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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The communicative approach to second language learning has encouraged learners to take greater responsibility for their own learning, and its principles have stimulated the use of appropriate, positive learning strategies. Parallel with the focus of research, there is growing interest in identifying learning behaviors and thought processes used by language learners.

The idea that students can be taught to be more effective and creative learners has been explored in relation to recent advances in cognitive psychology and other principles. With the advent of Interlanguage theory as well as the emergence of cognitive psychology, the importance of learner strategy has been demonstrated by a growing body of strategy research studies. There have been numerous books and articles discussing the identification, importance, implications, and teachability of learner strategies. Instruments for measuring them have been
designed and re-designed (Oxford, 1986).

Learner strategies can be tools which enable learners to "bridge the inevitable gap between classroom interaction and various communicative situations outside the classroom," thereby increasing their communicative competence (Faerch & Kasper, 1983: p. 56). Self-directed language learning is based on the condition that learners "believe in their potential to learn and to manage their learning and to be willing to assume a more responsible role" in the process of second language acquisition (Wenden, 1987: p.12).

Learner strategies are potentially useful in a number of learning situations. This potential will be realized when a person acquires facility in their use and familiarity with their application (O’Neil, 1978). According to Bialystok (1983), the best strategy users are those who have adequate proficiency in the target language and are able to modify their strategies appropriately to the task.

The importance of self-directed language learning is rightly addressed in Knowles’ (1975) statement:

One immediate reason (for teaching learner strategies) is that there is convincing evidence that people who take the initiative in learning (proactive learners) learn more things, and learn better, than do people who sit at the feet of teachers passively waiting to be taught (reactive learners)...A second immediate reason is that self-directed learning is more tune with our natural processes of psychological development. (p.14)
Researchers in the field of second language learning agree that using appropriate learning strategies enables students to take responsibility for their own learning by enhancing learner autonomy and self-direction. Faerch and Kasper (1983), for example, underscore the necessity for teaching strategy as follows:

If by teaching we mean passing on new information only, there is probably no need to 'teach' strategies. But if by teaching we also mean making learners conscious about aspects of their (already existing) behavior, it is obvious that we should teach them about strategies. (p.55)

The study of learner strategies is mainly linked to the analysis of such learner variables as personality, the level of proficiency, motivation, gender, and cultural background; the studies of learner factors and the choice of strategy have been done under the categories of lists, interviews, and think-aloud procedures, note taking, diaries, surveys, and training studies. These studies have provided insightful information about successful and unsuccessful learning and, at the same time, have led to the hypothesis that individual strategies may be the primary causes of performance differences (Prokop, 1989).

Without doubt, wider range and more appropriate choices of strategies correlate with more effective language learning. Moreover, understanding variables affecting the use of such strategies contributes to better insight into the "black box" of second language acquisition (Ehrman &
Oxford, 1989). The ultimate purpose of identifying the learning strategies used by successful learners is to enable the teacher to teach them to those students who are not yet using them (Prokop, 1989). Bialystok (1978) stresses the potential of teaching learner strategies:

...the teachability of learning strategies is especially promising because whereas aptitude is probably an unmodifiable variable in second language achievement, the strategies are by definition trainable. Thus, any language learner can be expected to improve his language proficiency by increasing his use of these learning strategies. (p.334)

A study by Weinstein (Weinstein, 1978) has provided evidence that a program of generalizable learning strategies could be developed and implemented in an educational or training environment. The successful development of a program to teach learner strategies will provide the individual learner with opportunities to maximize the acquisition, retention, and retrieval outcomes of his learning. However, one should take into account the fact that Wenden (1987) points out:

Facility in the use of self-instructional techniques or strategies must be accompanied by an internal change of consciousness. Otherwise, attempts at strategy training will meet resistance and may be doomed to failure... Together with the training in the use of strategies, the fostering of learner autonomy will require that learners become critically reflective of the conceptual context of their learning. They must be led to clarify, refine and expand their views of what language means and of what language entails. They should also understand the purpose for which they need to learn a second language. (p.12)
Even though there are several barriers to understanding learner strategies, it is clear that their implications for second language acquisition are great. The present study attempts to present a theoretical description and practical application of the concept of autonomy in learning English by Korean students by showing, in particular, which variables affect their choice of strategies and how they correlate. The study also seeks to demonstrate what implications can be suggested on the basis of its results. Based on Logan's (1978: p. 141) belief that deficient or proficient learner characteristics can be "compensated for or optimized" by specific learning techniques, the researcher can analyze the problem by addressing three smaller problem areas: (a) identification of learner characteristics, (b) examination into the relationship between learner variables and the choice of strategies, and (c) collection and analysis of the data.

Purpose of the Study

While many Korean students study in the United States, very little is known about the learner strategies they employ to learn English. The aim of this study is to examine and analyze some characteristics of Korean ESL students and their selection of learner strategies. The purpose of the present study is fourfold:
1. To identify the learner strategies and specific techniques that Korean ESL students employ to develop their communicative abilities in the United States;
2. To assess the effects of certain learner strategies on their level of proficiency;
3. To investigate the effects of such significant factors as classroom-specific personalities, level of oral proficiency, and cultural background on the use of good language learner strategies; and
4. To find out whether there is any relationship between those three variables and the learners’ use of reductive strategies, and if so, how they correlate with each other.

Research Questions

Various interpretations of learner strategies leave several questions unanswered. Are some learner strategies always successful? If not, what kind of less successful strategies do learners use? Which learner factors have an impact on the selection of strategies? And in what ways do learner factors correlate in selecting the strategy?

The present study addresses the following research questions:
1) Is there an interaction between the ESL learner’s level of oral proficiency and his/her choice of strategy?
2) In what ways do the intermediate learner and advanced learner differ in using successful and less successful
strategies?
3) Is there an interaction between learner’s personality and the selection of learner strategies?
4) How does Korean cultural background affect the choice of learner strategies?

Theoretical Bases

The theoretical bases for the present study can be found in Interlanguage theory, in Cognitive theory, and in Acculturation theory.

Recent research on second language learning strategy is based on the study of "Interlanguage" proposed by Selinker (cited in Taylor, 1975). In the field of second language teaching, learner strategies have been related to interlanguage as universal language-processing traits (Corder, 1983; Tarone, Cohen, & Dumas, 1983; Selinker, 1984; Ellis, 1986).

Selinker (cited in Taylor, 1975) calls the form of the target language as used by non-native speakers an "interlanguage." He argues that an interlanguage can be understood as a linguistic system which reflects how the second language learner acquires the target language. When beginning the study of language, learners rely heavily on their native languages for support due to their limited knowledge of the new language (Taylor, 1975). Once they become proficient in the target language, they rely less
frequently on their native languages and more frequently on
the target language, handling it directly, and transferring
or overgeneralizing its rules, (Taylor, 1975). Selinker
(cited in Taylor, 1975: p. 392) maintains that learner
interlanguage can be interpreted by considering "the
psychological learning strategies which the learner brings
to the language learning task, and which he exercises
regardless of his native language."

In the 1950s there was an increasing emphasis in
foreign/second language pedagogy on comprehending more
complex learner behaviors, such as problem-solving and
language processing. The failure of behaviorism to deal
adequately with these "higher-order" activities spurred the
growth of cognitive psychology (Dansereau, 1978), which has
contributed to research on learner behaviors and thought
processes and has begun to illuminate the importance of
learner strategies (Chamot & O'Malley, 1987).

According to Dansereau (1978: p. 3), cognitive
psychology focuses on the role of the organism's "covert
manipulations of the incoming stimuli in predicting
responses." Cognitive psychologists have attempted to
demonstrate operations and procedures that the student may
use to acquire, retain, and retrieve different kinds of
knowledge. Their research findings support the notion that
language learning requires "learners to actively integrate
new information into their own existing mental structures,

A model proposed by Singer and Dick (cited in Singer, 1978: p. 103) adequately describes the interaction between cognition and strategy (see Figure 1). In this framework, cognition is associated with "selective attention to the

Figure 1. The intermix of learner status, practice, and strategy variables in the learning process

minimal correct cues," "mental rehearsal," and "problem solving," and is closely linked to the production of strategies. Singer asserts that with training, skills are performed as if automatic. He further points out that those cognitive processes involved in the execution of an activity need to be identified and clarified and, at the same time, distinctions must be made according to the learning tasks,
learner's level of skill, and other individual variables.

Recent efforts to describe both second language acquisition and learning strategies within the cognitive theory proposed by Anderson (1985) also provide the necessary theoretical ground. In Anderson's view, information is stored in memory in two forms: "declarative knowledge, or what we know about a given topic" (e.g., grammar, rules, pronunciation, vocabulary), and "procedural knowledge, or what we know how to do" (e.g., communicative competence, functional proficiency, fluency). He also suggests three stages that describe the process of how language is acquired: (a) "a cognitive stage," in which learning is intentional, rule based, and often error accompanied; (b) "an associative stage," in which actions are performed more rapidly and errors begin to diminish; and (c) "an autonomous stage," in which actions are performed more fluently and the original rule governing the performance may no longer be retained.

Although he does not mention learning strategies, Anderson's description of these cognitive processes is congruent with the types of learning strategies. O'Malley, Chamot, and Walker (cited in Chamot & O'Malley, 1987) have suggested that learning strategies are declarative knowledge which may become procedural knowledge through practice. Learning strategies are conscious and deliberate when they are in the cognitive and associative stages of learning but
become automatic in the autonomous stage (Rabinowitz & Chi, cited in Chamot & O’Malley, 1987).

One of the most important findings from these studies is the formulation of learning strategies into an information-processing, theoretical model (O’Malley et al., 1985). A cognitive model of second language acquisition helps to show the process of how students acquire and retain a new language and also aids in identifying and explaining "the existence and use of specific learning strategies for different types of learners at various stages" in second language learning (Chamot & O’Malley, 1987: p. 87).

