversation classes along with the questionnaire. It took about thirty minutes for the students to complete the test.

IV. Results

To answer the first research question, i.e., what is thet general tendency of strategy use by Korean university students, I turn to the mean scores which were calculated for the individual SILL items and for the subcategories of the strategies. Most of the means for the individual items fell above or below 3.0 on the 5-point scale, indicating a moderately frequent use of all of the strategies. Table 1 presents the mean SILL scores for each of the six categories of

strategies used by all the three majors.

Table 1

Mean scores for each of the six categories of strategies

Strategies	Mean scores
Compensatory	3.12
Metacognitive	2.89
Cognitive	2.87
Social	2.83
Memory	2.82
Affective	2.52

The results show that the most frequent use of strategies by the students in this study was compensatory strategies (M= 3.12) through which students could overcome knowledge limitations, like guessing meanings intelligently and using synonyms or other production tricks when the precise expression is unknown. The result was not exactly consistent with that of Phillips' San Francisco study (1991) in which metacognitive strategies were the most frequently used strategies (3.70). These differences might be due to the fact that Phillips' study was done in the ESL settings, while the current study was conducted in the EFL settings. Another possible explanation for the results might be sought from the slight differences between the two question items.

The second most frequently used strategies were metacognitive strategies (M=2.89) which good language learners manage their own learning process through, such as paying attention, self-evaluating, and self-monitoring. Affective (2.52) and memory (2.82) strategies were less frequently used than cognitive (2.87) and social (2.83)

strategies. There existed a striking difference between compensatory (M=3.12) and affective (M=2.52) strategies in terms of the frequent use of learning strategies.

Table 2 shows the mean scores of the six subcategories of strategies by the three different majors. The results demonstrate that the management majors (M=2.94) tended to use learning strategies more frequently than engineering (M= 2.72) and marine transportation (M=2.86) majors.

Table 2

Mean scores of the six categories by the three majors

	Management	Engineering	Marine Transportation	Total
		N=89	N=63	N=67	
Cognitive	2.97	2.77	2.88	2.87
Memory	2.91	2.71	2.84	2.82
Compensatory	3.22	3.02	3.13	3.12
Metacognitive	3.00	2.75	2.94	2.89
Affective	2.61	2.45	2.52	2.52
Social	2.96	2.67	2.88	2.83

The most frequent use of strategies across the three majors was compensatory strategies, the mean scores of which fell above 3.0 on the 5-point scale, indicating that the students used the strategies to a considerable extent frequently. The second most frequent use of strategies was metacognitive by the management majors (M=3.0), cognitive by engineering (2. 77), and marine transportation (2.94). The third most frequently used strategies were cognitive strategies by management (M=2.97) and marine transportation (M=2.88), metacognitive strategies by engineering majors(M=2.75).

Each of the three different majors employed affective strategies less frequently than any other strategies in the current study. In brief, management and marine transportation majors were consistent in the use of the six strategies and not much different from each other in the mean scores of the subcategories.

In answering the third research question, i.e., do the good language learners, determined by the results of the cloze test (level of proficiency), report using a wide range of strategies than less proficient learners, I investigated this question by dividing the population into three groups. Table 3 illustrates the mean scores of the high and low groups of each of the three majors. In order to maximize the differences between the groups, I deleted the mean scores of the middle groups in table 3.

The analysis of the six subcategories of strategies revealed that there was a wide difference between the high (M=2.97) and low)M=2.79) groups in the use of learning strategies. The students in the high groups used cognitive (M=3.11) social (M=3.03) strategies strikingly more frequently than the learners in the low groups (cognitive, M=2.74); social, M=2. 77). The low group in the management majors employed affective strategies(M=2.70) more frequently than the high group (M=2,60) of the same majors. And also the low group of the engineering majors used compensatory strategies

Table 3

The mean scores of the high and low groups of each of the majors

	Low N=28	High N=34	Low N=20	High N=22	Low N=25	High N=24	Low N=73	High N=80
Cognitive	2.87	3.11	2.58	3.01	2.79	3.21	2.74	3.11

Memory	2.90	3.00	2.68	2.83	2.80	2.92	2.79	2.91
Compensatory	3.14	3.27	3.13	3.05	2.99	3.34	3.08	3.22
Metacognitive	3.03	3.10	2.67	2.91	2.84	3.10	2.84	3.03
Affective	2.70	2.60	2.41	2.55	2.60	2.58	2.57	2.57
Social	2.97	3.11	2.60	2.89	2.75	3.11	2.77	3.03
Sum	2.93	3.03	2.67	2.87	2.79	3.04	2.79	2.97

(M＝3.13) than the high counterpart (M＝3.05). There was almost no difference between the high and low groups of the three majors in the use of affective strategies.

