Language Learning Strategies: Theory and Research

by Carol Griffiths
School of Foundations Studies
AIS St Helens, Auckland, New Zealand

Occasional Paper No. 1
February 2004

Abstract

What is considered by many to be the pioneering work in the field of language learning strategies was carried out in the mid seventies by researchers such as Rubin (1975) and Stern (1975). Although nearly a quarter of a century has passed since then, the language learning strategy field continues to be characterised by "no consensus" (O'Malley *et al,* 1985, p.22) and the concept of language learning strategies itself remains "fuzzy" (Ellis, 1994, p.529). This article attempts to clarify some of the fuzziness by trying first of all to establish basic terminology and going on to discuss definition and classification of language learning strategies. The development of language learning strategy theory and how it fits into the framework of contemporary language teaching and learning for students who speak other languages is examined, and research on language learning strategies to date is reviewed.

Introduction

As Wenden (1985) reminds us, there is an old proverb which states: "Give a man a fish and he eats for a day. Teach him how to fish and he eats for a lifetime". Applied to the language teaching and learning field, this proverb might be interpreted to mean that if students are provided with answers, the immediate problem is solved. But if they are taught the strategies to work out the answers for themselves, they are empowered to manage their own learning.

Since the pioneering work carried out in the mid-seventies (for instance by Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975) there has been an awareness that language learning strategies have the potential to be "an extremely powerful learning tool" (O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Kupper, and Russo, 1985, p.43*)*. In spite of this awareness, and in spite of much useful and interesting work having been carried out in the intervening years (nearly a quarter of a century), the language learning strategy field continues to be characterised by "confusion" and "no consensus" (O'Malley *et al,* 1985, p.22) while Ellis (1994, p.529) comments that the language learning strategy concept remains "fuzzy".

Considering the potential usefulness of language learning strategies as a language teaching and learning tool, I would like to try to put this rather fuzzy picture in to some sort of perspective. I will begin by looking at the basic terminology, the frequently conflicting use of which does nothing to aid consensus. I will then discuss definition and classification of language learning strategies, and go on from there to look at language learning strategies from a theoretical perspective before reviewing language learning strategy research to date.

Terminology

Before attempting to define and classify language learning strategies as used by speakers of other languages, I would like first of all to provide a rationale for the choice of the term <u>strategy</u>. Although used by many prominent writers (such as Rubin, 1975; O'Malley *et al,* 1985; Oxford, 1990) the term <u>strategy</u> is not without its controversy. Consensus is not assisted by some writers' use of conflicting terminology such as <u>learning behaviours</u> (Wesche, 1977; Politzer and McGroarty, 1985), <u>tactics</u> (Seliger, 1984) and <u>techniques</u> (Stern, 1992) more or less (but not always exactly) synonymously with the term <u>strategy</u>. Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991, p.199) opt for the term <u>strategy</u> since, as they point out, Rubin (1975) used it "in perhaps the earliest study in this area and it enjoys the widest currency today". For this reason, <u>strategy</u> is the term which will be used for the purposes of the present work.

Definition and Classification

Since the work done by researchers such as Rubin (1975) and Stern (1975) in the mid-seventies, awareness has been slowly growing of the importance of the strategies used by learners in the language learning process, since ultimately, like the proverbial horse led to water but which must do the drinking itself, even with the best teachers and methods, students are the only ones who can actually do the learning. As Nyikos and Oxford (1993, p.11) put it: “learning begins with the learner”.

This growing awareness has resulted in more recent years in what Skehan (1989, p.285) calls an “explosion of activity” in the field of language learning strategy research. In spite of this activity, however, defining and classifying language learning strategies remains no easy task. Wenden and Rubin (1987, p.7) talk of “the elusive nature of the term”, Ellis (1994, p.529) describes the concept as “fuzzy”, while O’Malley *et al* (1985, p.22) put it this way:

> There is no consensus on what constitutes a learning strategy in second language learning or how these differ from other types of learner activities. Learning, teaching and communication strategies are often interlaced in discussions of language learning and are often applied to the same behaviour. Further, even within the group of activities most often referred to as learning strategies, there is considerable confusion about definitions of specific strategies and about the hierarchic relationship among strategies.

One of the earliest researchers in this field, Rubin (1975, p.43) provided a very broad definition of learning strategies as “the techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge”. In 1981 (pp.124-126) she identified two kinds of learning strategies: those which contribute directly to learning, and those which contribute indirectly to learning. The direct learning strategies she divided into six types (clarification/verification, monitoring, memorization, guessing/inductive inferencing, deductive reasoning, practice), and the indirect learning strategies she divided into two types (creating opportunities for practice, production tricks).

Under production tricks, Rubin included communication strategies. This is a controversial inclusion since learning strategies and communication strategies are seen by some as two quite separate manifestations of language learner behaviour. Brown (1980, p.87), for instance, draws a clear distinction between learning strategies and communication strategies on the grounds that “communication is the output modality and learning is the input modality”. Brown suggests that, while a learner generally

applies the same fundamental strategies (such as rule transference) used in learning a language to communicating in that language, there are other communication strategies such as avoidance or message abandonment which do not result in learning. Brown (1994, p.118) concedes, however, that "in the arena of linguistic interaction, it is sometimes difficult.....to distinguish between the two".

Ellis (1986) is another who views strategies for learning and strategies for using, including communication strategies or "devices for compensating for inadequate resources" (p.165), as quite different manifestations of a more general phenomenon which he calls learner strategies. He argues that it is even possible that successful use of communication strategies may actually prevent language learning since skilful compensation for lack of linguistic knowledge may obviate the need for learning.

Tarone (1980) takes a different point of view. She suggests that by helping students to say what they want or need to say, communication strategies can help to expand language. Even if the communication is not perfect in grammatical or lexical terms, in the process of using the language for communication the learner will be exposed to language input which may result in learning and which therefore may be considered a learning strategy. The key point in this argument would seem to be that in order to be considered a learning strategy rather than a communication strategy, the "basic motivation is not to communicate but to learn" (Tarone, 1980, p.419). The problems with differentiating between communication strategies and learning strategies on the grounds of motivation or intention, however, as Tarone (1981) acknowledges, are that we have, in practice, no way of determining what motivates a learner, that learners may have a dual motivation to both learn and communicate, or that learners may learn language even when the basic motivation was to communicate. As Tarone (1981, p.290) aptly comments, "the relationship of learning strategies to communication strategies is somewhat problematic".

