

I C U Language Research Bulletin

語 学 研 究 Vol. 6, No.1 1991 抜刷

Classification of Language Learning Strategies

Y o s h i n o r i W A T A N A B E

Classification of Language Learning Strategies

Yoshinori Watanabe

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to propose a classification of language learning strategies based on the results of factor analysis. The translated Japanese version of Oxford's (1990a) Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) was administered to a total of 315 college and university students. The Japanese SILL was found to be highly reliable as well, with internal consistency reliability ranging from .93 to .89 (Cronbach alpha). However, a different classification of strategies emerged for the present subjects. Among others it was found that "communicative learning strategy" is one of the important strategy groups employed by the present ESL learners. It was suggested that many more replication studies should be done before setting up a definite classification system.

Introduction

Growing interest has recently been observed in the area of teaching students how to learn. Numerous factors are involved in learning a foreign language including internal factors such as motivation, personality, cognitive styles, and external factors such as contexts, parents' attitudes

towards language learning, and accessibility of learning materials. However, the most important aspect of learning consists in how the learner makes use of these factors to learn the target language in a better way. A highly motivated learner will fail without the knowledge of how to go about learning the target language. A learner who has high accessibility to language resources will also fail if he or she does not know how to make use of them. Thus, the learners need to learn to use learning strategies.

Language learning strategy is commonly defined as "the special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information" (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990, p.1). Oxford (1990a) has made a step further toward a better definition: "learning strategies are specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations" (p.8). It is this definition of learning strategies that we will employ in this paper. Learning strategies are different from mere learning skills or learning techniques in that they are systematic. By systematic is meant that learning strategies are made up of subgroups, and that these subgroups interact with each other to help learners learn the target language in a better way. It is therefore important to clarify what kinds of strategies are used by the learners. In addition, the classification will benefit teachers as well as researchers when they teach learning strategies since it will clarify which types of strategies the learners are lacking and need more training in. Although several classifications have been proposed so far (e.g., O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Ellis &

Sinclair, 1989; Oxford, 1990a), they are not definitive yet. The purpose of this paper is to propose an alternative classification system of learning strategies based on the translated version of Oxford's Strategy Inventory of Language Learning, employing factor analytic technique.

Instrumentation

Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) was used as a tool to elicit learning strategies of the present subjects. According to Oxford (1990a), "the SILL was originally developed for the Language Skill Change Project, which periodically assesses the amount of change found in language skills after the learner's foreign language training has been completed" (p. 255). Among several versions of the SILL, Version 7.0 was chosen for the present study. This SILL consists of 50 items and is intended to examine the strategies employed by speakers of other languages learning English. The items were "based on the author's strategy system, and additional items were adopted from early surveys and strategy items by O'Malley, Chamot, and Rubin" (Oxford, 1990, p. 255). Each item asks the respondent to indicate his or her frequency of using a certain learning strategy on a five-point scale (from 1, almost never; to 5, almost always). The items of the SILL are classified into six groups: Memory (items 1 through 9), cognitive (10-23), compensation (24-29), metacognitive (30-38), affective (39-44), and social (45-50) strategies. These strategies come from two major classes: Memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies belong to "direct

strategies," and the other three strategies, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies, belong to "indirect strategies." Direct strategies, which are related to language; take charge of "remembering and retrieving new information" (memory strategies), "understanding and producing the language" (cognitive strategies), and "using the language despite knowledge gaps" (compensation strategies) (Oxford 1990a; pp. 14-15). On the other hand, indirect strategies deal with "general management of learning" (metacognitive strategies), "regulating emotions" (affective strategies), and "learning with others" (social strategies) (p. 15).

SILL has been employed for research and educational purposes with many fruitful results. For example, Oxford and her colleagues have successfully found out the relationships between various learner factors such as personality, educational background, gender, career choices, university majors, etc., and language learning strategies (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989).