Acculturation appears to be a highly complex process when it is considered together with second language acquisition. Stauble (1978) properly illustrates the correlation between the acculturation process and second language learning:

...the second language learning process in particular is subject to interference from a number of acculturative influences which exist within the second language learner’s linguistic and cultural environment. These acculturative influences take the form of social and psychological factors which succeed with varying degrees of effectiveness in hindering some more than other learners from achieving maximal acculturation. Thus the more social and psychological distance there was between second language learners and the TLG (Target Language Group) the less likely they were to succeed in learning the target language, and the more social and psychological proximity there was between second language learners and the TLG the more likely they were to learn the target language. (p. 49)
Within the construct of social and psychological distance, Schumann (1976) explores those acculturative influences which have either encouraging or discouraging effects on SLA. According to Schumann, social distance involves such sociological factors as "domination versus subordination, assimilation versus adaptation versus preservation, enclosure, size, congruence, and attitude." Psychological distance involves such psychological factors as "resolution of language shock, culture shock, and culture stress, integrative versus instrumental motivation, and ego permeability" (p. 139). He has found that the subject who was the most socially and psychologically distant from the target language group acquired the least amount of English and employed many simplification and reduction strategies.

Linton (cited in Stauble, 1978) states that the acculturation process encompasses not only modifying one's cultural habits but also learning the appropriate linguistic patterns to perform within the target language group. Thus it seems that the overall process of acculturation can be said to be not only social adaptation but also psychological adaptation which involves the learning of the language, beliefs, attitudes, values, and other behavioral patterns of the target language group (Stauble, 1978). In conclusion, continued research into second language learning as part of the overall process of acculturation will yield fruitful insight into the differential success issue.
Definitions of Terms

The operational terms used in this study are defined as follows:

1. **Culture**: "Culture is the context within which we exist, think, feel, and relate to others (Brown, 1987: p. 147)." Culture, as behavioral patterns and modes of perception, becomes highly important in second language acquisition. Cross-cultural research has shown that there are indeed characteristics of culture that make one culture different from another and that cultural background has an effect on strategy choice. The term "culture" is used in this study to examine whether there is any relationship between Korean cultural background and strategy choice.

2. **Learner strategies**: Learner strategies refers to "language learning behaviors learners engage in to learn and manage the learning of a second language" (Wenden, 1987: p. 89). Bialystok (1978) defines learner strategies as "optional means for exploiting available information to improve competence in a second language" (p. 214).

Ellis (1986) divides learner strategies into an L2 learning strategy and an L2 using strategy. Similarly, the field of second language acquisition has distinguished between two types of strategy: learning strategies and communication strategies. Brown (1987) states that the former relates to "input" - to processing, storage, and retrieval, and the latter has more to do with "output" - or
how we express meaning in the language, how we act upon what we already know. In this study the term "learner strategies" covers both learning strategies and communication strategies.

3. **Successful learner strategies**: Successful learner strategies are those which help language learning and make it more effective. They are defined as those strategies used by good or successful language learners (Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975). In general, effective students use learning strategies more often, more appropriately, and with greater variety than ineffective students (Chamot & Kupper, 1989). The term "successful strategies" is used in this study to refer to cognitive strategies, memory strategies, metacognitive strategies, compensation strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies which could help learners acquire communicative competence.

4. **Unsuccessful learner strategies**: Unsuccessful strategies inhibit language learning and make it less productive. It is affirmed that less effective students have fewer strategy types and frequently use strategies that are inappropriate to the task (Chamot & Kupper, 1989). In addition to the learner's level of proficiency, the use of unsuccessful learner strategies seems to be related to such variables as personality and cultural background. In this study, the term "unsuccessful learner strategies" generally refers to such reductive strategies as the avoidance and/or
simplification of language usage.

5. **Proficiency**: The effects of aptitude on language learning have been measured in terms of the proficiency levels achieved by different classroom learners. This term entails composite meanings, that is, cognitive language ability and skills required in basic interpersonal communication (Ellis, 1986). The term "proficiency" is used in this study to refer to students' oral proficiency measured by the SPEAK test. The test requires the following skills: vocabulary, accent, pronunciation, fluency, and listening comprehension. The present study uses intermediate and advanced groups, and students' TOEFL scores are also used as a reference.

6. **Personality**: In general psychology, personality has been explored in terms of a number of personal traits, which in aggregate are said to constitute the personality of an individual. For example, Myers (cited in Ellis, 1986) attempts to measure personality using a series of dichotomies such as Introversion/Intuition/Thinking/Judging. Ellis (1986) claims that different personality characteristics are involved in promoting communicative and linguistic abilities.

As Ely (1986) has already demonstrated, the term "personality" in the present study deals with three aspects: "Language Class Risk-taking," "Language Class Sociability," and "Language Class Discomfort." The first two constructs,
Language Class Risk-taking and Language Class Sociability, are associated with extroversion-introversion, and Language Class Discomfort, a third construct, is concerned with the degree of anxiety, self-consciousness, or embarrassment felt when speaking the L2 in the classroom (Fly, 1986).

Assumptions
In order to conduct the present study, the following assumptions were made:
1. It was assumed that the selection of successful or unsuccessful strategies was influenced by personality, the level of oral proficiency, and cultural background.
2. It was assumed that advanced learners used more successful strategies than intermediate learners.
3. It was assumed that the successful use of reductive strategies could impede language learning, especially speaking ability.

Significance of the Study
It is important to investigate the learner strategies of Korean ESL students, since this work could be the cornerstone to help them acquire greater communicative proficiency. In the following discussion, the teaching methods of English education in Korea and the differences between Korean and American culture which might affect Korean ESL students' choice of learner strategies are
discussed in terms of their relevance to this study.

Large class size and the scarcity of competent teachers in Korea are found to be the most impeding factors in the development of effective language learning. Furthermore, only grammar and vocabulary knowledge and reading skills are tested on the college entrance examinations. Foreign language teachers rarely mention how students should tackle their learning tasks or how to cope with their linguistic and communicative limitations.

Even in prestigious universities, teacher education in English focuses on teaching English literature and linguistics rather than on effective ways of teaching language and culture or how to develop the students' communicative competence. The fact that most faculty members' major is either English literature or linguistics contributes to the lack of an integrated curriculum of English education at universities.

In intercultural communication, misunderstanding may occur because the speaker and the listener do not share the same values and communication patterns. Condon (1972) lists four categories of culture that cause misunderstanding: language, non-verbal language, differences in values, and differences in reasoning and rhetoric. In the United States, the mode of communication is based on independence, argument, and individualism (Kim, 1983). In Korea, on the other hand, the principles of communication are
interdependence, harmony, and modesty (Kim, 1983). For example, Korean students hesitate to ask questions or present their ideas in class unless they are sure that their questions and ideas are intelligent ones. As a Korean adage, "Silence is gold," implies, keeping quiet is regarded as a virtue even in the classroom.

While Americans like to seek agreement/disagreement, Koreans sometimes choose not to say yes/no when either of them is expected (Kim, 1983). This ambiguity is sometimes not acceptable in English, yet in Korean expressing yes or no explicitly is sometimes considered too direct or rude in interpersonal communication. As a result, Korean students often do not know what level of directness they should employ in communicating with English speakers.

To sum up the cultural differences, they are based on two different philosophical systems: American culture is characterized by democracy, pragmatism, individualism, logical and critical thinking, openness, and equality; whereas Korean culture is based on Confucianism, vertical relationships, group-orientedness, harmony, modesty, unequal relationships between men and women, respect for honor and reputation, and subjective and emotional thinking (Park, 1979). These differences may cause misunderstanding and frustration in intercultural communication.

There are noteworthy differences between the two cultures. In addition, Korean students have not learned the
appropriate use of strategies, especially communicative strategies due to the large class size, lack of competent teachers, and grammar and reading centered teaching. Therefore, it may not be too imprudent to assume that Korean learners are likely to have a difficulty in overcoming their limited English knowledge.

The results of this study may help to define the role of proficiency, personality, and ethnic background in the learning processes of Korean learners of English. While various studies in the United States have been conducted involving the role of proficiency and personality in learner strategies of ESL students, as yet no investigation has been done on the learner strategies of Korean learners of English as a second language.

The present study is the first attempt to obtain and compare data of successful and unsuccessful learner strategies employed by Korean students of English as a second language with special consideration of the effects of personality, level of proficiency, and cultural background on the choice of strategies.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This study is based on several studies conducted in foreign/second language learner strategies. The review of literature falls into the following sections: 1. some characteristics and taxonomies of learner strategies; 2. learner factors and the choice of strategies; 3. the characteristics of good or successful learner strategies; 4. negative aspects of learner strategies.

Some Characteristics and Taxonomies of Learner Strategies

Learner strategies have been defined as learning tactics, cognitive skills, language learning process, problem solving techniques or autonomous/self-directed learning skills (Wenden, 1987; Oxford & Crookall, 1989). Holec (1979) refers to autonomy as "the ability to take charge of one's own learning" (p. 158). However, he claims that the potential to make language learning more effective can function only if two conditions are satisfied: that the
learner is willing to accept responsibility and that he is also capable of doing so. According to him, this ability is "not inborn but must be acquired by natural means or by formal learning, in a systematic, deliberate way" (p.3). The nature of self-directed language learning thus implies redefinition of the teacher's role as well as the learner's role (Holec, 1979). To quote Knowles (1975):

In its broadest meaning, "self-directed learning" describes a process in which individuals take the initiative, with or without the help of others, in diagnosing their learning needs, formulating learning goals, identifying human and material resources for learning, choosing and implementing appropriate learning strategies, and evaluating learning outcomes. (p.18)

Strategy study is originated by Canale and Swain's research (1980), which identifies the learner's ability to handle the limitations of the target language knowledge as an integral part of his/her communicative competence. Canale and Swain (1980) have referred to this ability of using communication strategies as the learner's "strategic competence." In its focusing on the learner's communicative ability, the notion of a strategic competence seems to be in accordance with recent attempts to facilitate the learner's knowledge and abilities in L2 learning and communication. Both the concept of a strategic competence and communicative strategies share two characteristics: a learner consciously attempts to convey his ideas when his target language competence is not adequate to the task; and, while using the
strategy, the learner should outperform his actual ability (Marton, 1983).