Ellis (1994, p.530) also concedes that there is "no easy way of telling whether a strategy is motivated by a desire to learn or a desire to communicate". This inability to differentiate clearly between communication and learning strategies does nothing to simplify the decision regarding what should or should not be included in learning strategy taxonomies such as Rubin's and others', and leads to what Stern (1992, p.264) acknowledges is "a certain arbitrariness in the classification of learning strategies".

Working at much the same time as Rubin in the mid-seventies, Stern (1975) produced a list of ten language learning strategies which he believed to be characteristic of good language learners. At the top of the list he put "personal learning style" (p.311). Stern later defined "strategies" as "broadly conceived intentional directions" (1992, p.261), which is more similar to the definition of the term styles as used by other writers such as Willing (1988) and Nunan (1991). The "behavioural manifestations of the strategies" (Stern, 1992, p.261) he called techniques - a definition which would fit better with what Rubin (1975) calls strategies. This inconsistent use of basic

terminology as employed by key researchers and writers in the language learning strategy field has contributed to difficulties with definition and classification which remain to this day.

When O'Malley *et al* (1985) came to conduct their research, they used the definition of learning strategies as being "operations or steps used by a learner that will facilitate the acquisition, storage, retrieval or use of information" (p.23), a definition originally used by Rigney (1978). In an attempt to produce a classification scheme with mutually exclusive categories, O'Malley and his colleagues developed a taxonomy of their own identifying 26 strategies which they divided into three categories: metacognitive (knowing about learning), cognitive (specific to distinct learning activities) and social. The metacognitive and cognitive categories correspond approximately with Rubin's indirect and direct strategies. However, the addition of the social mediation category was an important step in the direction of acknowledging the importance of interactional strategies in language learning.

Oxford (1990) took this process a step further. Like O'Malley *et al* (1985), she used Rigney's definition of language learning strategies as "operations employed by the learner to aid the acquisition, storage, retrieval, and use of information" (Oxford, 1990, p.8) as a base. Attempting to redress the perceived problem that many strategy inventories appeared to emphasise cognitive and metacognitive strategies and to ascribe much less importance to affective and social strategies, she classified learning strategies into six groups: *memory strategies* (which relate to how students remember language), *cognitive strategies* (which relate to how students think about their learning), *compensation strategies* (which enable students to make up for limited knowledge), *metacognitive strategies* (relating to how students manage their own learning), *affective strategies* (relating to students' feelings) and *social strategies* (which involve learning by interaction with others).

These six categories (which underlie the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) used by Oxford and others for a great deal of research in the learning strategy field) were further divided into direct strategies (those which directly involve the target language such as reviewing and practising) and indirect strategies (those which provide indirect support for language learning such as planning, co-operating and seeking opportunities). Although Oxford's taxonomy is "perhaps the most comprehensive classification of learning strategies to date" (Ellis, 1994, p.539), it is still, of necessity, somewhat selective since "dozens and perhaps hundreds of such strategies exist" (Oxford, Lavine and Crookall, 1989, p.29). Oxford (1990) acknowledges the possibility that the categories will overlap, and gives as an example the metacognitive strategy of planning, which, in as far as planning requires reasoning, might also be considered a cognitive strategy. She also deals with the difficulty of whether a compensation strategy such as looking for synonyms when the exact word is unknown is a learning strategy or a communication strategy. Although Ellis (1994, p.539) comments that compensation strategies are included "somewhat

confusingly", Oxford (1990, p.49) justifies including such behaviours as learning strategies on the grounds that they "help learners become more fluent in what they already know [and] may lead learners to gain new information about what is appropriate or permissible in the target language". However, she acknowledges that (p.17)

> there is no complete agreement on exactly what strategies are; how many strategies exist; how they should be defined, demarcated, and categorised; and whether it is - or ever will be - possible to create a real, scientifically validated hierarchy of strategies....Classification conflicts are inevitable.

Amid this welter of overlapping material and conflicting opinion, the process of establishing terminology, definitions and classification systems for language learning strategies is far from straightforward. In the face of the lack of consensus which is a feature of the language learning strategy field, whatever term may be used, and however it may be defined or classified, it is inevitably going to come into conflict with one or other of the competing terms, definitions and classification systems. I would, however, like to suggest that Rigney's (1978) definition together with Oxford's (1990) classification system can provide a useful base for understanding language learning strategies (Rubin's 1975 term) and for launching research.

The Development of Language Learning Strategy Theory

As noted by Griffiths and Parr (2001) over the years many different methods and approaches to the teaching and learning of language to and by speakers of other languages (SOL), each with its own theoretical basis, have come and gone in and out of fashion (for instance the grammar-translation method, the audio lingual method, the communicative approach). Language learning strategies, although still fuzzily defined and controversially classified, are increasingly attracting the interest of contemporary educators because of their potential to enhance learning. In the light of this interest, I would like to take a look at the theory underlying language learning strategies beginning from the perspective of the various other theories, methods and approaches from which, and alongside which, language learning strategy theory has developed.

Derived from the way Latin and Greek were taught, the grammar-translation method, as its name suggests, relied heavily on the teaching of grammar and practising translation as its main teaching and learning activities (Richards, Platt and Platt, 1992). The major focus of this method tended to be reading and writing, with very little attention paid to speaking and listening. Vocabulary was typically taught in lists, and a high priority was given to accuracy and to the ability to construct correct

sentences. Instruction was typically conducted in the students' native language. This resulted in, as Richards and Rodgers (1986, pp.3-4) put it,

> the type of grammar-translation courses remembered with distaste by thousands of school learners, for whom foreign language learning meant a tedious experience of memorising endless lists of unusable grammar rules and vocabulary and attempting to produce perfect translations of stilted or literary prose.

The possibility that students might use language learning strategies to promote their own learning had little or no place in grammar-translation theory, and is rarely if ever mentioned in any literature on the subject, as Tarone and Yule (1989, p.133) point out when they comment "relatively little attention seems to have been paid, in any consistent way, to considerations of the whole process from the learner's point of view". It tended to be assumed that if learners simply followed the grammar-translation method they would, as a matter of course, learn language, although the seeds of an awareness of the importance of the learner's contribution to the learning process was perhaps there in, for instance, suggestions for how to remember vocabulary lists (mnemonics, grouping, repetition etc) which were quite common in grammar-translation classrooms.