SILL was employed for the present study for the following three reasons. First, the inventory is based on a more comprehensive and detailed system of language learning strategies than any other system that has been proposed so far. Second, because individual strategies and strategy groups are linked with each other, and because it uses less technical terminology, it is easily applicable to teaching. The third reason was that SILL is a questionnaire type inventory. Perhaps this reason needs further explanation. Most of the strategy systems to date have been based on retrospective or on-line processing studies. In a typical situation where

the strategies are elicited from subjects, they are asked to perform some learning tasks. In retrospective research, the subjects are asked how they have performed the task after they have completed it. In the on-line processing approach, subjects are asked to "think-aloud" while they are performing the task. These methods of data collection are effective in order to "see" what the learners are doing while they are learning. However, these methods have several limitations. First, they are rather time-consuming. Typically, the subjects have to go through a series of warm-up sessions before they are engaged in actual learning tasks. Further, especially in the case of retrospection, the experimenter has to spend large amounts of time transcribing the data. Second, as was pointed out by O'Malley & Chamot (1990), subjects often fail to return for repeat data collection sessions "once they realize how much effort is involved in reporting their thought processes while learning" (p. 223). Unfortunately, "this is particularly true of students rated by their teachers as among the less effective language learners" (p. 223). Third, particularly in the case of think-aloud tasks, subjects' learning processes tend to be distorted since learners are usually not thinking aloud while they are engaged in learning. The process of thinking aloud might not reflect the subjects' natural learning processes. Fourth, the language which is used for retrospection and think-aloud sometimes poses a problem. There are relatively few problems when dealing with proficient learners. However, when examining less proficient learners, the language problem becomes more serious. Although they are often allowed to use their first language, the use of the language might

interfere with the performance of the task which is being done in the target language. Finally, these qualitative data are difficult to be statistically analyzed. In other words, from these data alone, it is quite difficult to examine how typical the data are among language learners.

The questionnaire, however, is less time-consuming, relatively easily administered, and provides data for statistic analyses. Besides, in the case of questionnaire the seriousness of the language problem can be alleviated through translation of the items into the subjects' first language. The questionnaire has of course its limitations, however. The most serious one is its reliability. In other words, the response to the items might not reflect what the subjects are really doing while learning, partly because the learning strategies which are being used subconsciously might not be raised to consciousness when responding to the questionnaire items. In this respect, the questionnaire shares the same problem as the on-line processing and retrospection in that the strategies elicited might not reflect what the learner is actually doing while learning. Learning strategy research, like other second language acquisition research, has to employ triangulation or multiple data collection procedures. So the present study does not pretend to be exhaustive. Rather it attempts to complement the previous studies by mitigating the deficiencies of the strategy description studies based on qualitative data collection by employing the questionnaire type SILL.

For the present study, the English version of SILL was translated into Japanese so that the effects of individual differences in the ability in

English should be minimised. In the process of translation, best efforts were made to maintain the same proposition of each item, although a circumlocution was used about some items which are quite difficult to translate literally into Japanese. After that, two Japanese who are proficient in English were asked to try them out, and reproduce the propositional content in English. The items which were found to be distorted were corrected. The translated items with their original English items are given in the appendix. When the Japanese SILL was administered to the present subjects, it was in the form of Oxford's original version (1990a), where the questionnaire items are categorized into Oxford's six strategy groups, and the English part of the items were not given.

As a result, internal consistency reliability measured by Cronbach alpha is .93 for the 156 college students, and .89 for the 159 university students who took part in the present study as subjects. The coefficients are slightly lower than the one which was reported in Oxford (1990b), who reports the reliability of the English version of SILL (version 7.0) is .95. Yet the present coefficients still confirm the high reliability of the Japanese SILL. They also largely agree with the reliability of the earlier version of the 121-item SILL of Oxford (1990a), who reports .96 for a 1,200-person university sample and .95 for a 483-person military sample (p. 255). Thus, the reliability analysis revealed that the translated version of SILL is highly reliable as well as the original English version, providing consistent and accurate information on the use of language learning strategies.

Subjects

A total of 315 subjects took part in the present study. 156 were from H college, and 159 were from S university. H college is situated in a rural area of Japan, and all the students are females. They rarely have a chance to use English in daily life. Those who took part in the present study belong to the English department, and they study English for about 20 hours a week at college, in addition to other general academic subjects such as social studies and natural sciences. Out of the 20 hours, two hours are taught by native speakers of English both at the first year and second year. The age range is from 18 to 20. There were no students who had stayed overseas for any purposes.

S university is in a metropolitan area and all the students in the study are from the English department. Both first and second year students study English for about 20 hours a week at university in addition to the required general subjects such as social studies and natural sciences like in the case of H college. Most of the English classes are taught by native speakers of English both at the first and second years. The age range of the students is from 18 to 23. Out of the 82 first year students, there were 30 males and 52 females, while out of 77 second year students, there were 24 males and 53 females.