V. Discussion

The students completing the 58-item questionnaire on language learning strategies indicate a moderately frequent use (M＝2.84 on the 5-point scale) of the strategies in all of the six subcategories: cognitive, memory, compensatory, metacognitive, affective, and social. These findings show that the students in this study were found to use learning strategies less frequently than the subjects in recent studies (O'Malley, 1984-1987; Oxford, 1985-1990; Phillips, 1991). These differences, as I mentioned before, might be due to the fact that most of the recent studies have been conducted in ESL settings, whereas this study was carried out in EFL environment. The mean scores of the six subcategories in Phillips' recent San Francisco study fell at or above 3.0 on the point of 1-5: memory (M＝3.0), cognitive (M＝3.41), compensatory (M＝3.59), metacognitive (M＝3.79), affective (M＝3.12), and social (M＝3.65).

In the current study, students report using compensatory strategies with the greatest frequency, as indicated by the mean score (M＝3.12 on the 1-5 point scale). The result is not

consistent with that Phillips' study, in which metacognitive strategies were used most frequently. The next most frequently employed category of strategies was metacognitive strategies (M=2.89). The results support data collected recently from a similar population using the SILL by Oxford et. al. (1990) at Penn State. The mean SILL subcategory scores show that the next most frequently used strategies were cognitive (M=2.87) and social (M=2.84). These results partially support the study (Phillips, 1991), in which cognitive strategies were the third most frequently employed strategies. And also social strategies were found to be used less frequently, whereas the strategies were the second most frequently used strategies by the Phillips' study (1991). A possible explanation for Korean students' less frequent use of social strategies might be that Korean students are usually reluctant to participate in social interaction in Korean society, while even Asian students studying in America usually try to adjust themselves to American open society. Another explanation for these results might be sought from the fact that Korean students learnig English as a foreign language in their native country usually are not able to have enough opportunity to participate in various social activities in which English is spoken as a main means of communication.

The least popular strategies in this study, according to the mean scores of the subcategories, are affective and memory. The results are remarkably consistent with those of the San Francisco study by Phillips (1991). These results strongly demonstrate that most of the students tend not to pay much attention to their feelings and anxieties in learning a foreign language and university students also seem not to rely to a considerable degree on memory when they learn a language.

Another important findings in the current study are that there existed a considerable differences among the three majors in the use of any of the six subcategories of strategies. These results strongly support several recent studies by Politzer and McGroaty (1985), Oxford and Nyikos (1989), Ehrman and Oxford (1989), and Reid (1987). Surprisingly enough, the students majoring in management were found to use all of the six subcategories strikingly more frequently than engineering counterparts. The total mean score was 2.94 for the management majors while the total mean score was 2.72 for the engineering majors. The findings are also consistent with those of Politzer and McGroarty (1985). They found that social science/humanities majors used language learning strategies far more often than engineering/science majors. According to their explanation for these results, engineering/ science majors avoiding learning strategies were usually viewed as positive. The mean score(2.86) for the marine transportation majors was even higher than the total mean scores (2.72) for the engineering majors. the results may be explained from the fact that both management and marine transportation majors reported metacognitive strategies were the second most frequent use of strategies while the engineering majors used cognitive strategies second most frequently. At any rate, previous studies and this study has strongly confirmed that engineering majors tend to use learning strategies less frequently than almost any other major. Therefore, we might say that career orientation can be an independent variable in language learning strategies.