The audio lingual method grew partly out of a reaction against the limitations of the grammar-translation method, and partly out of the urgent war-time demands for fluent speakers of languages such as German, Italian and Japanese. The "Army Method" was developed to produce military personnel with conversational proficiency in the target language. After the war, the "Army Method" attracted the attention of linguists already looking for an alternative to grammar-translation and became known as the audio lingual method. By the sixties, audiolingualism was widespread (Richards and Rodgers, 1986).

In direct contrast to the grammar-translation method, the audio lingual method was based on the belief that speaking and listening are the most basic language skills and should be emphasised before reading and writing (Richards, Platt and Platt, 1992). Audio lingual teaching methods depended heavily on drills and repetition, which were justified according to behaviourist theories that language is a system of habits which can be taught and learnt on the stimulus, response and reinforcement basis that behaviourists believed controlled all human learning, including language learning.

Since audio lingual theory depended on the automatic patterning of behaviour there was little or no recognition given to any conscious contribution which the individual learner might make in the learning process. Indeed, learners were discouraged from taking initiative in the learning situation because they might make mistakes (Richards and Rodgers, 1986). If anything, there was even less place for individual language learning strategies in audio lingual theory than there had been in grammar-translation

theory, except, perhaps, in a very limited form in the exercising of memory and cognitive strategies by means of repetition and substitution exercises, and even this was rarely, if ever, made explicit. The effect of audio lingual techniques of rote learning, repetition, imitation, memorisation and pattern practice was to minimise the importance of explicit learning strategies in the language learning process (Stern, 1992).

In the early sixties, audiolingualism was commonly seen as a major breakthrough which would revolutionise the teaching and learning of languages. No more tedious grammar rules! No more vocabulary lists! No more hours spent translating boring texts! Audiolingualism, as Stern (1980, p.465) puts it "raised hopes of ushering in a golden age of language learning". By the end of the sixties, however, the limitations of the audio lingual method were beginning to make themselves obvious. Contrary to audio lingual theory, as Hutchinson and Waters (1990) comment, language learners did not act according to behaviourist expectations. They wanted to translate things, demanded grammar rules, found endless repetition boring and not conducive to learning.

It was at this time, in the mid to late sixties, that the ideas of the highly influential linguist, Noam Chomsky (for instance Chomsky, 1965; 1968) began to have a major effect on linguistic theory. Chomsky postulated that all normal human beings are born with a Language Acquisition Device (LAD) which enables them to develop language from an innate set of principles which he called the Universal Grammar (UG). Chomsky's theory of Transformational-Generative Grammar attempts to explain how original utterances are generated from a language user's underlying competence. Chomsky believed that behaviourist theory could not explain the complexities of generative grammar and concluded that "the creative aspect of language use, when investigated with care and respect for the facts, shows that current notions of habit and generalisation, as determinants of behaviour or knowledge, are quite inadequate" (Chomsky, 1968, p.84).

Although Chomsky's theories directly related mainly to first language learners, his view of the learner as a generator of rules was taken up by Corder (1967) who argued that language errors made by students who are speakers of other languages indicate the development of underlying linguistic competence and reflect the learners' attempts to organise linguistic input. The intermediate system created while the learner is trying to come to terms with the target language was later called "interlanguage" (IL) by Selinker (1972) who viewed learner errors as evidence of positive efforts by the student to learn the new language. This view of language learning allowed for the possibility of learners making deliberate attempts to control their own learning and, along with theories of cognitive processes in language learning promoted by writers such as McLaughlin (1978) and Bialystok (1978), contributed to a research thrust in the mid to late seventies aimed at discovering how learners employ learning strategies to promote the learning of language (for instance Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975; Naiman,

Frohlich, Stern and Todesco*,* 1978). The idea that teachers should be concerned not only with "finding the best method or with getting the correct answer" but also with assisting a student in order to "enable him to learn on his own" (Rubin 1975, p.45) was, at the time, quite revolutionary.

At much the same time, however, as researchers such as Rubin, Stern and Naiman *et al* were working to develop an awareness of language learning strategies, Krashen (for instance Krashen, 1976; 1977) dealt the fledgling language learning strategy movement a body blow and took off in almost exactly the opposite direction. Challenging the rule-driven theories of the grammar-translation method, the audio lingual behaviourist theories that language can be taught as a system of habits, as well as the idea of learners being able to consciously control their own learning, Krashen proposed his five hypotheses. Summarised briefly (Krashen and Terrell, 1983), these consist of *the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis* (conscious learning is an ineffective way of developing language, which is better acquired through natural communication), *the Natural Order Hypothesis* (grammatical structures of a language are acquired in a predictable order), *the Monitor Hypothesis* (conscious learning is of very little value to an adult language learner, and can only be useful under certain conditions as a monitor or editor), *the Input Hypothesis* (language is acquired by understanding input which is a little beyond the current level of competence (comprehensible input)) and *the Affective Filter Hypothesis* (a learner's emotions and attitudes can act as a filter which slows down the acquisition of language. When the affective filter is high it can block language development).

Taken to their extreme, Krashen's hypotheses led to the belief that conscious teaching and learning were not useful in the language learning process, and that any attempt to teach or learn language in a formal kind of a way was doomed to failure. By implication, therefore, since in Krashen's view conscious learning had so little value, there was very little room for conscious language learning strategies to play a role in the process of language development. Many of Krashen's ideas have been soundly criticised over the years, and his penchant for sweeping statements, such as "speech cannot be taught directly but 'emerges' on its own as a result of building competence via comprehensible input" (Krashen, 1985, p.2) and "when the filter is 'down' and comprehensible input is presented and comprehended, acquisition is inevitable. It is, in fact, unavoidable and cannot be prevented" (Krashen, 1985, p.4), have made him easy to challenge. McLaughlin (1978), for instance, approaching the issue from a cognitive psychologist's point of view, proposed an information-processing approach to language development whereby students can obtain knowledge of a language by thinking through the rules until they become automatic, a view which is quite contrary to the assertions of the Monitor Hypothesis. Gregg (1984, p.94) voiced the criticism that "each of Krashen's hypotheses is marked by serious flaws", while Pienemann (for instance Pienemann, 1985; 1989), challenging the claims of the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, postulated that language can be taught and learnt when the learner is ready (Teachability Hypothesis).