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

The Japanese SILL was administered during a class of English. Respon-

dents were allowed to leave items blank which they did not think they could give a definite answer.

Factor analysis was employed to analyse the present data. Factor analysis, to paraphrase Skehan (1989), is one type of multivariate statistics which examines the raw data to try to find out underlying groupings which seem to unite sets of the measures that are being used. These groupings are the factors, and the analysis portrays the influence of these underlying factors on actual tests by means of loadings. Such loadings reflect how important the underlying factor is for each test, with loadings varying from -1 through 0 to +1. Higher loadings indicate that the test in question is especially well accounted for by the factor in question (p. 17). For the present study, factor analysis based on principle components analysis with varimax rotation was employed since this is one of the widely used methods for factor extraction (Bryman & Cramer, 1990, pp. 255-257). Finally, note that missing data were excluded from the present analyses. That is, in cases where the respondents left questions blank, they were excluded from consideration.

Results and Discussion

The results of factor analysis are given in Tables 1.1 through 2.2. It can be seen from these tables that the five main factors were extracted. These factors had eigenvalues above 1.000, and 44.5% of the total variance was attributable to these five factors in the case of H college, and 38.6%,

Table 1.1 Final Statistics of Factor Analysis for SILL (H college)

Factor	Communality	Eigenvalue	Pct of Var	Cum Pct
1	.40677	12.57749	25.2	25.2
2	.52193	2.88637	5.8	30.9
3	.34507	2.58849	5.2	36.1
4	.32578	2.33349	4.7	40.8
5	.12445	1.85830	3.7	44.5

(Pct of Var = Percentage of variance; Cum Pct = Cumulative percent)

in the case of S university (Tables 1.1 and 2.1).¹ In Tables 1.2 and 2.2, the strategy items with factor loadings of .40 and above for H college and .35 and above for S university are displayed, the loadings which extracted the most meaningful factors for the college and the university. Note that there were several items which had loadings on two factors. For example, item 34 of H college had .48 for factor 1, and .56 for factor 4. In cases like this, the factor which was more heavily loaded was chosen. That is, in this case, item 34 was judged to belong to factor 4 rather than factor 1. As can be seen from the tables, quite a different picture from that of Oxford emerged for the present subjects. Below are the characteristics of each strategy group with labels (which were made by myself) according to the present results.

H college

Factor 1: Communicative learning strategies

This group of strategies is related to "learning through communication" or "learning by using the language." The examples include seeking an

Table 1.2 Factor Loadings of SILL (H college)

(Letters in the brackets indicate Oxford's original category to which each of the items belonged; A=memory, B=cognitive, C=compensation, D=metacognitive, E= affective, F=social)

Items	Factors				
	1	2	3	4	5
14 (B)	.74				
35 (D)	.73				
36 (D)	.70				
16 (B)	.69				
30 (D)	.67				
17 (B)	.66				
49 (F)	.64				
13 (B)	.57				
40 (E)	.51				
15 (B)	.51				
11 (B)	.50				
50 (F)	.49				
34 (D)	.48			.56	
22 (B)	.47				
4 (A)	.44				
26 (C)		.68			
18 (B)		.60			
24 (C)		.60			
19 (B)		.58			
29 (C)		.56			
25 (C)		.55			
28 (C)	.40	.52			
21 (B)		.48			.40
47 (F)			.62		
46 (F)			.61		
48 (F)			.58		
42 (E)			.57		
44 (E)			.54		
43 (E)			.52		
33 (D)			.50		
45 (F)			.49		
41 (E)			.46		
39 (E)			.42		
12 (B)				.71	
10 (B)				.70	
8 (A)				.63	
2 (A)					.69
9 (A)					.63
23 (B)					.55
1 (A)					.50
3 (A)					.40
38 (D)					.40

(The number of each item corresponds to that of strategy item given in Appendix.)