Several researchers have divided strategies into categories from different perspectives, yet they seem to agree that strategies refer to what learners do to learn and that "appropriateness of most strategies is governed by the nature of the task" (Oxford and Crookall, 1989: p. 409). Brown (1987) divides strategies into learning, which involves input—the processing, storage, and retrieval of information; and communication, which involves output—expressing, manipulating, and compensating. Similarly, Tarone (1980) divides strategies into ones which concern language learning, and ones which concern language use. Bialystok (1981) calls these formal and functional strategies. In all three designs, there is a division between the strategies used in mastering or developing conventions of a linguistic code (those that deal with input), and strategies used in producing or expressing (those that deal with output).

Research by O'Malley and Chamot et al. (1985) describes learning strategies as metacognitive (e.g., planning, monitoring, and evaluating, thinking about learning process), cognitive (e.g., specific learning tasks), and socioaffective (e.g., activities involving affective and social factors like cooperative learning). Oxford and Crookall (1989) have clustered learning strategies into six
groups; a) cognitive strategies - manipulating the language in some direct way; b) memory strategies - storing new information and retrieving it later; c) compensation strategies - inferencing or using synonyms; d) metacognitive strategies - centering, arranging, planning, and evaluating; e) affective strategies - obtaining better control over emotions, attitudes, and motivations through self-reinforcement and self-encouragement; and f) social strategies - asking questions, cooperating, and developing empathy. Recently, Ehrman and Oxford (1990) categorized the taxonomy mentioned above into two groups, the direct strategy group and the indirect strategy group. While direct strategies involve direct use of the language and include memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies, indirect strategies such as metacognitive, affective, and social strategies do not directly involve using the language although they certainly aid language learning (Ehrman & Oxford, 1990).

Communication strategies are used when there is a gap between the learner’s knowledge of the target language and the learner’s communicative intent. Even though communication strategies are less directly related to language learning compared to the learning strategies, they are also crucial since "they allow the learner to remain in the conversation and gain essential opportunities to practice what they have learned and test new hypotheses"
(Rubin, 1987: p. 27)." While most researchers differentiate learning strategy from communicative strategy from different views, it is difficult to set them apart in a real situation. The present study adopts "the learner strategy" which encompasses both receptive and productive aspects.

In spite of the shortage of consensus, there seem to be two assumptions that researchers all share: all learner strategies are problem-oriented and amenable to change, and all appropriate learner strategies are steps toward the achievement of communicative competence (Oxford et al, 1989).

**Learner Factors and the Choice of Learner Strategies**

In addition to developing instruments to measure students' specific learning styles, researchers have also concerned themselves with personality characteristics, cognitive styles, and specific strategies used by successful vs. unsuccessful language learners. Various models have been suggested with the aim of identifying essential factors involved in the second language learning process and indicating ways in which they are likely to interact.

In a model proposed by Stern (cited in Huang, 1984: p. 15), five sets of variables have been distinguished (see Figure 2). In this framework, social context is considered to have an influence on learner characteristics and learning conditions. These are proposed as determiners of the
Figure 2. Stern's Model for Examination of Second Language Learning
learning process, which in turn decides the learning outcomes (Huang, 1984). In Stern’s model, the learning process "can be looked upon as consisting overtly of strategies and techniques employed by the learner, and covertly, of conscious and unconscious mental operations" (cited in Huang, 1984: p.14). The concept of learner strategy has not been defined in exactly the same way in strategy studies, yet it basically entails the characteristics of learning behaviors and cognitive processes.

Several researchers have studied specific factors related to the choice of language learning strategies. These factors include: the level of language proficiency, sex, personality, attitudes and motivation, cultural background, and field of specialization (Huang, 1984; Wesche, 1979; Bialystok, 1979; Naiman et al., 1978; Ehrman & Oxford, 1989). All of these learner variables interact to affect a learner’s choice of a strategy, as well as the ability to determine which strategies are appropriate in a given situation. Following is an overview of recent research contributing to the study of learner differences (personality, cultural background, and the level of proficiency) on strategy choice in second language acquisition.

In the model of second language learning proposed by Stern (cited in Huang, 1984), learners’ affective aspects
have a direct influence on the learning process. It is common that, in spite of a good teacher, effective teaching methods, the best learning environment, and a high level of language learning aptitude, the learner often fails to achieve his communicative goal because of an affective block. Oxford (1986) supports this view: the use of strategies is related primarily to the learner's attitude and not to language-learning aptitude. Rubin (cited in Pearson, 1988) also includes both cognitive factors and personality factors as being equally relevant and significant to successful second-language acquisition. Brown (1987) rightly points out:

...of the major facets of human behavior, the affective domain is the most important in governing a person's success in second language learning. After all, human behavior in general is dominated by emotion. (p.113)

Several studies investigated the degree to which students' personality characteristics influence their attitudes toward various learning activities in the language classroom. For instance, strong anxiety may cause some learners to give up active efforts toward learning the language but may cause other learners to try harder, as Bailey (cited in Oxford, 1989) has discovered.

Ehrman and Oxford (1989) have explored the possible cognitive styles of language learners in terms of their Myers-Briggs personality types: extroverts/introverts; sensing types/intuitives; thinkers/feelers; and
judgers/perceivers. In this study, extroverts used social strategies more frequently and easily, yet introverts obviously preferred metacognitive strategies, and generally rejected affective and social strategies. They also suggest that certain personality traits correlate highly with success in language learning: sense of humor, achievement orientation, assertiveness, outgoingness, impulsivity, risk-taking, adventurousness, flexibility, tolerance of ambiguity and frustration, confidence, determination, and empathy. However, they conclude that most students belong between two types and use "cross-type strategies."

In a slightly different vein, Ely (1988) attempted to operationalize personality variables in the specific context of second language learning. Focusing on situation-specific personality, Ely (1986) has found that "Language Class Risk-taking" and "Language Class Sociability" affect students' voluntary classroom participation and that a tendency to take risks is associated with greater language learning success. Ely (1986) developed a scale of Language Class Discomfort which reflected the self-consciousness, anxiety and embarrassment learners experienced when taking part in a language class. From this research, he concludes that anxious students are less likely to participate in class.

To sum up, personality type appears to affect the way learners use strategies, and to identify a learner's personality type offers "an accessible conceptual framework

Although several researchers have mentioned that national origin or ethnicity has an impact on the kinds of strategies used by language learners, only a few studies out of hundreds have dealt with this issue. In one study, Politzer and McGroarty (1985) have found that cultural background is strongly linked to the type of language learning behavior. They discovered that although Asians engage in good learning behaviors less frequently than Hispanics, they surpassed Hispanics in average gains in linguistic competence and on the discrete-point measure of communicative competence. They also report that oriental students tend to prefer strategies involving rote memorization and language rules compared to more communicative strategies.

In previous studies (Russo & Stewner-Manzanares, 1985; Chamot, cited in Oxford & Crookall, 1989), Hispanics responded favorably to strategy training and benefitted from training, while Asian students resisted training and insisted on their own established rote strategies. In addition, Reid (cited in Oxford, 1989) discovered that learners of certain nationalities preferred working independently and resisted social, cooperative learning.
This finding supports the ethnic differences in strategy use found by Politzer and McGroarty (1985).

Sutter (cited in Oxford, 1989) maintains that strategy preferences are linked to learners' national origin or cultural background, and have an impact on the success of second language learning. Sutter found it essential to "camouflage the new strategies under the guise of old, familiar ones" (p. 243). From an interview study, Pearson (1988) concludes that "culture shock" might be a factor inhibiting the use of learning strategies. As Pearson (1989) points out, the length of the stay in a foreign culture may not facilitate second-language learning; on the contrary, it may generate additional inhibiting factors by creating negative attitudes towards the other culture and encouraging ethnocentric and prejudiced thinking.

Politzer and McGroarty (1985) point out that, analyzing the studies done to date on this issue, some of the good learner strategies discussed in recent research may be ethnocentrically based on Western cultural values. For that reason, even if these behaviors are regarded as valid, they may not lead to effective language learning depending on the learners' cultural backgrounds (Politzer & McGroarty, 1985). Nevertheless, it seems promising to find that strategy training made all students more aware of their learning processes (Russo & Stewner-Manzenares, 1985). Whether they were attracted to certain strategies or not, all students
showed an improvement in performance after strategy training (Russo & Stewner-Manzanares, 1985).

With respect to ethnic background, it is obvious that strategy study is "culturally loaded" (Skehan, 1989). Different groups may have different standards for strategy use. Thus, it is possible to interpret these strategies only "within the set of cultural assumptions that hold within each group" (Faerch & Kasper, cited in Skehan, 1989: p. 85).

Learners' proficiency level is strongly believed to affect their use of strategies (Ellis, 1986; O'Malley & Chamot et al., 1985). Bialystok (1983) has found that advanced learners use more L2-based strategies than L1-based strategies, and a similar result has been discovered in Haastrup and Phillipson's study (1983). Similarly, Tarone (1983) found that subjects with lower proficiency levels prefer reduction strategies to achievement strategies. In addition, Politzer (cited in Oxford, 1989) has found that course level influenced foreign language learning strategies, with higher-level students using more positive strategies. However, Chamot et al. (cited in Oxford, 1989) discovered that social-affective strategy use remained very low across all course levels in spite of the increased use of metacognitive strategy compared to cognitive strategy use with the advancement in course level. In a slightly different vein, Prokop (1989) has found that students at
intermediate and advanced levels benefit less from instruction in using second language learning strategies than do beginners.