In spite of the many challenges, Krashen's views have been and remain very influential in the language teaching and learning field. Even a harsh critic such as Gregg, who censures Krashen for being "incoherent" and "dogmatic" admits that "he is often right on the important questions" (Gregg, 1984, pp.94-95), and in as far as Krashen (for instance Krashen, 1981) believed that language develops through natural communication, he might be considered one of the driving forces behind the communicative language teaching movement which is in vogue to the present day.

An important theoretical principle underlying the communicative language teaching movement was called "communicative competence" by Hymes (1972). Communicative competence is the ability to use language to convey and interpret meaning, and it was later divided by Canale and Swain (1980) into four separate components: *grammatical competence* (which relates to the learner's knowledge of the vocabulary, phonology and rules of the language), *discourse competence* (which relates to the learner's ability to connect utterances into a meaningful whole), *sociolinguistic competence* (which relates to the learner's ability to use language appropriately) and *strategic competence* (which relates to a learner's ability to employ strategies to compensate for imperfect knowledge). Another cornerstone of communicative language teaching theory is the belief that how language functions is more important than knowledge of form or structure. The concept of the communicative functions of language promoted by Wilkins (1976) have had a strong influence on contemporary language learning programmes and textbooks. Other well-known figures in the field have consolidated and extended the theories of communicative language teaching. Widdowson, for instance, believes that by using a communicative approach language can be developed incidentally, as a by-product of using it (1978), and that "knowing will emerge from doing" (1991, p.160), while Littlewood (1981) stresses the need to give learners extensive opportunities to use the target language for real communicative purposes, and believes that the ability to communicate effectively is more important than perfect mastery.

Although "the communicative approach implicitly encourages learners to take greater responsibility for their own learning" (Oxford *et al*, 1989, p.33), typically the emphasis in the communicative language movement, as in previous methods and approaches, has been on how teachers teach, with relatively little attention paid to how learners learn. Even today, when the communicative approach underlies a substantial number of syllabuses for speakers of other languages, and in spite of insights from a now considerable body of research, it is unusual to find textbooks which include learning strategies in their material. A rare exception is *Blueprint* (Abbs and Freebairn, 1991), and even in this series, the space dedicated to learning strategies consists of no more than a paragraph at the end of each section.

Other less widely adopted language teaching and learning methods and approaches include, among others, situational language teaching (whereby grammar and

vocabulary are practised through situations), the natural method (which emphasises natural acquisition rather than formal grammar study), the direct method (which uses only the target language), the total physical response method (which stresses the importance of motor activity), the silent way (which encourages the teacher to be silent as much as possible) and suggestopoedia (which attempts to harness the influence of suggestion, such as music or art, on human behaviour).

It would probably be fair to say that to a greater or lesser extent all of these various methods and approaches have had some influence on the contemporary language learning and teaching field which has tended in recent years to move away from dogmatic positions of "right" or "wrong" and to become much more eclectic in its attitudes and willing to recognise the potential merits of a wide variety of possible methods and approaches, as noted by writers such as Larsen-Freeman (1987) and Tarone and Yule (1989). In line with this modern interest in eclecticism, educators are becoming increasingly interested in the contribution made by the learners themselves in the teaching/learning partnership. Awareness has been slowly growing for some time that "*any learning is an active process*" (Rivers, 1983, p.134. Author's italics), and the idea that language learners are individuals who can take charge of their own learning and achieve autonomy by the use of learning strategies has been researched and promoted by educators such as Oxford (1990), O'Malley and Chamot (1990), Bialystok (1991), Cohen (1991), Wenden (1991), and Green and Oxford (1995).

There are several important theoretical assumptions which underlie contemporary ideas on language learning strategies. To comment that some students are more successful at learning language than others is, of course, to do no more than state the obvious. Language learning strategy theory postulates that, other things being equal, at least part of this differential success rate is attributable to the varying strategies which different learners bring to the task. From this perspective, which views students as being able to consciously influence their own learning, the learning of language becomes a cognitive process similar in many ways to any other kind of learning (McLaughlin, 1978). It is a view diametrically opposed to Krashen's Monitor and Acquisition/Learning Hypotheses (Krashen, 1976; 1977) which state that language cannot be consciously learnt but only acquired through natural communication and therefore, by implication, that conscious learning strategies are not useful in the development of language.

With the exception of the Monitor and Acquisition/Learning Hypotheses, language learning strategy theory operates comfortably alongside most of the contemporary language learning and teaching theories and fits easily with a wide variety of different methods and approaches. For instance, memory and cognitive strategies are involved in the development of vocabulary and grammar knowledge on which the grammar-translation method depends. Memory and cognitive strategies can be involved to make the patterning of automatic responses characteristic of the audiolingual method more effective. Learning from errors (developed from interlanguage theory) involves

cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Compensation and social strategies can easily be assimilated into communicative competence theory and the communicative language teaching approach. Methods such as suggestopoedia involve affective strategies. The fact that learning strategy theory can work so easily alongside other theories, methods and approaches means that it has the potential to be a valuable component of contemporary eclectic syllabuses.

Research into Language Learning Strategies

One of the difficulties with researching language learning strategies is that they cannot usually be observed directly; they can only be inferred from language learner behaviour. As Ellis (1986, p.14) rather colourfully puts it: "It is a bit like trying to work out the classification system of a library when the only evidence to go on consists of the few books you have been allowed to take out". Given the difficulties of such a task, the challenge has been to devise a means first of all to record and subsequently to interpret the phenomena involved, a process which Ellis (1986, p.188) likens to "stumbling blindfold round a room to find a hidden object". Over the years, different researchers have employed a variety of approaches to this rather daunting task, one of the most frequently used of which has been the gathering of data about good language learners and about what it is that they do that makes them more successful than slower language learners

Studies involving successful and unsuccessful language learners

One of the earliest researchers in this area, Rubin (1975), defining strategies as "the techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge" (p.43) concluded that successful language learners had a strong desire to communicate, were willing to guess when unsure, and were not afraid of being wrong or appearing foolish. This did not mean that they did not care about correctness, however: good language learners also paid attention to form and meaning in their language. In addition, good language learners practise and monitor their own language and the language of those around them. Rubin noted that the employment of these strategies depended on a number of variables such as target language proficiency, age, situation and cultural differences. Some of Rubin's findings have been supported by other more recent researchers, such as Wong Filmore (1982), who, reporting on research into individual differences at the University of California, paid special attention to the social strategies (although she did not use this term) employed by good language learners. She reported that the good language learners "spent more time than they should have during class time socialising and minding everyone else's

business.....they were constantly involved in the affairs of their classmates" (p.63). This behaviour is consistent with the strong desire to communicate noted by Rubin (1975) as characteristic of good language learners.