Another important findings in this study are that there actually existed considerable differences between high (M=2. 97) and low (M=2.79) groups of all of the three majors in the

use of the six subcategories. These results are also consistent
with those of the previous studies (Chamot and O'Malley,
1990; Oxford, 1989; Rubin and Wenden, 1987; Rubin, 1975;
Stern, 1975; Phillips, 1991; Wenden, 1987). In terms of each of
the six subcategories of strategies, the most striking
differences between high and low groups were found in the use
of cognitive strategies which consisted, in the word of Oxford,
of practicing, receiving and sending messages, analyzing
reasoning, and creating structure for input and output. The
results show that the students in the high groups of each of
the three majors tend to have more practice, to analyze more
contrastively, and to summarize more frequently and more
appropriately in learning a foreign language. Interestingly, the
most striking difference between the high and low groups was
found in the engineering majors in the use of cognitive
strategies. In some sense, that means the low group of the
engineering (M=2.58) used the cognitive strategies less
frequently. Unexpectedly, the students in the low group of the
engineering (M=3.13) employed the compensatory strategies
more frequently than the high group (M=3.03). And also the
affective strategies for the management majors (H: M=2.60, L:
M=2.70) were the same case. These were the only two results
that the subjects in the low groups of each major exceeded
those of the high groups in the use of the six subcategories of
strategies in this study. The explanation for the results might
be that the students in the high group used the strategies
unconsciously while the students in the low group consciously
employed the strategies when they learned a foreign language.
Another possible explanation for these results might be due to
the fact that the students might not be accurate in reporting
compensatory and affective strategies. Another interesting

result may be that both the total mean scores for the affective
strategies were exactly the same between the high and low
groups. This might be explained in terms of the fact that both
groups of the students used the strategies least frequently (M
=2.57). In brief, this study has strongly confirmed the fact
that more proficient language learners tent to use learning
strategies more frequently than less proficient learners.

VI. Conclusion

The current study investigated the differences not only
between majors but also between levels of proficiency in the
use of language learning strategies, along with finding out the
general tendency of strategy use, based on the data collected
from the college freshman students who majored in
management, engineering, and marine transportation in the
second semester of 1993. In order to examine the differences,
we administered a questionnaire which consisted of 58-
question items dealing with the six subcategories of strategies:
cognitive, memory, compensatory, metaconitive, affective, and
social. Along with the questionnaire, a cloze test was
undertaken in order to determine levels of language
proficiency.

The analysis of the six subcategories of learning strategies
reported by three different university majors revealed that the
two categories of strategies students reported to use most
frequently were compensatory and metacognitive strategies
and the two least frequently used categories of strategies were
found to be affective and memory strategies. The results has
strongly confirmed those of several previous studies. The
students in this study, however, reported to use all of the six
subcategories of strategies far less frequently than the

students in the studies conducted in the ESL settings.

The results of the questionnaire also clearly illustrated that there existed considerable differences among the three different majors in the use of learning strategies. It was found that management majors employed all of the six categories of strategies more often than engineering and marine transportation counterparts. Engineering majors were the language learners who used learning strategies least frequently in learning a foreign language. In the previous studies mentioned before, engineering majors were also found to use learning strategies less frequently than any other major. Thus, this study has unquestionably confirmed the fact that career orientation can be an independent variable in learning strategies.

The results of the current study also strongly demonstrated that levels of language proficiency could produce noticeable differences in the use of learning strategies. The analysis of the questionnaire clearly revealed that more proficient language learners tended to use almost all of the six subcategoies of strategies far more frequently than less successful language learners. But no differences between more and less proficient students were shown only in the use of affective strategies. Anyhow, the results of this study were quite consistent with those of a number of previous studies in terms of the fact that good language learners used learning strategies more frequently than unsuccessful language learners.

From the above-mentioned results, I might suggest that the learners in the ESL settings should be encouraged to use language learning strategies more frequently and appropriately for the improvement of their language

proficiency. Language teachers are also required to be familiar with learning strategies in order to encourage their students to use strategies more often inside and outside the classroom. I also suggest that less proficient language learners should be recommended to use the strategies which more proficient learners employ frequently. More studies on language learning strategies are needed to obtain the greatest possible benefit from foreign language learning in the future.

REFERENCES

Bialystok, E. (1978). A theoretical model of second language learning. Modern Language Journal , 28,69_83.

Bialystok, E. (1981). The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency. Modern Language Journal, 65, 24-35.

Chamot, A.U. (1987). The learning strategies of EFL students. Learner strategies in language learning. (Ed.), Wenden, A.L. & Rubin, J.Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. Prentice-Hall. 71-83.

Chamot, A.U. & Kupper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. Foreign Language Annals, 22, 13-24

Ehrman, M. & Oxford, R. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an Intensive training setting. Modern Language Journal, 74, 311-327.

Ehrman, M. & Oxford, R. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice and Psychological type on adult language learning strategies. Modern Language Journal, 73, 1-13.