Chamot and Kupper (1989) proposed that all students, no matter what their degree of success in learning a foreign language, have some cognitive control over their own mental processes. Their point is that beginning learners also use advanced learner strategies, but the main differentiation between the more effective students and the less effective ones is in the way in which strategies are used and the range of strategies. By the same token, more successful students use learning strategies "more often, more appropriately, with greater variety, and in ways that help them complete the task successfully" (Chamot & Kupper, 1989: p. 17). Less effective students, on the other hand, not only have fewer strategies, but also frequently use strategies that are not proper to the task (Chamot & Kupper, 1989).

Bialystok (1983) maintains that proficiency obviously is linked to the effective implementation of strategies while not being directly related to the exact strategy that will be employed. In addition, Oxford and Crookall (1989) state that students appear to discard less productive strategies and to match the strategy to the task as they become more advanced. As Bialystok (1983) claims, it seems clear that "a minimal level of proficiency is required for
learners to have at their disposal an adequate range of strategies from which to select" (p. 178).

Despite the lack of agreement on the definition of learner strategies and on some of the variables that would affect them, the use of appropriate learning strategies apparently leads to successful language learning (Chamot & Kupper, 1989), so self-directed language learning should proceed actively in and outside the classroom (Oxford, 1986; Wenden, 1987; Rubin, 1987; Oxford & Crookall, 1989).

The Characteristics of Successful Learner Strategies

To better understand the nature of learner strategies, the good or successful language learner has been a primary focus. Even though learner strategies have been identified in good language learners (Rubin, 1975; Reiss, 1985; Oxford, 1986; Stern, 1975; Abraham & Vann, 1987), as Brown (1987) points out, a clear-cut definition has not been given for the good language learner. Nevertheless, if the identification of the good language learner serves as a general goal for strategy teaching and provides the optimistic assumption that these characteristics can be transferred to other learners, it would be helpful to examine good language learner strategies

In general, successful learners are more creative and flexible in adjusting themselves to new learning conditions and in developing their preferred learning techniques. They
seem to be keenly aware of their advantages as well as difficulties, and have insights into their learning process and their own learning techniques.

Stern (1975) has developed a profile of the specific learning techniques employed by successful learners: an active approach to the learning task; a tolerant and outgoing approach to the target language; technical know-how to tackle a language; willingness to practice and to use the language in real situations; strategies of experimentation and planning for the purpose of developing the target language; looking for meaning; self-monitoring; and critical sensitivity to language use.

Rubin and Thompson (1982) report that the good language learner decides the learning methods that fit well for him/her, organizes, is creative, makes opportunities to practice, learns to live with uncertainty, uses memory devices, learns from errors, uses linguistic knowledge and the context to enhance comprehension, makes intelligent guesses, memorizes word strings as a whole, learns formalized routines, employs certain production techniques, and uses varying styles of speech.

Rubin (1987) in more recent research restates that a good language learner is a willing and accurate guesser; eager to communicate or to learn from communication; often not inhibited; attentive to form and meaning; able to take advantage of opportunities to practice; conscious of his own
speech as well as that of others. Despite some ambiguity, Rubin’s strategies are widely accepted in the research field (Huang, 1984; Reiss, 1985).

The main reason that some language learners are more successful than others seems to be rooted in differences of cognitive and metacognitive behaviors, so successful strategies should be learned by less effective learners. Effective language learners evidently use a variety of appropriate metacognitive, cognitive, and socioaffective strategies for both receptive and productive skills while less effective students use such strategies less frequently and often do not choose appropriate strategies for the task. However, it sounds reasonable that the effects of the strategies are not universal; the effects, rather, are specific according to the language learning tasks (Bialystok, 1979). Furthermore, learners may combine both successful and unsuccessful learner’s characteristics in real life (Stern, 1975). An important suggestion from the study of good language learner strategies is the necessity of integrating strategy study with the study of other learner factors, such as cognitive styles, attitudinal and motivational factors, personality traits and ethnic background.

Negative Aspects of Learner Strategies

While many researchers have focused on good learner
strategies, some researchers argue that learners use both successful and unsuccessful strategies. Several researchers assert that the effectiveness of learner strategies should not be considered in any absolute sense but rather as relative. For example, some researchers share the opinion that strategies can make learning more efficient and productive, while Politzer and McGroarty (1985) claim that not all strategies can be proper in all situations and for all learning purposes. Willems (1987), and Faerch and Kasper (1983) show the same reaction: learner strategies can be positive and negative.

Research on communication strategies concerns itself with such issues as how learners attempt to solve communication problems when they lack adequate competence in the target language (Corrales & Call, 1989). In the process of working out a problem, learners may attempt to solve it in one of two ways -- either by avoiding the problem or by coping with it (Corrales & Call, 1989). If learners adopt avoidance strategies, they avoid topics which require the use of unfamiliar rules and forms. If, on the other hand, they choose to attempt to communicate, they will use "resource-expansion strategies" to express their thoughts (Corrales & Call, 1989).

Second language teachers often notice their students using such reductive strategies as "simplification," and "avoidance." Claiming that reduction strategies cannot be
easily identified as achievement strategies, Willems (1987) describes the reductive behavior adequately on the basis of learner’s psychological aspects:

...often learners, for fear of making mistakes, leave things unsaid that they want to say, without trying to verbalize them with the help of achievement strategies. Learners seem to think that there must be a "correct" way of saying what they have in mind. If they do not have this correct formulation at their disposal they prefer saying nothing. For these reasons, I strongly feel that achievement strategies should be encouraged in spite of all the consequences this may have for the (in)correctness of the language, if only to diminish our learners’ reduction behavior. Reduction behavior is, obviously, a major obstacle to language development. (p. 354)

Kleinmann (1977) states that both linguistic and psychological variables determine learner behavior in a second language and that the use of avoidance and simplification strategies largely depends on the affective state of the learner with respect to such variables as confidence and levels of anxiety. According to him, confidence does not necessarily indicate the learner’s knowledge; rather, it reflects the learner’s perception of his knowledge, which may or may not be accurate. Holec (cited in Wenden, 1987) adds the critical point:

If learners are to be weaned away from their state of dependence to one of independence or autonomy, they must not only acquire a number of relevant learning techniques but also experience a change of psychological attitude towards what learning is. (p. 11)

Tarone, Cohen, and Dumas (1983) categorize avoidance strategies in three types: topic avoidance, semantic
avoidance, and message abandonment. According to them, topic avoidance is the attempt to totally evade communication about topics which require the use of target language rules or forms which the learner does not know very well. Topic avoidance may take the form of either a change of topic or no verbal response. In semantic avoidance, the learner avoids the communication by talking about related concepts which may presuppose the intended message. The final type of avoidance strategy is message abandonment where communication on a topic is initiated but then cut short because the learner encounters difficulty with a target language form or rule. Those avoidance strategies carry common characteristics in that they are used "where the gap is perceived as unbridgeable" (Tarone, 1981: p. 288).

The use of either "simplification" or "avoidance" strategy results from the learners' feeling of linguistic inadequacy or lack of target language knowledge. Under the influence of some social and psychological factors, this type of strategy can lead to a fossilized form of the target language (Blum & Levenston, 1977; Schumann, cited in Marton, 1983). The reality might be that such behavior is in some ways dominant to learner strategy use, but there is still a lot of work to be done in this area.
Summary

As reflected in the literature review, some ambiguities about learner strategies still exist, and the need for further study is supported. On the whole, research on second language learner strategies is still in its infancy. Many questions concerning the learning process and strategies still remain unanswered. Attempts have been made in the last decade to identify and verify specific learner strategies which are believed to account for successful learning. While the effectiveness of the various strategies may vary from learner to learner and from task to task, a successful second language learner is likely to take "an active, independent, persistent, self-assured approach to a learning task, to process information at a deeper level rather than merely repeating or memorizing it, and to integrate it with his pre-existing knowledge" (Prokop, 1989: p. 37). Nevertheless, these strategy lists are by no means complete; they are tentative and subject to further confirmation and modification through investigation and experimentation.

In addition, research on the role of learner variables in the choice of strategies reveals that such learner variables as the level of proficiency, cultural background, and personality factors have an effect on the use of successful and unsuccessful strategies. To date, it is believed that most of these factors affect learners' choice
of strategies, but more research is required to allow firm conclusion to be reached. The current study is an attempt to further examine effects of oral proficiency, personality, and ethnic background on the selection of language learning strategies in the second language acquisition process.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Population

The population in this study consists of Korean graduate students who have come to the United States to further their study at American universities. Most Korean students have at least six years of English: three years in middle school and three years in high school. Under a highly centralized educational system, they have studied English using textbooks authorized by the Ministry of Education. However, supplementary textbooks or workbook materials vary depending on the schools. In secondary schools, more emphasis is placed on grammar and translation than on listening and speaking.

Students are admitted to college on the basis of their high school academic records and scores on nationally administered college entrance examinations. Regardless of their major field of study, all college freshmen are required to take three credit hours of English each semester.
It is a general policy that most universities in the United States require foreign applicants whose native language is not English to submit scores from either the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) or the MELAB (Michigan English Language Assessment Battery). Korean students who want to study at universities in the United States typically take the TOEFL to demonstrate their English proficiency.