Table 2.1 Final Statistics of Factor Analysis for SILL (S university)

Factor	Communality	Eigenvalue	Pct of Var	Cum Pct
1	.59931	9.20655	18.4	18.4
2	.50422	2.89936	5.8	24.2
3	.50105	2.84936	5.7	29.9
4	.32578	2.37043	4.7	34.7
5	.12445	1.97300	3.9	38.6

(Pct of Var = Percentage of variance; Cum Pct = Cumulative percent)

Table 2.2 Factor Loadings of SILL (S university)

Items	Factors				
	1	2	3	4	5
17 (B)	.77				
14 (B)	.76				
35 (D)	.63				
30 (D)	.63				
48 (F)	.61				
16 (D)	.53				.40
13 (B)	.52		.43		
50 (F)	.51				
40 (E)	.51				
49 (F)	.50				
15 (B)	.49				
36 (D)	.40	.60			
29 (C)	.40				.43
34 (D)		.71			
37 (D)		.60			
6 (A)		.46			
38 (D)		.46			
8 (A)		.44			
33 (D)		.38			
39 (E)			.74		
42 (E)			.72		
41 (E)			.46		
10 (B)			.41		
1 (A)			.36		.37
4 (F)				.72	
3 (A)				.60	
7 (A)				.59	
2 (A)				.57	
9 (A)				.55	
27 (C)					.68
28 (C)					.49
24 (C)					.37
22 (B)					.36

opportunity to use English, trying to use it without being afraid of making mistakes, and trying to obtain as much authentic input as possible through various media.

Factor 2: Compensation and guessing strategies

These strategies are employed when the knowledge of English is not enough and needs compensation. "Guessing" could be regarded as a part of the compensation strategy in that it can be conceived as "compensating for the lack of knowledge by guessing." The specific items included are guessing the meaning of unfamiliar words, predicting what comes next while listening and reading, making up for the deficiency of knowledge of the target language by using the first language, paraphrasing, and gestures.

Factor 3: Socio-affective strategies

This is a strategy group which is characterized as focusing on the social aspects of language, and managing affective factors in language learning. Examples include asking for help from native speakers, cooperating with other students, managing feelings about learning by trying to relax when speaking, and giving a reward or treat for improvement.

Factor 4: Formal learning strategies

These strategies are those which are related to learning language in a formal setting such as learning English as a school subject: Practicing the sounds, memorizing new words by writing them several times,

reviewing lessons, and planning a schedule for learning.

Factor 5: Mental operational strategies

This group is related to mental operations. Examples are putting a new word in a sentence, remembering the word with the situation where it appears, summarizing the information, creating a mental linkage between new knowledge and information, and imagining when remembering new words.

S university

Factor 1: Communicative learning strategies

This group of strategies shares the characteristics of Factor 1 of H college (learning by using the language): Seeking an opportunity to use English, trying to use it without being afraid of making mistakes, using paraphrases when a target word is not available, and trying to obtain as much input as possible through various media.

Factor 2: General study strategies (cognitive)

These strategies are related to self-management of learning. They are, however, associated with learning through cognitive operations, as different from affective ones in Factor 3 below. That is, planning a schedule of learning, setting clear goals, looking for opportunities to use the language, thinking about progress, and trying to find out how to be a better learner, in addition to more general strategies such as using flashcards to remember new words, and reviewing lessons.

Factor 3: General study strategies (affective)

This group of strategies are, although labeled as "general study

strategies," slightly different from those of Factor 2, in that the strategies are related to affective aspects of learning rather than cognitive ones. These strategies include trying to relax when afraid of using the language, being conscious of psychological states of oneself (being tense or nervous), and giving oneself a reward for a good result.

Factor 4: Memory strategies

This group largely corresponds to that of Oxford's classification of the strategy group with the same label. All the items included are related to how to memorize well. Some examples are remembering a new word with a situation where the word might be used, remembering a word with an associated image, remembering a word by physically acting it out, using a new word in a sentence when remembering it, and remembering words or phrases with the situation where they are used.

Factor 5: Compensation and guessing strategies

Although only a few items are the same as those of Factor 2 of H college, which has the same label, the strategies included here have so many common characteristics that they seem to deserve the label. Examples of this group of strategies are reading without looking up every new word (which involves a considerable amount of guessing), trying to guess what the other person says next, guessing the meaning of unfamiliar words, using paraphrasing, and relating new knowledge to previous knowledge.

According to Oxford (1990a), concurrent validity of an earlier version of the SILL, on which the present version (7.0) is based, is .95. That is, two independent raters matched each of the SILL items with the strategies in the comprehensive list of strategies, and the correlation between them is very high. However, for the present subjects, her classification validity was not fully attested. Table 3 shows which of Oxford's original items were analyzed into which categories of the present results. Looking at this table, it can be seen that items which were agreed upon in all the three types of categories were as follows: 2, 3, and 9 (Memory strategies); and 24, 28, and 29 (Compensation strategies). Items 39, 41, and 42 could be said to share common factors, however, since although they were labeled with different names in the present study, they still have something to do with affective strategies. Also it could be said that the general study strategies (cognitive) of S university have something in common with the original items of Oxford which belong to metacognitive strategies. Oxford (1990a) characterizes metacognitive strategies as "actions which go beyond purely cognitive devices, and which provide a way for learners to coordinate their own learning processes" (p. 136). This definition seems to be close to our definition of this strategy group. So the difference between her classification and the present one might just be a matter of definition of terms.