At around the same time as Rubin, Stern (1975) produced a list of ten language learning strategies. He believed that the good language learner is characterised by a personal learning style or positive learning strategies, an active approach to the learning task, a tolerant and outgoing approach to the target language which is empathetic with its speakers, technical know-how about how to tackle a language, strategies of experimentation and planning with the object of developing the new language into an ordered system with progressive revision, constantly searching for meaning, willingness to practise, willingness to use the language in real communication, critically sensitive self-monitoring in language use and an ability to develop the target language more and more as a separate reference system while learning to think about it.

These rather broad "characterisations" (Stern, 1975, p.316) are somewhat at variance with the more specific way in which Rubin (1975) defines the term strategy, especially as she refined her usage of the term in later work (for instance Rubin, 1981; 1987). Although this very early work by researchers such as Rubin and Stern provided many valuable insights and formed the foundations for much subsequent work on language learning strategies, the difficulties with the definition evident even at this point remain unresolved to this day, as previously discussed.

In another pioneering piece of research, Naiman, Frohlich, Stern and Todesco (1978) also tried to find out what people known to be good at languages had in common. Using a very broad definition of strategies as " general, more or less deliberate approaches" (p.4), they discovered that good language learners are able to adapt learning styles to suit themselves, are actively involved in the language learning process, are able to develop an awareness of language both as a system of rules and as a means of communication, are constantly working at expanding their language knowledge, develop the target language as a separate system which does not always have to be related to the first language, and are realistically aware of the demands of learning language.

Other studies which have attempted to investigate the relationship between language learning strategies and success in language development by speakers of other languages have produced mixed results. O'Malley *et al* (1985, 1985a) discovered that, although students at all levels reported the use of an extensive variety of learning strategies, defined as "any set of operations or steps used by a learner that will facilitate the acquisition, storage, retrieval or use of information" (1985, p.23), higher level students reported greater use of metacognitive strategies (that is strategies used by students to manage their own learning), leading the researchers to conclude that the more successful students are probably able to exercise greater metacognitive control over their learning. This conclusion, however, is somewhat at variance with

the results of a study by Ehrman and Oxford (1995) who investigated the relationship between end-of-course proficiency and a number of variables including language learning strategies. The results of this study indicated that cognitive strategies such as looking for patterns and reading for pleasure in the target language were the only kinds of strategies which had a significant positive relationship with success in learning language.

Language learning strategies of all kinds are used more frequently by higher level students according to the results of a large-scale study of university students in Puerto Rico by Green and Oxford (1995). Green and Oxford also discovered a core of what they call "*bedrock strategies"* (p.289. Authors' italics), a group of 23 strategies used equally frequently by students across proficiency levels. Green and Oxford speculate that these basic strategies are not necessarily unproductive, but that they may contribute significantly to the learning process without being in themselves sufficient to move the less successful students to higher levels of proficiency.

Griffiths (2003) also discovered a positive correlation between course level and reported frequency of language learning strategy use. In a study involving 348 students in a private language school in New Zealand, Griffiths found that language learning strategies were reportedly used significantly more frequently by advanced students than by elementary students. According to an examination of the patterns of language learning strategy use which emerged from the data, higher level students reported highly frequent use of strategies relating to interaction with others, to vocabulary, to reading, to the tolerance of ambiguity, to language systems, to the management of feelings, to the management of learning and to the utilisation of available resources.

Although it is perhaps natural to want to concentrate positive attention on good language learners, researchers have also been aware that there is a lot to be learnt by observation of what unsuccessful language learners do, and, therefore, by implication, what learners should, perhaps, try to avoid. Writing about her own less than totally successful efforts to become literate in Chinese, Sinclair Bell (1995) reports that she found the experience immensely stressful. One of the reasons for her difficulties, she believes, is "I used the same strategies and approaches for L2 literacy as had given me success in L1 literacy" (p.701). The difficulty of changing students familiar strategy patterns is also reported by O'Malley (1987)

A similar observation is also made by Porte (1988, p.168): "The majority of learners said that they used strategies which were the same as, or very similar to, those they had used at schools in their native countries". After interviewing fifteen under-achieving learners in private language schools in London, Porte came to the rather interesting conclusion that these under-achieving students in fact used very similar strategies to those used by successful language learners. The difference seemed to be

not so much which strategies were used, but "the fact that they may demonstrate less sophistication and a less suitable response to a particular activity" (p.68).

Although the research into language learning strategies used by successful and unsuccessful language learners has produced some interesting insights, the picture which emerges is far from unified. An alternative approach used by researchers has been to study some of the various factors which influence individual students in their choice of learning strategies

Studies investigating factors affecting strategy choice

Studies which have examined the relationship between sex and strategy use have come to mixed conclusions. Ehrman and Oxford (1989) and Oxford and Nyikos (1989) discovered distinct gender differences in strategy use. The study by Green and Oxford (1995) came to the same conclusion. Ehrman and Oxford's (1990) study, however failed to discover any evidence of differing language learning strategy use between the sexes. It might be concluded, perhaps, that, although men and women do not always demonstrate differences in language learning strategy use, where differences are found women tend to use more language learning strategies than men.

The effects of psychological type were the focus of a study by Ehrman and Oxford (1989) when they reported on an investigation into the effects of learner variables on adult language learning strategies at the Foreign Service Institute, USA. They concluded that the relationship between language learning strategy use and personality type (as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator MBTI) is far from straightforward. In a later study in the same setting, Ehrman and Oxford (1990) concluded that psychological type appears to have a strong influence on the way learners use language learning strategies.