Hosenfeld, C. (1977). A preliminary investigation of the reading strategies of successful and non successful second language learners. System, 5, 116-23.

O'Malley, J. M. , Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manazares, G., Kupper, L. & Russo, R. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. Language Learning, 35, 21-46.

_____. (1985). Learning strategy applications with students

ofEnglish as a second language. TESOL Quarterly, 557-84.

Oxford, R. (1989). Language learning strategies. What every teacher should know. New York. Newbury House/Harper & Row.

_____. (1989). Use of language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. System, 17, 1-13.

_____ , Lavine, R. & Crookall D. (1989). Language learning strategies, the communicative approach and their classroom implications. Foreign Language Annals, 22, 29-39.

_____ , and Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. Modern Language Journal, 73, 291-300.

_____ , Nyikos, M., and Ehrman, M. (1988). Vive la difference? Reflections on sex differences in use of language learning strategies. Foreign Language Annals, 21, 321-29.

Politzer, R. L. (1983). An exploratory study of self-reported language learning behaviors and their relation to achievement. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 6, 54-65.

Ramirez, A. G. (1986). Language Learning Strategies used by adolescents studying French in New York Schools. Foreign Language Annals, 19, 131-41.

Reiss, M. A. (1985). The good language learner. Another look. Canadian Modern Language Review, 41, 511-23.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the good language leaner can teach us. TESOL Quarterly, 9, 41-51.

_____. (1981). Study of cognitive processes in second language learning. Applied Linguistics,11, 118-31.

_____. (1987). Learner strategies. Theoretical assumptions, research, history, and typology. Learner Strategies in Language Learning. (Ed.), Wenden, A. L. & Rubin, J. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall 15-30.

_____, & Thompson, I. (1982). How to be a more successful language learner. Boston, MA, Heinle.

Stern, H. H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language

learner? Canadian Modern Language Review, 31, 304-18.

Wenden, A. L. (1985). Learner strategies. TESOL Newsletter, 19, 1-7.

_____. (1986). Helping language learners think about leaning. ELT Journal 40, 3-12.

_____. (1986). What do second language learners know about their language learning? A second look at retrospective accounts. Applied Linguistics, 7, 186-205.

영어를 학습하는 학습책략에 관한 설문조사

본 설문지는 학생 여러분들이 영어를 학습하는데 있어서 실제로 행하고 있는 것(What you actually do)에 관한 설문입니다. 이는 가령 어떻게 해야 할 것 같다든지, 다른 사람은 어떻게 하더라는 것에 대한 설문이 아닌 것을 의미합니다.

설문의 편의상 여러분이 해당하는 경우를 아래의 보기와 같이 5단계로 나누어 구분하였습니다

1. 전혀 그렇지 않다 (never)   2. 그렇지 않다 (seldom/rarely)
3. 어느 정도 그렇다 (maybe/sometimes) 4. 대체로 그렇다 (probably)
5. 확실히 그렇다 (absolutely)

각 문항별로 여러분이 해당되는 경우를 응답지에 기재하여 주기 바랍니다.

본 설문조사결과는 이 연구이외의 목적으로는 사용되지 아니함을 밝혀드리며 성실히 답변하여 주기 바랍니다.

1. 관용적인 표현이나 슬랭과 같은 비속어 또는 영어가사(예를 들어 팝송)를 많이 외우려 한다.

2. 되도록이면 회화테이프를 많이 듣고 반복학습하며 정기적으로 TV, RADIO와 같은 매체를 통하여 영어방송을 접한다.

3. 하루의 일상생활을 영어로 생각하고 말하려고 노력한다.

4. 길거리에 있는 사물이나 주위사물의 명칭을 영어로 번역하여 본다.

5. 영어수업시간에 다른 급우가 실수한 것을 알았을 때, 자기 스스로 정확한 답을 되새 긴다.

6. 영어로 무엇인가를 말하려고 할때 항상 말하려는 것을 먼저 모국어로 생각한 뒤에 문법 규칙과 동의어를 선택하여 영어문장을 작문한다.

7. 새로운 영어표현을 반복하여 말하거나 쓰면서 익힌다.

8. 영어를 모국어로 사용하는 자의 이야기하는 방법을 모방한다.

9. 이해가 될때까지 하나의 영어대화나 이야기를 여러번 반복하여 읽는다.

10. 영어단어의 의미를 알지 못할 때 내가 이미 알고 있는 부분과 모르는 부분을 나누어 그 의미를 찾는다.