Among numerous differences, the biggest one is that the present results have shown that strategies labeled with "communicative learning strategies" are prime factors for both of the two cases, while in Oxford's system, they

Table 3 Comparison of Strategy Items

Item	Oxford (1990a)	H college	S university
1	memory	memory	compensation
2	memory	memory	memory
3	memory	communicative	memory
4	memory	-----	memory
5	memory	-----	-----
6	memory	-----	general study (cog.)
7	memory	-----	memory
8	memory	formal learning	general study (cog.)
9	memory	memory	memory
10	cognitive	formal learning	general study (aff.)
11	cognitive	communicative	-----
12	cognitive	formal learning	-----
13	cognitive	communicative	communicative
14	cognitive	communicative	communicative
15	cognitive	communicative	communicative
16	cognitive	communicative	communicative
17	cognitive	communicative	communicative
18	cognitive	compensation	-----
19	cognitive	compensation	-----
20	cognitive	memory	-----
21	cognitive	compensation	-----
22	cognitive	communicative	compensation
23	cognitive	memory	-----
24	compensation	compensation	compensation
25	compensation	compensation	-----
26	compensation	compensation	-----
27	compensation	-----	compensation
28	compensation	compensation	compensation
29	compensation	compensation	compensation
30	metacognitive	communicative	communicative
31	metacognitive	-----	-----
32	metacognitive	-----	-----
33	metacognitive	socio-affective	general study (cog.)
34	metacognitive	formal learning	general study (cog.)
35	metacognitive	communicative	-----
36	metacognitive	communicative	general study (cog.)
37	metacognitive	-----	general study (cog.)
38	metacognitive	memory	general study (cog.)
39	affective	socio-affective	general study (aff.)
40	affective	communicative	communicative
41	affective	socio-affective	general study (aff.)
42	affective	socio-affective	general study (aff.)
43	affective	socio-affective	-----
44	affective	socio-affective	-----
45	social	socio-affective	-----
46	social	socio-affective	-----
47	social	socio-affective	-----
48	social	socio-affective	communicative
49	social	communicative	communicative
50	social	communicative	communicative

(The number of each item indicates that of strategy item given in the appendix.)

are not established as one category. For example, item 13 (i.e., I use the English words I know in different ways.) is a cognitive strategy in Oxford, while it is classified into "communicative learning strategies" both in the case of H college and S university according to the present analysis. This group of strategy seems to the present author to be included in a strategy system, because as is often claimed by researchers of second language acquisition, communication provides an important opportunity of learning (Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Oxford, 1990a). Also Allwright (1989) pointed out that practice of listening, for example, gives learners two kinds of opportunities of improving the target language ability: improving a listening skill itself, and acquiring knowledge of the target language.

It should be noted, however, that the two broad categories, direct and indirect strategies, seem to be identified in the present results as well as in Oxford's original classification. As has been already described above, according to Oxford (1990a), direct strategies are the strategies that directly involve the target language, while indirect strategies are those that "underpin the business of language learning" (p. 135). In the case of H college, compensation and guessing strategies (Factor 2) and mental operational strategies (Factor 5) seem to belong to direct strategies, while formal learning strategies (Factor 4) and socio-affective strategies (Factor 3) belong to indirect strategies. In the case of S university, memory strategies (Factor 4) and compensation and guessing strategies (Factor 5) belong to direct strategies, whereas general study strategies (cognitive and affective) belong to indirect strategies.

Coming back to the differences, it might be worth asking why such differences emerged even though the same strategy inventory was used. The reason cannot be clarified at all in this preliminary research. However, one possibility is that the differences are due to translation effects. Although every effort was made to retain the same proposition, and although the reliability was still high, some items of the Japanese version might have differences in their meaning from those of Oxford's original version. Another answer is that the differences might be due to the differences in the characteristics of subjects who took part in the research of Oxford and in the present study. Yet not having the details about their background, this answer is merely a surmise at present.