The effects of motivation on language learning strategy use were highlighted when Oxford and Nyikos (1989) surveyed 1,200 students studying various languages in a Midwestern American university in order to examine the kinds of language learning strategies the students reported using. On this occasion, the degree of expressed motivation was discovered to be the most influential of the variables affecting strategy choice examined. In their study at the Foreign Service Institute, Ehrman and Oxford (1989) discovered that career choice had a major effect on reported language learning strategy use, a finding which they suggest may be the result of underlying motivation.

Studies which have investigated nationality as a factor in language learning strategy use are not easy to find, although Griffiths and Parr (2000) reported finding that European students reported using language learning strategies significantly more frequently than students of other nationalities, especially strategies relating to vocabulary, to reading, to interaction with others and to the tolerance of ambiguity.

European students were also working at a significantly higher level than students of other nationalities. In a study involving a questionnaire and group interviews in Taiwan, Yang (1998) made some interesting discoveries about her students' language learning strategy use, including strategies for using dictionaries. In a later study, Yang (1999) discovered that, although her students were aware of various language learning strategies, few of them actually reported using them. Using a journal writing method, Usuki (2000) discussed the psychological barriers to the adoption of effective language learning strategies by Japanese students, who are typically regarded as passive learners, and recommended more co-operation between students and teachers. Two studies which produced findings on nationality-related differences in language learning strategies incidental to the main research thrust were those reported by Politzer and McGroarty (1985) and by O'Malley (1987). Politzer and McGroarty discovered that Asian students exhibited fewer of the strategies expected of "good" language learners than did Hispanic students while O'Malley ascribed the lack of success of Asian students to the persistence of familiar strategies.

An interesting contrast to the findings of the all of the previous studies in this section is that by Willing (1988). Willing administered questionnaires on learning style preference and strategy use to a large number of adult immigrant speakers of other languages in Australia. The results were examined for style preference and strategy use compared with various biographical variables such as ethnic origin, age, gender, proficiency and length of residence in Australia. Willing concluded that style preference and strategy use remained virtually constant across all of these variables. Such conflicting research findings do nothing but underscore the difficulties of reaching any kind of consensus in the area of language learning strategies.

Studies of the effects of strategy instruction

The belief that language learning strategies are teachable and that learners can benefit from coaching in learning strategies underlies much of the research in the field (for instance Oxford, 1990; Larsen-Freeman, 1991; Cook, 1991) In line with this belief, many researchers have worked to demonstrate the pedagogical applications of findings from studies into language learning strategies.

One study which researched the effects of the teaching of cognitive and metacognitive strategies on reading comprehension in the classroom was conducted by Tang and Moore (1992). They concluded that, while cognitive strategy instruction (title discussion, pre-teaching vocabulary) improved comprehension scores, the performance gains were not maintained upon the withdrawal of the treatment. Metacognitive strategy instruction, on the other hand, involving the teaching of self-monitoring strategies, appeared to lead to improvements in comprehension ability which were maintained beyond the end of the treatment. This finding accords with that of O'Malley *et al* (1985) who discovered that higher level students are more able than lower level students to exercise metacognitive control over their learning.

In another classroom based study which aimed to research whether learner strategy training makes a difference in terms of knowledge, skills and attitudes, Nunan (1995) involved 60 students in a 12 week programme "designed to help them reflect on their own learning, to develop their knowledge of, and ability to apply learning strategies, to assess their own progress, and to apply their language skills beyond the classroom"(p.3). Nunan concluded that his study supported the idea that language classrooms should have a dual focus, teaching both content and an awareness of language processes.

A negative result for the effectiveness of language learning strategy instruction was achieved, however, when O'Malley (1987) and his colleagues randomly assigned 75 students to one of three instructional groups where they received training in (1)metacognitive, cognitive and socioaffective strategies, (2)cognitive and socioaffective strategies, or (3)no special instruction in language learning strategies (control group) for listening, speaking and vocabulary acquisition skills. Among other findings, it was discovered that the control group for vocabulary actually scored slightly higher than the treatment groups. O'Mally explains this unexpected finding as being due to the persistence of familiar strategies among certain students, who continued to use rote repetitive strategies and were unwilling to adopt the strategies presented in training, especially when they knew they would be tested within only a few minutes. This is an interesting finding when compared with Porte's (1988) observations concerning his underachieving students and with Sinclair Bell's (1995) comments on her own attempt to become literate in Chinese.

Although results regarding the effectiveness of strategy training are rather mixed, the hypothesis that some of the success achieved by good language learners may be as a result of more effective language learning strategies is intuitively appealing, as is the assumption that the language learning strategies of the more successful students may be learnt by the less successful students and that teachers can assist the language learning process by promoting language learning strategy awareness and use. This teachability component has meant that language learning strategies are increasingly attracting the attention of contemporary educators and researchers who are keen to harness the potential which language learning strategies would seem to have to enhance an individual's ability to learn language.

Conclusion

It is common in the literature on language learning strategies for writers to refer to the "recent" nature of research in this field (for instance Cohen, 1991; Oxford and Cohen,

1992; Nyikos and Oxford, 1993; Green and Oxford, 1995). In fact, however, what are regarded by many (for instance Oxford, 1989a; Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991; Ellis, 1994) as the foundation studies in this area were conducted in the mid seventies (for instance by Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975). The questions which arise, then, are: If language learning strategies have as much potential for enhancing learning as some (for instance O'Malley *et al,* 1985; Chamot and O'Malley, 1987; Willing, 1989; Brown, 1994) believe, why has it taken nearly a quarter of a century for research findings to be applied to the classroom? Why do teachers give them such scant attention and understand them so poorly, as reported for instance by O'Malley *et al* (1985), Wenden (1987) and Oxford *et al* (1989). Why do they receive such cursory treatment (if any) in SOL textbooks? And why has it taken so long to even establish a generally agreed definition and classification system?