11. 어원분석이나 단어책을 통하여 단기간에 많은 어휘를 익히려 한다.

12. 한번 익힌 단어를 계속하여 기억할 수 있도록 기회가 생길 때마다 그 영어단어를 사용 한다.

13. 사전에서 영어단어를 찾을 때 항상 그 단어의 용례를 설명하여 주는 예문을 읽는다.

14. 사전에서 영어단어를 찾을 때 큰소리로 영어단어의 발음을 하여 본다.

15. 학습한 영어단어의 기록을 기록카드나 단어목록을 이용하여 보존한다.

16. 새로운 영어단어의 암기를 위하여 그 단어로 문장을 만들어 암기한다.

17. 새로운 영어단어의 발음을 유사영어단어의 발음과 연관시켜 외운다.

18. 새로운 영어단어나 숙어를 그 단어가 사용된 길거리 간판, 게시판, 책의 페이지 등을 기억하여 암기한다.

19. 새로운 영어단어를 무조건 반복학습하여 외운다.

20. 영어에서 모르는 문법사항이 생길 때마다 즉각 확인하고 복습한다.

21. 말하거나 써야 할 정확한 영어단어를 생각해 낼 수 없을 때 그 생각을 표현할 다른 방법을 모색한다. 예를 들어 동의어를 사용하거나 그 상황을 묘사한다.

22. 영어회를 하는 중에 생각해 낼 수 없는 단어가 있으면 상대방에게 그 단어를 이야기 하여 달라고 한다.

23. 영어로 대화를 하는 중에 올바른 표현을 생각해 낼 수 없으면 몸짓을 이용하거나 한국어로 바꾸어 말한다.

24. 생소한 영어단어를 모두 찾지 않고 독서한다.

25. 듣거나 읽은 영어단어를 이해할 수 없을 때는 앞뒤 문맥이나 상황으로부터 그 의미에 대한 실마리를 찾는다.

26. 주위의 시선을 의식하지 않고 영어로 대화할 기회가 있을 때마다 어디서든 지 영어로 이야기 한다.

27. 영어에서 내가 부족하다고 느끼는 문법, 어휘, 패턴, 숙어등을 책을 참고하 여 몇번이고 학습한다.

28. 영어수업시간에 내가 올바른 답을 안다고 확신하는 경우에만 그 질문에 대 답하기를 자원한다.

29. 영어문법규칙에 따라 문장을 분석하지 않고 가능한 한 그 문장전체를 많이 암기하려고 한다.

30. 영어책을 읽을 때 나는 먼저 생소한 단어를 찾아 그 의미를 모국어로 책에 적어두고 그 다음에 책을 읽는다.

31. 영어를 모국어로 사용하는 자 또는 선생님의 영어발음을 주의깊게 듣고 나 의 잘못된 점을 교정하려고 한다.

32. 주로 영어를 연습할 목적으로 다른 사람과 회화를 한다.

33. 나에게 익숙한 주제나 표현으로 대화를 이끌려고 한다.

34. 영어를 학습할 때 미리 특정언어영역에 관심을 둘 것을 결정한다. 예를 들 어 영어 모국어 사용자가 발음하는 방법에 관심을 둔다.

35. 단지 시험에 대비해서만이 아니라 지속적으로 영어를 공부하고 연습할 시 간표를 짠다.

36. 보다 효율적인 영어학습을 위해 조용한 환경 및 편안한 장소와 같은 물리적 환경을 조성한다.

37. 영어에 대한 중요한 정보를 기록할 기록카드나 언어노트를 준비한다.

38. 자기 스스로 영어학습의 목표를 설정한다. 예를 들어, 장기적으로 내가 어 떻게 영어를 사용할 수 있게 되기를 원하는가, 또는 얼마나 능숙해 지기를 원하는가 등.

39. 명확하게 영어학습활동의 목적을 확인한다.

40. 영어를 사용하다가 발생한 나의 실수로부터 올바른 영어를 배운다.

41. 영어학습에서 내가 성취한 전체적인 성과를 평가한다.

42. 영어를 말할때 느끼는 긴장감이나 두려움을 자신감을 가지고 타파한다.

43. 영어로 대화함으로써 정신적 피로가 생기므로 때때로 영어를 사용하는 것을 꺼린다.

44. 영어를 사용하면서 불안감을 느낄때마다 휴식을 취하려고 한다.