What is more important than answering the question is, however, to realize the fact that one strategy can be conceived of as belonging to more than one category. That is, some strategy items are "ambiguous," and there are many other ambiguous strategies in terms of the categories where they belong. This kind of overlapping problem is common among the classification research as has already been pointed out by O'Malley & Chamot (p. 103, 1990). Oxford also recognizes it:

At this stage in the short history of language learning strategy research, there is no complete agreement on exactly what strategies are; how many strategies exist; how they should be defined, demarcated, and categorized; and whether it is-or even will be-possible to create a real, scientifically validated hierarchy of strategies... Classification

conflicts are inevitable. A given strategy, such as using synonyms if the exact word is not known to the learner, is classed by some experts as a learning strategy ... but is unceremoniously thrown out of the learning strategy arena by other experts, who think it is merely a communication strategy which is not useful for learning. (1990a; pp. 17-22).

What the present results have suggested for future research then is that many more replication studies should be done before reaching a definite classification system in an attempt to find out core strategies, which represent each strategy group. Whether employing SILL or any other inventory, the classification should be first attested through statistics such as factor analysis, to examine if it really reflects the strategies employed by the target subjects as has successfully been done by Oxford and her colleagues. Watanabe (1990) also employed the present classification and found that his college students tended to use socio-affective strategies less frequently than other strategies. Therefore, it might be too early to prescribe a strategy classification which applies to any learner.

Conclusion

The present research reported in this paper was one type of strategy research; i.e., classification of language learning strategies based on factor analysis of Oxford's Strategy Inventory of Language Learning. The

results are still tentative, but several implications can be drawn. First, communicative learning strategies or learning through communication should have its place in any classification system, since they seem to be prime strategies employed by learners. Second, it is recommended that any language learning strategy system takes into account direct and indirect strategies as primary categories. These two strategy types have long been identified by many researchers in the field (e.g., Nisbet & Shucksmith, 1986). The present results confirmed this long-standing distinction about language learning strategies. In the process of the present research more questions were raised than settled. However, it could be concluded that more studies should be done employing quantitative as well qualitative research methods before gaining a unified system of language learning strategies.

Note

1. For more details about the technical terms of factor analysis, see for example Hatch & Lazaraton (pp. 490-498; 1991), and Chapter 4 of Norusis (1988).

References

Allwright, D. Personal communication at Lancaster University. 1989.

- Bryman, A. & D. Cramer. *Quantitative Data Analysis for Social Scientists*. London: Routledge. 1990.
- Ehrman, M. & R. Oxford. "Effects of Sex Differences, Career Choice, and Psychological Type on Adult Language Learning Strategies." *Modern Language Journal*, 73. 1989. 1-13.
- Ellis, G. & B. Sinclair. *Learning to Learn English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1989.
- Faerch, C. & G. Kasper. "On Identifying Communication Strategies in Interlanguage Production." In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.) *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman. 1983. pp. 210-238.
- Hatch, E. & A. Lazaraton. *The Research Manual*. New York: Newbury House. 1991.
- Nisbet, J. & J. Shucksmith. *Learning Strategies*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1986.
- Norusis, M.J. *Spss-X Advanced Statistics Guide (2nd ed.)*. Chicago: Spss Inc.
- O'Malley, J.M. & A.U. Chamot. *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1990.

Oxford, R. *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*.
New York: Newbury House. 1990a.

-----, Personal correspondence. 1990b.

Oxford, R. & M. Nyikos. "Variables Affecting Choice of Language Learning Strategies by University Students." *Modern Language Journal*, 73. 1989. 291-300.

Skehan, P. *Individual Differences in Second-Language Learning*. London: Edward Arnold. 1989.

Watanabe, Y. "External Variables Affecting Language Learning Strategies of Japanese EFL Learners." Unpublished MA thesis. Lancaster University. 1990.

Appendix

Translated Items of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning

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

1. 英語を勉強する時、すでに持っている様々な背景的知識を生かす。
(I think of the relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.)