Sample

The sample consisted of 14 Korean graduate students at a major midwestern university: ESL learners of spoken English for international graduate students (English 104 & 105). They took a placement test in order to be placed in the appropriate class. Some students in 105 had started in 104. All subjects solicited for participation in the study came to the United States as foreign students to further their education and were working on their graduate degree at the time of the study.

Information on each subject’s background such as age, the length of stay in the U.S., gender, and TOEFL score was obtained through a questionnaire (see Appendix D). Of the 14 subjects, eleven (79%) were male and three (11%) were female. The average length of their stay in the U.S. was eighteen months. Six subjects had been in the U.S. less than a year and seven subjects had been in the U.S. for two
years. One subject had been here for four years, which was the longest duration of stay among the subjects.

The average age of the subjects was 31 years. The youngest subject was 26 and the oldest was 38. The length of English study of the subjects ranged from ten to fifteen years. Their self-reported TOEFL scores ranged from 550 to 600. When asked to describe their overall English proficiency, most subjects answered 'average' or 'good' to the question, and two subjects marked 'poor'. Not surprisingly, when asked to rank in order their language skills from strongest to least strong, 90% of the subjects ranked them in the following order: (1) reading (2) writing (3) listening (4) speaking.

**Design**

The study attempted to address the research questions posed in the previous section by means of analyzing and comparing the data using three instruments: SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning), an adapted strategy questionnaire regarding less successful strategies, and a personality questionnaire designed by Ely (1988).

For statistical analysis of data, this study employed a chi-square test and ridit analysis. This study included three independent variables.

The first independent variable--English proficiency--consisted of two levels of proficiency:
1. advanced
2. intermediate

The second independent variable--personality--consisted of three levels:
1. language class risk-taking
2. language class sociability
3. language class discomfort

The third independent variable was Korean cultural background; the existence of a relationship between Korean cultural background and the selection of strategies was examined.

The study used two dependent variables: scores on a reductive strategy questionnaire and scores on SILL as measured by the researcher's own scoring system.

**Instruments**

SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) was utilized as the data-gathering instrument (see Appendix A). SILL assesses the frequency that learners use various techniques for second/foreign language acquisition. It is a 50-item, Likert-scaled, self-report instrument. SILL has been used for students of second and foreign languages in schools and government agencies. Strategy descriptions on SILL were drawn from a comprehensive taxonomy of language learning strategies that covers the four language skill areas of listening, reading, speaking, and writing.

A strategy questionnaire (see Appendix B) adapted from Reiss' 1985 study concerning less successful strategies was used as the data gathering instrument for the purpose of comparing the use of successful strategies and unsuccessful strategies. It was expected that the less successful language learner would use these strategies more often.

This questionnaire consists of 8 questions regarding such personality variables as introversion, extroversion, and low/high tolerance of ambiguity. The questionnaire also deals with motivation to communicate, attending to form/meaning, practicing, monitoring, and using mnemonics. Each item is followed by a five-point Likert response scale with the alternatives labeled: "never or almost never true of me," "usually not true of me," "somewhat true of me," "usually true of me," and "always or almost always true of me."

The personality questionnaire (see Appendix C) designed by Ely (1988) was used in order to inquire into the degree
to which students' personality characteristics influenced their attitudes toward various learning activities. The aspects of personality included in this design are "Language Class Risk-taking," "Language Class Sociability," and "Language Class Discomfort." "Language Class Risk-taking" refers to the degree to which an individual tends to take risks in using the L2 in the second language class. "Language Class Sociability" is the degree to which one likes to interact in class by means of the second language. The third personality variable included in the study was that of "Language Class Discomfort." This variable represents the degree of anxiety, self-consciousness, or embarrassment felt when speaking the foreign language in the classroom.

Procedures

This study was conducted during the winter quarter at a major midwestern university. There were seven subjects in each of two groups. Subjects in 104 and 105 were randomly assigned to the Language questionnaire (see Appendix E), which integrated SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning), the adapted questionnaire regarding less successful strategies, and the personality questionnaire. This session took approximately one hour. Prior to the experiment, students got a brief letter which stated that their foreign language learning experiences and their ideas
about the learning processes and strategies would be extremely helpful to a research project on Korean students’ ESL learning in the U.S. (see Appendix F). However, the purpose and the nature of the project was not described in detail, in order not to invalidate the results.

At the beginning of the session, the subjects were orally informed that they would be participating in an experiment to investigate the use of English strategies of Korean students studying in the United States. They were also assured that none of the results of the questionnaire would be revealed to their teachers, and that the results would absolutely not influence their school marks.

Along with the oral instructions, each subject was asked to carefully read the written directions in English. The subjects were then informed that during the experiment they would be asked to choose answers to 74 questions. There was no strict time limit for reading and answering those questions.

Data Analysis

For the test of significance, the data were analyzed using the chi-square test and ridit analysis. In order to facilitate the comprehensibility of this study, the concepts of these two methods of statistical analyses were described briefly.
Chi-square is defined as "the inferential statistic most frequently used for nominal and partially ordered data arranged in contingency table format" (Wright, 1986: p. 514). A coefficient of 0 indicates no association, and 1.0 indicates a perfect association (Wright, 1986). The interpretation for the chi-square is somewhat limited, because chi-square tells only whether any association exists in the population, not how much association exists (Wright, 1986). This limitation can be overcome by way of ridit analysis.

The term ridit is derived from the initials of "relative to an identified distribution" (Bross, 1958). Ridit analysis is based on the observed distribution of a response variable for a specified set of individuals. It is especially useful when the response variable is a subjective scale (e.g., a well ordered series of categories such as "never true of me," "somewhat true of me," "always true of me") (Bross, 1958).

Ridit analysis begins with "the selection of a population to serve as a standard or reference group" (Fleiss, 1981: p.151). The average ridit has a probability interpretation, which is an estimate of the chance that an individual in a comparison class is "worse off" or "better off" than an individual in the reference class. The average ridit for the identified distribution is always 0.5 (Bross, 1958). For example, if the mean ridit for a comparison
group is greater than 0.5, then more than half of the time a randomly selected subject from it will have a more extreme value than a randomly selected subject from the reference group (Fleiss, 1981). Ridit analysis not only shows that individuals in the comparison group are better off than individuals in the reference class, but it also indicates how much better off they are (Bross, 1958).

The present study proposed to investigate the effects of personality, cultural background, and the level of proficiency on the choice of language learning strategies. Each student's score was rated first. Then, each class score was totalled and compared. Thus, which variable affected the choice of strategy and how those variables related to each other were investigated. The study also examined whether Korean cultural background had an effect on their choice of strategy. Since the degree of subjects' responses was converted to a number, it was possible to calculate chi-square test of independence and average ridits in a category.

**Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted during the second week of February, 1991 in order to: (1) refine experimental procedures, determine appropriate time allotments of the task, examine the clarity of directions; and (2) verify the level of content difficulty.
The pilot study involved six Korean speakers who were all college graduates. Two of the students were taking English 104 at the time of the study, and the remaining four had already finished English 105.

After finishing all the tasks, the participants were asked to give their opinions as to which questions were ambiguous or difficult to comprehend, and whether the written directions were clear. One change was made in SILL questions. The original question, "I start conversations in English," was replaced by "I start conversations when I meet an English speaker," which made more sense to the students. On the whole, the questionnaires and written directions were considered appropriate for the study. No procedural change was made as a result of the pilot study.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Overview of the Data

The present study proposed to investigate the effects of the level of proficiency, personality, and cultural background on the measures of reductive strategy and SILL strategy used by Korean students learning English as a second language. As a summary of measurements, Table 1 through Table 12 on the following pages present the scores (the number of subjects * the number of questions) on the reductive strategy and SILL strategy questionnaires.

Table 1: The Frequency (F) of Reductive Strategy Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>104 Group (n=7*8)</th>
<th>105 Group (n=7*8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* 1: never or almost never true of me
* 2: usually not true of me
* 3: somewhat true of me
* 4: usually true of me
* 5: always or almost always true of me

Table 2: The Frequency (F) of Memory Strategy (Part A) Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>104 Group (n=7*9)</th>
<th>105 Group (n=7*9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The Frequency (F) of Cognitive Strategy (Part B) Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>104 Group (n=7*14)</th>
<th>105 Group (n=7*14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: The Frequency ($F$) of Compensation Strategy (Part C) Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>104 Group ($n=7*6$)</th>
<th>105 Group ($n=7*6$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: The Frequency ($F$) of Metacognitive Strategy (Part D) Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>104 Group ($n=7*9$)</th>
<th>105 Group ($n=7*9$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: The Frequency ($F$) of Affective Strategy (Part E) Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>104 Group ($n=7*6$)</th>
<th>105 Group ($n=7*6$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: The Frequency (F) of Social Strategy (Part F) Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>104 Group ( (n=7*6) )</th>
<th>105 Group ( (n=7*6) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: The Frequency (F) of SILL Strategy Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>104 Group ( (n=7*50) )</th>
<th>105 Group ( (n=7*50) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: The Frequency (F) of Risk-Taking Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>104 Group ( (n=7*6) )</th>
<th>105 Group ( (n=7*6) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: The Frequency (F) of Sociability Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>104 Group (n=7*5)</th>
<th>105 Group (n=7*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: The Frequency (F) of Discomfort Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>104 Group (n=7*5)</th>
<th>105 Group (n=7*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: The Frequency (F) of Personality Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>104 Group (n=7*16)</th>
<th>105 Group (n=7*16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The scoring system in this study was created by the researcher. As shown in the above tables, there were five types of responses. The system assigned one point for each answer. In the scoring system, the answers "never or almost never true of me" and "usually not true of me" were categorized into the weak tendency group, and the answers "somewhat true of me," "usually true of me," and "always or almost always true of me" were categorized into the strong tendency group. The answer "somewhat true of me" didn't make any significant difference whether it belonged to the weak tendency group or the strong tendency group. In addition, the scores on the reductive strategy and discomfort questionnaires, which originally had negative values, were transformed into a positive value when scoring.