45. 영어를 배우면서 현명하게 위험을 감수하도록 자신을 격려하면서 활동적으로 학습한다. 즉 약간의 실수를 한다 할 지라도 그 의미를 추측하거나 말을 하여 보려고 노력한다.

46. 영어를 학습할 때 내가 어떻게 느끼는 지에 대하여 다른 믿을만한 사람에게 이야기 한다.

47. 영어를 사용하는 것이 두려워 질 때마다 휴식을 취하려고 한다.

48. 영어학습일기장에 영어학습에 대한 나의 감정을 기록한다.

49. 상대방의 이야기를 이해하지 못했을 때 그에게 천천히 이야기하도록 요구하거나 반복하게 하여 무슨뜻인지를 내가 이해할 수 있도록 한다.

50. 나의 영어발음을 교정할 수 있도록 다른사람에게 도움을 구한다.

51. 학습정보를 공유하거나 복습 및 연습을 위하여 다른 영어학습자와 함께 공부한다.

52. 학교수업이외에 정기적인 영어학습상대자가 있다.

53. 영어로 다른 사람과 대화할 때 내가 관심이 있다는 것을 보이고 가능한 한 내가 대화에 관여한 것처럼 보이기 위하여 질문을 한다.

54. 영어가 사용되는 곳의 문화에 대하여 알려고 한다.

55. 영어로 생각을 어떻게 표현하는 지를 모르는 경우 다른 사람(선생님 또는 영어를 모국어로 사용하는 자)에게 도움을 구한다.

56. 누군가 당신이 영어로 말한 것을 상대방이 이해하지 못했을 때 다른 표현을 사용하여 상대방을 이해시킬려고 한다.

57. 영어회화를 할 때 교과서등에서 암기한 문장을 종종 사용한다.

58. 영어회화에서 당신은 때때로 수업에서 금방배운 단어나 구조를 종종 사용한다.

응 답 지

성명 : _____ 나이 : 만___세 학교 : _____ 성별 : _____

```
┌──────────────────────────────────────┐
│           응 답 보 기                  │
│  1. 전혀 그렇지 않다.(never)            │
│  2. 그렇지 않다.(seldom / rarely)      │
│  3. 어느 정도 그렇다.(maybe)           │
│  4. 대체로 그렇다.(probably)           │
│  5. 확실히 그렇다.(absolutely)         │
└──────────────────────────────────────┘
```

1._____	10._____	20._____	26._____	42._____	49._____
2._____	11._____	21._____	27._____	43._____	50._____
3._____	12._____	22._____	28._____	44._____	51._____
4._____	13._____	23._____	29._____	45._____	52._____
5._____	14._____	24._____	30._____	46._____	53._____
6._____	15._____	25._____	31._____	47._____	54._____
7._____	16._____		32._____	48._____	55._____
8._____	17._____		33._____		56._____
9._____	18._____		34._____		57._____
	19._____		35._____		58._____
			36._____		
			37._____		
			38._____		
			39._____		
			40._____		
			41._____		

Univ.(   ) Dept. (   ) No. (   ) Name. (   )

*** Fill in the blanks with the most suitable word.

The weather often changes ( ) people do and how they do it. The (   ) is important every day in our lives. ( ) may even change the way we feel ( ) think.

Meteorologists are scientists (   ) study the weather. They try to (   ) the weather. That is, they need to know ( ) the weather will be like tomorrow, next (   ),maybe next month. how do they find ( ) this information?

For a long time scientists have ( ) to predict the weather by looking at ( ). This doesn't work very well. If a man stands ( ) a very high mountain, he can only ( ) a small part of the weather. In 1820, a German ( ) showed that scientists could draw a ( ) of the way weather moves.

The weather of tomorrow ( ) far away today. It may move as (   ) as 30 miles an hour. It may move (   ) miles in 24 hours.

Because weather moves, the best (   ) to predict it is to use maps. You ( ) see a picture of the weather for large (   ) of the country on a map. Winter storms of (   ) and snow can be 1000 miles wide. Meteorologists can (   ) see a storm this big on a map.

In 1820, it (   ) difficult to make these maps. (   ) was it so difficult ? It was not (   ) then to get weather reports quickly. The (   ) needed the reports to make the maps. (   ) it is not difficult to get weather reports quickly (   ) everywhere.

Today the whole works together (   ) make weather maps.