By trying to locate language learning strategies within the framework of other theories, methods and approaches to the teaching of language to speakers of other languages, I have attempted to demonstrate that the history of what might be called modern second language teaching (since the middle of the twentieth century) has been punctuated by extremes. Each new method or approach has tended to be heralded as the answer to all problems, and, in the rush to welcome the newcomer, the older methods and approaches have often been unceremoniously abandoned in what might be called a baby-and-bathwater type reaction. Increasingly, however, as the new methods and approaches have failed to deliver quite the hoped-for miracles, awareness has grown that each different method or approach has its strengths and that, in combination, they can be used to enhance each other. As a result "there has emerged a general movement towards eclecticism" (Tarone and Yule, 1989, p.10) where methods are chosen to suit the students and the situation involved rather than because they conform to some rigid theory (such as the Audiolingual insistence that students should never see words written before they have heard them spoken). As Larsen-freeman (1897, p.7) puts it: "It is not uncommon for teachers today to practice a principled eclecticism, combining techniques and principles from various methods in a carefully reasoned manner".

In the light of historical experience, therefore, it is perhaps, important that, although learning strategies have the potential to be "an extremely powerful learning tool" (O'Malley, 1985, p.43), we should keep them also in perspective. It is probably unlikely that learning strategies will prove to be a magic wand to solve all language learning problems any more than any of the other eagerly-seized new ideas have proven to be in the last 50 years. But, used eclectically, in conjunction with other techniques, learning strategies may well prove to be an extremely useful addition to a language learner's tool kit.

References

Abbs, Brian & Ingrid Freebairn (1991). *Blueprint.* UK: Addison, Wesley, Longman

Allwright, Dick & Kathleen M Bailey (1991). *Focus on the language classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Bailey, Kathleen M & David Nunan (eds) (1996). *Voices from the language classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Bialystok, Ellen (1978). A theoretical model of second language learning, *Language Learning,* Vol 28, No1, 69-83

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

Bialystok, Ellen (1991). Achieving proficiency in a second language: a processing description. In R. Phillipson, Eric Kellerman, Larry Selinker, Mike Sharwood-Smith & Merrill Swain (eds), 63-77.

Brown, H Douglas (1980). *Principles and practices of language learning and teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Brown, H Douglas (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Brown, H, C Yorio, & R Crymes (eds) (1977). *On TESOL '77.* Washington DC: TESOL

Canale, Michael & Merrill Swain (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing, *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47

Chamot, Anna Uhl (1987). The Learning Strategies of ESL Students. In A. Wenden & Joan Rubin (eds), 71-83

Chamot, Anna Uhl & Michael O'Malley (1987). The cognitive academic language learning approach: a Bridge to the mainstream, *TESOL Quarterly,* 21/2, 227-250.

Chaudron, Craig (1995). *Second language classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Chomsky, Noam (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax.* Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press

Chomsky, Noam (1968). *Language and mind.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World

Clarke, Mark A & Jean Handscombe (1982). *On TESOL*. Washington: TESOL

Cohen, Andrew D (1991). Strategies in second language learning :insights from research. In Phillipson *et al* (eds), 107-119

Cook, Vivian (1991). *Second language learning and language teaching.* London: Edward Arnold

Corder, S Pit (1967). The significance of learners' errors, *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 160-170

Eckman, F, L Bell & D Nelson (eds) (1984). *Universals of second language acquisition.* Rowley, Mass: Newbury House

Ehrman, Madeline & Rebecca Oxford (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies, *The modern language journal,* 73/1, 1-13

Ehrman, Madeline & Rebecca Oxford (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting, *The modern language journal,* 74/3, 311-327

Ehrman, Madeline & Rebecca Oxford (1995). Cognition plus: correlates of language learning success, *The modern language journal,* 79/1, 67-89

Ellis, Gail & Barbara Sinclair (1994). *Learning to learn English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Ellis, Rod (1986). *Understanding second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, Rod (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Green, John, M & Rebecca Oxford (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 Proficiency and Gender, *TESOL Quarterly*, 29/2, 261-297.

Gregg, K (1984). Krashen's monitor and Occam's razor, *Applied Linguistics*, 5, 78-100.

Griffiths, Carol (2003). Patterns of language learning strategy use, *System,* 31, 367-383

Griffiths, C. & Judy M. Parr (2000). Language learning strategies, nationality, Independence and Proficiency, *Independence*, 28, 7-10

Griffiths, C & Judy M. Parr (2001). Language-learning strategies: theory and perception, *ELT Journal,* 55/3, 247-254

Henning, C (ed) (1977). *Proceedings of the Los Angeles second language research forum.* English Department, University of California at Los Angeles

Higgs, T (ed) (1982). *Curriculum, competence and the foreign language teacher.* Skokie, Il: National Textbook

Higgs, T & R Clifford (1982). The push toward communication. In T Higgs (ed), 57-79.

Hutchinson, Tom & Alan Waters (1990). *English for specific purposes: a learning-centred approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Hyltenstam, K & M Pienemann (eds) (1985). *Modelling and assessing second language acquisition*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters

Hymes, Del (1972). On communicative competence. In Pride and Holmes (eds) 1972

Krashen, Stephen (1976). Formal and informal linguistic environments in language acquisition and language learning, *TESOL Quarterly,* 10, 157-68

Krashen, Stephen (1977). Some issues relating to the Monitor Model. In H. Brown *et al* (eds), 144-158

Krashen, Stephen, D (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning.* Oxford: Pergamon Press

Krashen, Stephen, D (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon Press

Krashen, Stephen, D (1985). *The input hypothesis.* London: Longman

Krashen, Stephen, D & Tracy D Terrell (1983). *The natural approach.* Hayward, California: Hayward Press.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane (1987). From unity to diversity: twenty-five years of language-teaching methodology, *Forum*, 25/4, 2-10

Larsen-Freeman, Diane (1991). Second language acquisition research: staking out the territory, *TESOL Quarterly*, 25/2, 315-350

Larsen-Freeman, Diane & Michael H Long (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research.* London & NY: Longman

Littlewood, William (1981). *Communicative language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Long, M (1990). Maturational constraints on language development, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 251-285

McLaughlin, B (1978). The Monitor model: Some methodological considerations, *Language Learning*, 28, 309-32

McLaughlin, Barry, Tammi Rossman & Beverly McLeod (1983). Second language learning: An information-processing perspective, *Language Learning,* 33/2, 135-158

Naiman, N, M Frohlich, H Stern, & A Todesco (1978). *The good language learner.* Research in Education Series No 7. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Nunan, David (1991). *Language teaching methodology.* New York: Phoenix

Nunan, David (1994). *The learner-centred curriculum.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Nunan, David (1995). Learner strategy training in the classroom: A case study. Unpublished paper.