Statistical Analysis of the Data

The data were subjected to the chi-square test and ridit analysis appropriate for qualitatively ordered data. Independent variables were the Oral Proficiency (Intermediate, Advanced), Personality (Risk-taking, Sociability, and Discomfort), and Korean cultural background.

The results of the chi-square test and ridit analysis shown in the following Tables indicate that the main effects of the Oral Proficiency and the Personality variables, and the interaction effect of the Oral Proficiency, the
Personality variables, and Strategy Use were all statistically significant.

A. The Characteristics of 104 Subjects

Table 13. Ridit Analysis for the tendency of Risk-Taking, Sociability, and Discomfort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>F(Ref.)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F(Comp.1)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F(Comp.2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F: Frequency
*R: Ridit

Reference Group: Risk-Taking Variable
Comparison Group 1: Sociability Variable
Comparison Group 2: Discomfort Variable

The Mean Ridit of Comparison Group 1 = 0.67
Degree of Freedom = 1
Z = 3.094
The Level of Significance : 99%

The Mean Ridit of Comparison Group 2 = 0.39
Degree of Freedom = 1
Z = -2.036
The Level of Significance : 95%

Degree of Freedom = 2
Chi Square Value = 23.267
The Level of Significance: 99%
Table 14. Ridit Analysis for the Tendency of Sociability and Discomfort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>F(Ref.)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F(Comp.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference Group: Sociability Variable
Comparison Group: Discomfort Variable

The Mean Ridit of Comparison Group = 0.21
Degree of Freedom = 1
Z = -4.749
The Level of Significance : 99%

Degree of Freedom = 1
Chi Square Value = 22.876
The Level of Significance : 99%

As Table 13 and 14 indicate, the "discomfort" variable showed statistically significant difference (p<0.01) among the three independent variables, "risk-taking," "sociability," and "discomfort." That is, the variable "discomfort" stands out as the most powerful factor among the three situation-specific personality factors in the 104 class. In contrast, "risk-taking" revealed the weakest tendency among the three. As seen in Table 13, the subjects in the 104 class demonstrated a stronger "sociability" tendency than "risk-taking" tendency. The result was found significant at p<0.01.
Figure 3 on the following page shows the graphic representation on the analysis of these situation-specific personality factors among 104 and 105 students.

Table 15. Ridit Analysis for the Use of Reductive Strategy and Discomfort Tendency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>F(Ref.)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F(Comp.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference Group: Reductive Strategy
Comparison Group: Discomfort

The Mean Ridit of Comparison Group = 0.39
Degree of Freedom = 1
Z = -2.091
The Level of Significance : 95%

Degree of Freedom = 1
Chi Square Value = 4.423
The Level of Significance : 95%

As found in Table 15, the analysis indicated a highly significant interaction effect between the "discomfort" variable and the use of "reductive strategies": p<0.05. In other words, in the 104 class subjects who felt discomfort very strongly relied heavily on reductive strategies.
Figure 3. The Comparison of Personality Traits
Table 16: Ridit Analysis for the Use of Reductive Strategy and Sociability Tendency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>F(Ref.)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F(Comp.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference Group: The Frequency of Reductive Strategy Use
Comparison Group: Sociability Variable

The Mean Ridit of Comparison Group = 0.68
Degree of Freedom = 1
Z = 3.309
The Level of Significance : 99%

Degree of Freedom = 1
Chi Square Value = 11.071
The Level of Significance : 99%

As Table 16 illustrates, there was a significant difference between the use of "reductive strategies" and the "sociability" variable (p<0.01). Thus, it is clear that the subjects who were less sociable employed more reductive strategies than the subjects who were more sociable. However, as for the interaction effect between the "risk-taking" variable and the use of "reductive strategies," the results did not reach a significant difference.
Table 17: Ridit Analysis for the Use of Reductive Strategy and SILL Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>F(Ref.)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F(Comp.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference Group: The Frequency of Reductive Strategy Use
Comparison Group: The Frequency of SILL Strategy Use

The Mean Ridit of Comparison Group = 0.61
Degree of Freedom = 1
Z = 3.208
The Level of Significance: 99%

Degree of Freedom = 1
Chi Square Value = 10.314
The Level of Significance: 99%

As Table 17 demonstrates, one major finding drawn between the use of "SILL Strategy" and "reductive strategy" was that the subjects in the 104 class employed reductive strategies more frequently than SILL strategies. The results of the analysis yielded statistical difference at p<0.01.

Figure 4 on the following page shows the graphic representation on the use of six types of SILL strategies among the 104 and 105 students. The graph points out that the most commonly used technique reported by 104 subjects was "metacognitive" strategy. "Compensation" strategy and "cognitive" strategy appeared to be the second most common
Figure 4: The Comparison of SILL Use
strategies. Among the six types of strategies, "memory" strategy and "affective" strategy were the least used strategies.

B. The Characteristics of 105 Subjects

Table 18. Ridit Analysis for the Tendency of Risk-Taking and Discomfort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>F(Ref.)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F(Comp.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference Group: Risk-Taking Variable
Comparison Group: Discomfort Variable

The Mean Ridit of Comparison Group = 0.4
Degree of Freedom = 1
Z = -1.695
The Level of Significance: 90%

Degree of Freedom = 1
Chi Square Value = 2.911
The Level of Significance: 90%

Table 19: Ridit Analysis for the Tendency of Sociability and Discomfort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>F(Ref.)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F(Comp.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reference Group: Sociability Variable
Comparison Group: Discomfort Variable

The Mean Ridit of Comparison Group = 0.37
Degree of Freedom = 1
Z = -2.139
The Level of Significance : 95%

Degree of Freedom = 1
Chi Square Value = 4.644
The Level of Significance : 95%

As Table 18 and 19 indicate, among the 105 students, the "discomfort" variable appeared to be the most powerful tendency among the three variables and this was the same result obtained in the 104 class. Even though "risk-taking" was the weakest tendency, there was no significant difference between the "sociability" variable and "risk-taking" variable.

Figure 3 on page 60 shows the graphic representation on the analysis of these situation-specific personality factors.

Table 20: Ridit Analysis for the Use of Reductive Strategy and Discomfort Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>F(Ref.)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F(Comp.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference Group: The Frequency of Reductive Strategy Use
Comparison Group: Discomfort Variable
The Mean Ridit of Comparison Group = 0.4
Degree of Freedom = 1
Z = -1.915
The Level of Significance : 90%

Degree of Freedom = 1
Chi Square Value = 3.708
The Level of Significance : 90%

As found in the 104 class, the analysis showed that there was a significant interaction between the "discomfort" variable and the use of "reductive strategy" at p<0.1. That is, the result verified that the more strongly the subject felt discomfort, the more frequently he/she employed reductive strategies.

Table 21: Ridit Analysis for the Use of Reductive Strategy and SILL Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>F(Ref.)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F(Comp.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference Group: Reductive Strategy
Comparison Group: SILL Strategy

The Mean Ridit of Comparison Group = 0.57
Degree of Freedom = 1
Z = 2.107
The Level of Significance : 95%

Degree of Freedom = 1
Chi Square Value = 4.451
The Level of Significance : 95%
In the 105 class, reductive strategies were more frequently used than SILL strategies. As Table 21 demonstrates, the results of the analysis found the interaction significant at p<0.05.

Figure 4 on page 63 shows the graphic representation on the use of the six types of SILL strategies. The graph shows that the most frequently used technique was "compensation" strategy, and "metacognitive" strategy and "social" strategy were the second most common strategies. "Memory" and "affective" strategies were used least frequently in the 105 class.

C. Similarities and Differences Between 104 and 105 Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>F(Ref.)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F(Comp.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference Group: 104 Class
Comparison Group: 105 Class

The Mean Ridit of Comparison Group = 0.54
Degree of Freedom = 1
Z = 2.155
The Level of Significance : 95%

Degree of Freedom = 1
Chi Square Value = 4.650
The Level of Significance : 95%
As for the use of SILL strategies, there was a significant difference between 104 and 105 students: p<0.05. That is, the students in the 105 class were more likely to use SILL strategies than the 104 students. Especially, the subjects in the 105 class used "memory" and "compensation" strategies more often than the subjects in the 104 class.

Table 23: Ridit Analysis for the Use of Reductive Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>F(Ref.)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F(Comp.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference Group: 104 Class
Comparison Group: 105 Class

The Mean Ridit of Comparison Group = 0.58
Degree of Freedom = 1
Z = 1.696
The Level of Significance : 90%

Degree of Freedom = 1
Chi Square Value = 2.901
The Level of Significance : 90%

As Table 23 illustrates, there was a significant difference on the use of reductive strategies between the two groups. The subjects in the 104 class employed reductive strategies more frequently than the subjects in the 105 class (p<0.1).

On the whole, the two groups of subjects did not differ
significantly in "discomfort" and "risk-taking" tendency. However, the subjects in the 104 class tended to feel discomfort more strongly than the subjects in the 105 class and the subjects in the 105 class appeared to take more risks. It was interesting to find that subjects in the 104 class tended to be more sociable than subjects in the 105 class, yet the results failed to achieve significance. Regarding the use of reductive and SILL strategies, 104 subjects employed more "reductive" strategies and less "SILL" strategies than 105 subjects.

In both groups, "discomfort" was indicated as the strongest tendency among the three independent variables, and "risk-taking" as the least strong. In addition, there was a significant interaction between the "discomfort" variable and the use of "reductive strategy." Since subjects in both groups felt strong discomfort, they appeared to rely heavily on reductive strategies. Also, both groups of subjects employed "reductive" strategies more frequently than "SILL" strategies.