2. 英語の新しい単語は文の中で使いながら覚える。
(I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.)
3. 英語の新しい単語はイメージや映像と結び付けて覚える。
(I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.)
4. 英語の新しい単語は、その単語を使う場面を思い浮かべながら覚える。
(I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.)
5. 英語の新しい単語は、語呂合わせやライムを使って覚える。(I use rhymes to remember new English words.)
6. 英語の新しい単語はカードに書いて覚える。(I use flashcards to remember new English words.)
7. 英語の新しい単語は実際に具体的な動作をしてみても覚える。(I physically act out new English words.)
8. 英語の授業の復習をする。(I review English lessons often.)
9. 英語の新しい単語を覚える時その単語の現れた場面とともに覚える。(I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.)
10. 新しい英語の単語は何度も書いたり口に出して言ってみる。(I say or write new English words several times.)
11. 英語を話す時寝イティブスピーカーのように話すようにする。(I try to talk like native English speakers.)
12. 英語の綴りや発音の練習をする。(I practice the sounds of English.)
13. 知っている英語の単語や語句をいろいろに組み合わせて実際に使ってみる。

(I use the English words I know in different ways.)

14. 英語で話す時自分の方から進んで会話を始める。(I start conversations in English.)
15. テレビの二カ国語放送を見る、あるいは英語の映画を見る。(I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.)
16. 娯楽のために英語の本を読む。(I read for pleasure in English.)
17. メモや手紙を英語で書く。(I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.)
18. 英語を読む時、まず始めにざっと全体を見て、だいたいの内容をとってから始めに戻って詳しく読みなおす。(I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.)
19. 英語の新しい語句を見た時、日本語の訳を思い浮かべる。(I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.)
20. 英語を使う時、文法的に正確であるように心がける。(I try to find patterns in English.)
21. 長い単語の意味がわからない時は、それを分解して自分の知っている単語に結び付けて理解する。(I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.)
22. 読んだり聞いたりする時、逐語訳はしないように心がける。(I try not to translate word-for-word.)
23. 英語で聞いたり、読んだりしたことを要約する。(I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.)
24. 英語で読んだり聞いたりしていて知らない単語に出会ったら、意味を推測する

- ようにする。(To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.)
25. 英語で書いたり話したりしている時に適切な表現が思い浮かばなければジェスチャーを使う。(When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.)
 26. 英語で話したり書いたりしていて、適切な表現が思い浮かばない時には、意味は違っていても大体同じ意味の単語で代用する。(I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.)
 27. 英語を読む時いちいち辞書を引かない。(I read English without looking up every new word.)
 28. 英語で聞いている時全体の流れから相手が次に何を言うかを予測するようにする。(I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.)
 29. 英語で書いたり話したりしていて適切な単語や表現が思い浮かばない時、同じ意味の単語や言いまわしを自分で考えて使う。(If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.)
 30. 様々な方法で自分の英語を試すようにする。(I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.)
 31. 英語の間違いになるべく気づくようにし、もし気づいたらそれを今後の学習にいかす。(I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.)
 32. 英語を聞いている時ははそれに集中する。(I pay attention when someone is speaking English.)
 33. どうすれば英語学習がうまくいくかを知るために本を読んだり人に尋ねたりする。(I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.)
 34. テスト勉強以外にも英語学習の時間をみつけるために、計画的に時間をさく。

- (I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.)
35. 英語で話す相手を見つけて話しかけるようにする。(I look for people I can talk to in English.)
36. 英語で読む機会を多くつくる。(I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.)
37. 英語学習の目標がはっきりしている。(I have clear goals for improving my English skills.)
38. 自分の英語がどのくらい進歩したかを確かめながら勉強している。(I think about my progress in learning English.)
39. 英語を使うのが恥ずかしい時、自分をリラックスさせるようにする。(I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.)
40. 間違いを恐れず、積極的に英語を使うように自分を励ます。(I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.)
41. 英語でうまくいったとき(話しが通じた、良い成績がとれたなど)には、自分を誉める。(I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.)
42. 英語を使ったり、勉強したりしている時、緊張しているとか、リラックスしているとか、自分の感情に気を留める。(I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.)
43. 自分の英語の学習方法、英語学習に対する感情(好き嫌い)などを記録する。(I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.)
44. 英語学習についての自分の考えを人に話す。(I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.)
45. 英語がわからない時、ゆっくり話すように、あるいは、もう一度いってもらうように頼む。(If I do not understand something in English, I ask the

- other person to slow down or say it again.)
46. 英語を話している時間遅えたら直してもらうように頼む。(I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.)
 47. 友人と英語の練習をしたり、予習復習をしたり、学習方法について話し合ったりする。(I practice English with other students.)
 48. ネイティブスピーカーの助けを借りる。(I ask for help from English speakers.)
 49. 英語で質問する。(I ask questions in English.)
 50. 英語国の文化を理解するようにする。(I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.)