Nyikos, Martha & Rebecca Oxford (1993). A factor Analytic Study of Language-Learning Strategy Use: Interpretations from Information-Processing Theory and Social Psychology, *The Modern Language Journal,* 77, 11-22

O'Malley, J Michael (1987). The effects of training in the use of learning strategies on learning English as a second language. In Anita Wenden & Joan Rubin (eds) 133-143

O'Malley, J Michael, Anna Uhl Chamot, Gloria Stewner-Manzanares, Lisa Kupper & Rocco P Russo (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students, *Language Learning*, 35/1, 21-46

O'Malley, J Michael, Anna Uhl Chamot, Gloria Stewner-Manzanares, Rocco P Russo & Lisa Kupper (1985a). Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language, *TESOL Quarterly*, 19/3, 557-584

O'Malley, J Michael & Anna Uhl Chamot (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Neil, HF (Jr) (ed) (1978). *Learning strategies.* New York: Academic Press

Oxford, Rebecca L (1989). 'The Best and the worst': an exercise to tap perceptions of language-learning experiences and strategies, *Foreign Language Annals,* 22/5, 447-454

Oxford, Rebecca L (1989a). Use of language learning strategies: a synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training, *System,* 17/2, 235-247

Oxford, R L (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* New York: Newbury House

Oxford, Rebecca L & Judith Burry-Stock (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), *System,* 25/1, 1-23

Oxford, Rebecca L & Andrew D Cohen (1992). Language learning strategies: crucial issues of concept and classification, *Applied Language Learning,* 3/1&2, 1-35

Oxford, Rebecca L, Roberta Z Lavine & David Crookall (1989). Language learning strategies, the communicative approach and their classroom implications, *Foreign Language Annals,* 22/1, 29-39

Oxford, Rebecca & Martha Nyikos (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students, *The Modern Language Journal,* 73/3, 291-300.

Pearson, Eloise (1988). Learner strategies and learner interviews, *ELT Journal,* 42/3, 173-178

Phillipson, Robert, Eric Kellerman, Larry Selinker, Michael Sharwood-Smith & Merrill Swain (1991). *Foreign/Second language pedagogy research.* Clevedon, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters

Pienemann, M (1985). Learnability and syllabus construction. In K. Hyltenstam & M Pienemann (eds) 23-75

Pienemann, M (1989). Is language teachable? Psycholinguistic experiments and hypotheses, *Applied Linguistics,* 10, 52-79

Politzer, R & McGroarty, M (1985). An exploratory study of learning behaviours and their relationship to gains in linguistic and communicative competence, *TESOL Quarterly* 19, 103-123

Porte, Graeme (1988). Poor language learners and their strategies for dealing with new vocabulary, *ELT Journal*, 42/3, 167-171

Pride, J B & J Holmes (eds) (1972). *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin

Richards, Jack, C (1994). *The language teaching matrix.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Richards, Jack C, John Platt & Heidi Platt (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Harlow: Longman

Richards, Jack C & Theodore Rodgers (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rigney, JW (1978). Learning strategies: A theoretical perspective. In H F O'Neil (Jr) (ed) 165-205

Rivers, Wilga (1983). *Speaking in many tongues*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

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

Rubin, J (1981). Study of cognitive processes in second language learning, *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 117-131

Rubin, Joan (1987). Learner strategies: theoretical assumptions, research history and typology. In A. Wenden & Joan Rubin (eds), 15-19.

Seliger, H (1984). Processing universals in second language acquisition. In F. Eckman, L Bell & D Nelson (eds) 36-47

Selinker, L (1972). Interlanguage, *International review of applied linguistics*, 10, 209-230

Sharwood Smith, Michael (1994). *Second language learning: theoretical foundations*. London and New York: Longman

Sinclair Bell, Jill (1995). The relationship between L1 and L2 literacy: Some complicating factors, *TESOL Quarterly,* 29/4, 687-704

Skehan, Peter (1989). *Individual differences in second-language learning.* London: Edward Arnold

Spolsky, Bernard (1989). *Conditions for second language Llearning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Stern, H H (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner?, *Canadian Modern Language Review,* 34, 304-318

Stern, H H (1980). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Stern, H H (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching* (edited posthumously by Patrick Allen & Birgit Harley). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tang, Hui Nee & Dennis W Moore (1992). Effects of cognitive and metacognitive pre-reading activities on the reading comprehension of ESL learners, *Educational Psychology,* 12/3&4, 315-331

Tarone, Elaine (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage, *Language Learning,* 30/2, 417-429

Tarone, Elaine (1981). Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy, *TESOL Quarterly,* 15/3, 285-295

Tarone, Elaine & George Yule (1989). *Focus on the language learner.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Usuki, Miyuki (2000). A new understanding of Japanese students views on classroom learning, *Independence*, 27, 2-6

Wenden, A L (1985). Learner strategies, *TESOL Newsletter,* 19(5), 1-7

Wenden, A L (1987). Incorporating learner training in the classroom. In A. Wenden & Joan Rubin (eds), 159-167

Wenden, A L (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy.* UK: Prentice Hall

Wenden, A L & Joan Rubin (eds) (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning.* UK: Prentice Hall

Wesche, M (1977). Learning behaviours of successful adult students on intensive language training. In Henning, C (ed) *Proceedings of the Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum*, 355-370. English Department, University of California at Los Angeles.

Widdowson, H (1978). *Teaching language as communication.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Widdowson, H (1991). *Aspects of language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Wilkins, D A (1976). *Notional syllabuses.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Willing, Ken (1988). *Learning styles in adult migrant education.* Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research

Willing, Ken (1989). *Teaching how to learn: learning strategies in ESL*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language teaching and Research

Wong Fillmore, Lily (1982). The language learner as an individual: implications of research in individual differences for the ESL teacher. In Mark A Clarke & Jean Handscombe (eds) 157-171

Yang, Nae-Dong (1998). An interviewing study of college students' English learning strategy use, *Studies in English language and literature*, 4, 1-11

Yang, Nae-Dong (1999). The relationship between EFL learners beliefs and learning strategy use, *System*, 27, 515-535