Both groups employed "compensation" and "metacognitive" strategies most frequently, and "affective" and "memory" strategies least frequently. Although the two groups reported employing more or less the same types of learner strategies, 105 subjects, on the whole, tended to use a wider variety of strategies and be better language learners.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Overview

This study was to answer the research questions by investigating the effects of oral proficiency and personality on the choice of successful and unsuccessful strategies of Korean graduate students learning English as a second language. Specifically, the influence of their national origin on the selection of strategy was explored.

The study used two types of strategy questionnaires, the SILL strategy questionnaire and the Reductive strategy questionnaire, in order to examine the learning behaviors of the subjects in the ESL situation. The first independent variable consisted of three situation-specific personality factors: "risk-taking," "sociability," and "discomfort." The study examined two groups having different oral proficiencies, which constituted the second independent variable: Intermediate (104 class) and Advanced (105 class). There were fourteen subjects in these two groups, with seven subjects in each group. The third independent variable was
Korean cultural background.

The dependent variable of the study was the list of scores on the reductive strategy and the SILL strategy questionnaires. Chi-square test and ridit analysis were used for the analysis of the study.

Discussion of Findings

The first and the second research questions posed in this study related to the interaction between the ESL learners' oral proficiency and the choice of strategy. Using chi-square test and ridit analysis, this study revealed that there was a difference between the 104 and 105 groups in the use of both "SILL" and "Reductive" strategies. The students in the 105 class were more likely to use successful strategies than 104 students, especially "memory" and "compensation" strategies. The value of chi-square and ridit for these data was significant (p<0.05). The students in the 104 class, on the other hand, employed reductive strategies more frequently than the 105 students (p<0.1). In addition, although the two groups did not differ significantly in their "discomfort" and "risk-Taking" tendencies, a closer look at the result revealed that the 104 students felt discomfort more strongly than the 105 students and that 105 subjects took more risks.

The previous studies (Chamot & Kupper, 1989; Chamot et al., cited in Oxford & Crookall, 1989) reported that
students regardless of their level of proficiency used more
cognitive strategies than metacognitive strategies.
However, the present study revealed that both groups
employed "metacognitive" and "compensation" strategies more
frequently. On the whole, both groups reported employing
more or less the same types of learner strategies, yet the 105
students tended to use a wider variety of strategies.
These results indicate that the level of oral proficiency
certainly affects the choice of strategy.

The third research question asked whether there was a
significant interaction between learner's personality and
the selection of strategies. In both groups, "discomfort"
was indicated as the strongest tendency among the three
independent variables, and "risk-taking" as the least
strong. A correlation was found between the use of
"reductive" strategies and the "discomfort" variable. That
is, students tended to rely on reductive strategies when
they felt strong discomfort. In addition, both groups of
subjects used "compensation" strategies most frequently and
"memory" and "affective" strategies least frequently. This
phenomenon could be interpreted as follows: students felt
such strong discomfort and anxiety that they often resorted
to "compensation strategies" rather than taking risks.

A similar assumption could be made when the results of
the use of reductive strategies and SILL strategies are
considered. Unexpectedly, the subjects in both groups
employed reductive strategies more frequently than SILL strategies. The results of the analysis found the significance at p<0.01 in the 104 class and at p<0.05 in the 105 class. The only plausible explanation is that their strong discomfort and risk-avoiding tendency might have led them to heavy reliance on reductive strategies. Even though there was little evidence of a direct influence of "Language Class Discomfort" on attitudes (Ely, 1986), the findings confirm that certain situation-specific personality factors significantly influence foreign/second language learners' learning style preferences.

The following discussion will be centered on the relationship between Korean cultural background and the choice of strategies. At this point, it is not easy to provide a clear evidence of a direct influence of cultural background on the choice of learner strategies, yet some possible explanations could be offered based on the results.

First, the subjects' strong discomfort could be explained by the numerous cultural differences between Korea and the United States as well as the differences in the classroom interactions. "Keeping silent" and "being modest," for example, are regarded as virtues in Korean classrooms, whereas "taking risks" and "making mistakes" are not. Therefore, it seems natural that in this study "risk-taking" revealed itself as the weakest tendency among the three independent variables. With respect to the choice of
strategies, traits such as risk-avoiding and strong discomfort caused by cultural differences appeared to foster reductive strategy use. Due to the difficulty of assimilating into the American culture, Korean ESL learners may make little effort to get to know English-speaking people and interact only with a group of Korean-speaking friends. It is reasonable to assume that the degree to which second language learners succeed in socially and psychologically adapting to the target culture might affect their choice of learner strategies and could have an influence on their success in learning the second language.

**Implications**

The present study found that the level of proficiency, personality, and cultural background are all important factors in the selection of learner strategies. The data from the present study documents the fact that L2 learners rely heavily on reductive strategies when they feel strong anxiety or cultural differences. Obviously, teaching methods are an important feature of the learning environment. ESL teachers seek to nourish good language learning strategies among their students, but it does not necessarily mean that the learner will adopt these strategies to enhance his language acquisition. For example, the learner may reject an imposed strategy because he/she cannot accept it due to his/her cultural background.
or personality factors.

As has already been shown, socio-affective factors must be considered in designing and conducting strategy training. Learners are induced to opt for reduction strategies if the foreign/second language teaching gives high priority to correctness and penalizes errors. As Faerch and Kasper (1984) point out, an emphasis on originality and creativity has implications for establishing a suitable socio-emotional climate in the classroom so that the learners feel free to express themselves without fear of ridicule or penalty. In addition, it is necessary to provide the learners with opportunities to make contact with English-speaking people so that they can assimilate into the target culture.

The present study could influence the way in which learning strategy instruction is developed or designed and conducted. The results of this study also reveal the importance of the learner’s proficiency, personality, and cultural background in the choice of learner strategies. A learning strategy instructional framework might include the following guidelines (Oxford, 1989): First, identify students’ current learning strategies, using one or more techniques such as diaries, observations, interviews, or surveys. Second, assess learners’ existing goals and needs, motivations, attitudes, and personality type by providing extensive opportunities to practice using the strategies. Third, identify students’ language learning experience,
national origin, sex, age, and other background factors by way of interviewing or giving questionnaires at the beginning of the class. Regardless of the difficulty in changing their personality factors and cultural background, such learning strategy teaching can be expected to increase the ability of all students to acquire the complex cognitive skill of a foreign language and to reduce students' learning burden and bad learning habits.

Recommendations for Further Research

Several studies could be done that would continue the work on which this thesis is based. An experimental design, with valid data, would help validate the results found in this study.

Another area of further research would be to explore in depth the influences of personality variables and ethnic background that affect the choice of learner strategies. Another recommendation is to examine the effects of such variables as motivation, attitudes, age, and major field of study on self-directed language learning. Especially, it is valuable to explore the effects of these variables on the use of reductive strategies as well as successful strategies.

The subjects in this study were categorized as intermediate and advanced learners of English. In future studies, it would be worthwhile to investigate several
research questions examined in this study with subjects who are at the various stages of learning a foreign/second language in Korea and in the United States.

Limitations

There are limitations that must be considered when analyzing the results of the study. First, the results of this study are not generalizable to all Korean students, since it is a descriptive study dealing with only fourteen Korean students.

In this study, the term "personality" was used in a very limited sense. Only three types of situation-specific personality factors -- risk-taking, sociability, and discomfort -- were examined. Therefore, it is not advisable to generalize the results to all personality types.

In order to identify students' English proficiency, the researcher has relied on self-reporting TOEFL scores and self-evaluation of overall proficiency. There are always limitations to using self-reports as a data source. That is, although information provided from these reports may not be fully reliable, the researcher had to take it at face value.

It is hoped that this study will serve as a small stepping stone to stimulate further research in self-directed learning of Korean ESL/EFL students.
APPENDIX A

SILL QUESTIONNAIRE
Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

Version for Speakers of Other Languages Learning English

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL)
(c)R.Oxford, 1989

Directions

This form of the STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING (SILL) is for students of English as a second or foreign language. You will find statements about learning English. Please read each statement. On the separate Worksheet, write the response (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) that tells HOW TRUE OF YOU THE STATEMENT IS.

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE OF ME means that the statement is very rarely true of you.

USUALLY NOT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true less than half the time.

SOMewhat TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you about half the time.

USUALLY TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true more than half the time.

ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you almost always.

Answer in terms of how well the statement describes you. Do not answer how you think you should be, or what other people do. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Put your answers on the separate Worksheet. Please make no marks on the items. Work as quickly as you can without being careless. This usually takes about 20-30 minutes to complete. If you have any questions let the teacher know immediately.
EXAMPLE

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

Read the item, and choose a response (1 through 5 as above), and write it in the space after the item.

I actively seek out the opportunities to talk with native speakers of English. __________

You have just completed the example item. Answer the rest of the items on the Worksheet.

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning
Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL)
(c) R. Oxford, 1989

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me
(Write answers on Worksheet)

Part A

1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.

2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.

3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.

4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.

5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.

6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.

7. I physically act out new English words.
8. I review English lessons often.

9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.

**Part B**

10. I say or write new English words several times.

11. I try to talk like native English speakers.

12. I practice the sounds of English.

13. I use the English words I know in different ways.


15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.

16. I read for pleasure in English.

17. I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.

18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.

   1. Never or almost never true of me
   2. Usually not true of me
   3. Somewhat true of me
   4. Usually true of me
   5. Always or almost always true of me
   (Write answers on Worksheet)

19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.

20. I try to find patterns in English.

21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.

22. I try not to translate word-for-word.

23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.
Part C

24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.

25. When I can’t think of a word during a conversation in English I use gestures.

26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.

27. I read English without looking up every new word.

28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.

29. If I can’t think of an English word I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.

Part D

30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.

31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.

32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.

33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.

34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.

35. I look for people I can talk to in English.

36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.

37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.

38. I think about my progress in learning English.

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

(Write answers on Worksheet)
Part E

39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.

40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.

41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.

42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.

43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.

44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.

   1. Never or almost never true of me
   2. Usually not true of me
   3. Somewhat true of me
   4. Usually true of me
   5. Always or almost always true of me

   (Write Answers on Worksheet)

Part F

45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.

46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.

47. I practice English with other students.

48. I ask for help from English speakers.

49. I ask questions in English.

50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.
Worksheet for Answering and Scoring

the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL)

(c) R. Oxford, 1989

1. The blanks (________) are numbered for each item on the SILL.

2. Write your response to each item (that is write 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) in each of the blanks.

3. Add up each column. Put the result on the line marked SUM.

4. Divide by the number under SUM to get the average for each column. Round this average off to the nearest tenth as in 3.4.

5. Figure out your overall average. To do this, add up all the SUMS for the different parts of the SILL. Then divide by 50.

6. When you have finished, your teacher will give you the Profile of Results. Copy your averages (for each part and for the whole SILL) from the Worksheet to the Profile.
Profile of Results on the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)
Version 7.0
(C) R. Oxford, 1989

You will receive this Profile after you have completed the Worksheet. This Profile will show your SILL results. These results will tell you the kinds of strategies you use in learning English. There are no right or wrong answers.

To complete this profile, transfer your averages for each part of the SILL, and your overall average for the whole SILL. These averages are found on the Worksheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>What Strategies Are Covered</th>
<th>Your Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Remembering more effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Using all your mental processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Compensating for missing knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Organizing and evaluating learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Managing your emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Learning with others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YOUR OVERALL AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What These Averages Mean to You

The overall average tells how often you use strategies for learning English. Each part of the SILL represents a group of learning strategies. The averages for each part of the SILL show which groups of strategies you use the most for learning English.

The best use of strategies depends on your age, personality and purpose for learning. If you have a very low average on one or more parts of the SILL, there may be some new strategies in these groups that you might want to use. Ask your teacher about these.
APPENDIX B

REDUCTIVE STRATEGY QUESTIONNAIRE
Reductive Strategy Questionnaire

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me
   (Write answers on worksheet)

1. If I am reading a sentence in English with several words unfamiliar to me, I look up all the words I do not know.

2. When I am trying to say something in English and I suddenly lack the necessary vocabulary, I skip the word(s) or change the message.

3. When my teacher speaks English and I don’t understand a good part of the message, I become frustrated and give up.

4. During the course of English class, I participate only if called upon.

5. When a native language speaker addresses me, I become tense and discouraged.

6. If a native speaker struggles to have a conversation with me, I feel shy and walk away from the situation.

7. When I am speaking English, I worry about "correctness" rather than meaning.

8. When I am speaking English, I say as little as possible.
APPENDIX C

PERSONALITY QUESTIONNAIRE
Personality Questionnaire

1. I like to wait until I know exactly how to use an English word before using it.

2. I don’t like trying out a difficult sentence in class.

3. At this point I don’t like trying to express complicated ideas in English in class.

4. I prefer to say what I want in English without worrying about the small details of grammar.

5. In class, I prefer to say a sentence to myself before I speak it.

6. I prefer to follow basic sentence models rather than risk misusing the language.

7. I’d like more class activities where the students use English to get to know each other better.

8. I think learning English in a group is more fun than if I had my own tutor.

9. I enjoy talking with the teacher and other students in English.

10. I don’t really enjoy interacting with the other students in the English class.

11. I think it’s important to have a strong group spirit in the language classroom.

12. I don’t feel very relaxed when I speak English in class.

13. Based on my class experience so far, I think that one barrier to my future use of English is my discomfort when speaking.

14. At times, I feel somewhat embarrassed in class when I’m trying to speak.

15. I think I’m less self-conscious about actively participating in English class than most of the other students.

APPENDIX D

BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE
Name (Korean/English):_________________________

**QUESTIONNAIRE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

NOTE: Your participation in this research project is very important in our understanding of learner strategies of Korean students. The information is needed for statistical purposes only. No information you supply will be given to anyone. Your responses will not be individually recorded. (Please fill out the questionnaire in English)

1. AGE:__________  2. SEX: F     M

3. TOEFL SCORE:__________ (When taken: __________)

4. Major Field of Study/College:__________________________
   Minor (if applicable):__________________________

5. When did you arrive in the U.S.?
   Month/Year:__________

6. How long have you studied at the college-level in the U.S.?
   ________________

7. How many years have you studied English (including any type of informal study, up to the present)?
   7 - 10 years(  )/ 11 - 14 years(  )/ 15 -18 years(  )

8. Among the four language skills (e.g., listening, speaking, reading and writing), which is your strongest English skill? Rank the order.
   (from 1: strongest to 4: least strong)

   LISTENING  ________________
   SPEAKING  ________________
   READING  ________________
   WRITING  ________________

9. Below are five areas of English language skills. Please mark the number that most clearly reflects your own ability in each area.

   * Accent    non-native    / / / / / / / / / /    native
   * Grammar    inaccurate    / / / / / / / / / /    accurate
   * Vocabulary    inadequate    / / / / / / / / / /    adequate
   * Fluency    broken    / / / / / / / / / /    smooth
   * Comprehension    incomplete    / / / / / / / / / /    complete
APPENDIX E

LANGUAGE QUESTIONNAIRE
LANGUAGE QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions

In filling out this questionnaire on language learning, please be as accurate and frank as possible in your answers. You should give your first reaction after reading each item. On the other hand, please do not rush, since it is important to express your true opinion. On the separate Answer sheet, write the response (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) that tells HOW TRUE OF YOU THE STATEMENT IS.

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE OF ME means that the statement is very rarely true of you.

USUALLY NOT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true less than half the time.

SOMewhat TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you about half the time.

USUALLY TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true more than half the time.

ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you almost always.

Answer in terms of how well the statement describes you. Do not answer how you think you should be, or what other people do. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Put your answers on the separate Answersheet. This usually takes about 30-40 minutes to complete.

Thank you very much!
EXAMPLE

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

Read the item, and choose a response (1 through 5 as above), and write it in the space after the item.

I actively seek out the opportunities to talk with native speakers of English. ________

You have just completed the example item. Answer the rest of the items on the Answer sheet.

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

(Write answers on Answer sheet)

1. If I am reading a sentence in English with several words unfamiliar to me, I look up all the words I do not know.

2. I like to wait until I know exactly how to use an English word before using it.

3. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.

4. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.

5. When I am trying to say something in English and I suddenly lack the necessary vocabulary, I skip the word(s) or change the message.

6. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.

7. I don’t like trying out a difficult sentence in class.

8. I’d like more class activities where the students use English to get to know each other better.
9. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.

10. I use rhymes to remember new English words.

11. When my teacher speaks English and I don’t understand a good part of the message, I become frustrated and give up.

12. At this point I don’t like trying to express complicated ideas in English in class.

13. I use flashcards to remember new English words.


15. I don’t feel very relaxed when I speak English in class.

16. I review English lessons often.

17. I prefer to say what I want in English without worrying about the small details of grammar.

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me
   (Write answers on Answer sheet)

18. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.

19. During the course of English class, I participate only if called upon.

20. I think learning English in a group is more fun than if I had my own tutor.

21. I say or write new English words several times.

22. Based on my class experience so far, I think that one barrier to my future use of English is my discomfort when speaking.

23. I try to talk like native English speakers.
24. I practice the sounds of English.
25. In class, I prefer to say a sentence to myself before I speak it.
26. When an English speaker addresses me, I become tense and discouraged.
27. I use the English words I know in different ways.
28. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.
29. I start conversations when I meet an English speaker.
30. I read for pleasure in English.
31. I enjoy talking with the teacher and other students in English.
32. At times, I feel somewhat embarrassed in class when I'm trying to speak.
33. I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.
34. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me
(Write answers on Answersheet)

35. If a native language speaker struggles to have a conversation with me, I feel shy and walk away from the situation.
36. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.
37. I try to find patterns in English.
38. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.
39. I try not to translate word-for-word.
40. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.

41. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.

42. I prefer to follow basic sentence models rather than risk misusing the language.

43. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.

44. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.

45. I read English without looking up every new word.

46. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.

47. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.

48. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.

49. I don't really enjoy interacting with the other students in the English class.

   1. Never or almost never true of me
   2. Usually not true of me
   3. Somewhat true of me
   4. Usually true of me
   5. Always or almost always true of me

(Write answers on Answersheet)

50. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.

51. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.

52. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.

53. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.

54. I look for people I can talk to in English.
55. I think I'm less self-conscious about actively participating in English class than most of the other students.

56. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.

57. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.

58. When I am speaking English, I worry about "correctness" rather than meaning.

59. I think about my progress in learning English.

60. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.

61. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.

62. I sometimes feel awkward speaking English.

63. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.

64. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.

65. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.

66. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.

67. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me
   (Write answers on Answersheet)

68. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.

69. I practice English with other students.

70. When I am speaking English, I say as little as possible.
71. I ask for help from English speakers.

72. I ask questions when I don't understand what an English speaker is saying.

73. I think it's important to have a strong group spirit in the language classroom.

74. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.
Dear Korean graduate students:

I am a master student in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) program at the Ohio State University.

Presently, I am writing my master’s thesis. The objective of my thesis is to explore English learning styles and strategies of Korean students. It is hoped that the results of the study will benefit both ESL teachers and Korean students in terms of developing English proficiency.

I am quite aware that you have a very busy schedule, however your cooperation and participation in answering a questionnaire will be extremely helpful for my research.

Thank you for your cooperation.
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