

LANGUAGE LEARNING STYLES AND STRATEGIES: AN OVERVIEW

Rebecca L. Oxford, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT: In “Language Learning Styles and Strategies,” the author synthesizes research from various parts of the world on two key variables affecting language learning: styles, i.e., the general approaches to learning a language; and strategies, the specific behaviors or thoughts learners use to enhance their language learning. These factors influence the student’s ability to learn in a particular instructional framework.

Introduction

Language learning styles and strategies are among the main factors that help determine how – and how well – our students learn a second or foreign language. A second language is a language studied in a setting where that language is the main vehicle of everyday communication and where abundant input exists in that language. A foreign language is a language studied in an environment where it is not the primary vehicle for daily interaction and where input in that language is restricted. Following the tradition in our field, the term “L2” is used in this chapter to refer to either a second or a foreign language.

The readers of this book will be primarily in the field of English as a second or foreign language (ESL or EFL), and most of the studies in this chapter were conducted in ESL or EFL

settings. However, some of the studies cited here focused on native English speakers learning French, German, Japanese, and other languages foreign to them. Information about language learning styles and strategies is valid regardless of what the learner's first language is.

Learning styles are the general approaches – for example, global or analytic, auditory or visual – that students use in acquiring a new language or in learning any other subject. These styles are “the overall patterns that give general direction to learning behavior” (Cornett, 1983, p. 9). Of greatest relevance to this methodology book is this statement: “Learning style is the biologically and developmentally imposed set of characteristics that make the same teaching method wonderful for some and terrible for others” (Dunn & Griggs, 1988, p. 3). This chapter explores the following aspects of learning style: sensory preferences, personality types, desired degree of generality, and biological differences.

Learning strategies are defined as “specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques -- such as seeking out conversation partners, or giving oneself encouragement to tackle a difficult language task -- used by students to enhance their own learning” (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992, p. 63). When the learner consciously chooses strategies that fit his or her learning style and the L2 task at hand, these strategies become a useful toolkit for active, conscious, and purposeful self-regulation of learning. Learning strategies can be classified into six groups: cognitive, metacognitive, memory-related, compensatory, affective, and social. Each of these is discussed later in this chapter.

Because this chapter contributes to an instructional methodology book, it is important to emphasize that learning styles and strategies of individual students can work together with – or conflict with – a given instructional methodology. If there is harmony between (a) the student (in terms of style and strategy preferences) and (b) the combination of instructional

methodology and materials, then the student is likely to perform well, feel confident, and experience low anxiety. If clashes occur between (a) and (b), the student often performs poorly, feels unconfident, and experiences significant anxiety. Sometimes such clashes lead to serious breakdowns in teacher-student interaction. These conflicts may also lead to the dispirited student's outright rejection of the teaching methodology, the teacher, and the subject matter. Now we move to the detailed discussion of learning styles.

Learning Styles

Ehrman and Oxford (1990) cited 9 major style dimensions relevant to L2 learning, although many more style aspects might also prove to be influential. This chapter discusses four dimensions of learning style that are likely to be among those most strongly associated with L2 learning: sensory preferences, personality types, desired degree of generality, and biological differences.

Learning styles are not dichotomous (black or white, present or absent). Learning styles generally operate on a continuum or on multiple, intersecting continua. For example, a person might be more extraverted than introverted, or more closure-oriented than open, or equally visual and auditory but with lesser kinesthetic and tactile involvement. Few if any people could be classified as having all or nothing in any of these categories (Ehrman, 1996).

Sensory Preferences

Sensory preferences can be broken down into four main areas: visual, auditory, kinesthetic (movement-oriented), and tactile (touch-oriented). Sensory preferences refer to the physical, perceptual learning channels with which the student is the most comfortable. Visual students like to read and obtain a great deal from visual stimulation. For them, lectures,

conversations, and oral directions without any visual backup can be very confusing. In contrast, auditory students are comfortable without visual input and therefore enjoy and profit from unembellished lectures, conversations, and oral directions. They are excited by classroom interactions in role-plays and similar activities. They sometimes, however, have difficulty with written work. Kinesthetic and tactile students like lots of movement and enjoy working with tangible objects, collages, and flashcards. Sitting at a desk for very long is not for them; they prefer to have frequent breaks and move around the room.

Reid (1987) demonstrated that ESL students varied significantly in their sensory preferences, with people from certain cultures differentially favoring the three different modalities for learning. Students from Asian cultures, for instance, were often highly visual, with Koreans being the most visual. Many studies, including Reid's, found that Hispanic learners were frequently auditory. Reid discovered that Japanese are very nonauditory. ESL students from a variety of cultures were tactile and kinesthetic in their sensory preferences. See also Reid (1995) and Oxford and Anderson (1995).

Personality Types

Another style aspect that is important for L2 education is that of personality type, which consists of four strands: extraverted vs. introverted; intuitive-random vs. sensing-sequential; thinking vs. feeling; and closure-oriented/judging vs. open/perceiving. Personality type (often called psychological type) is a construct based on the work of psychologist Carl Jung. Ehrman and Oxford (1989, 1990) found a number of significant relationships between personality type and L2 proficiency in native-English-speaking learners of foreign languages. For more on personality type in language learning, see Ehrman (1996) and Oxford (1996b).

Extraverted vs. Introverted. By definition, extraverts gain their greatest energy from the external world. They want interaction with people and have many friendships, some deep and some not. In contrast, introverts derive their energy from the internal world, seeking solitude and tending to have just a few friendships, which are often very deep. Extraverts and introverts can learn to work together with the help of the teacher. Enforcing time limits in the L2 classroom can keep extraverts' enthusiasm to a manageable level. Rotating the person in charge of leading L2 discussions gives introverts the opportunity to participate equally with extraverts.

Intuitive-Random vs. Sensing-Sequential. Intuitive-random students think in abstract, futuristic, large-scale, and nonsequential ways. They like to create theories and new possibilities, often have sudden insights, and prefer to guide their own learning. In contrast, sensing-sequential learners are grounded in the here and now. They like facts rather than theories, want guidance and specific instruction from the teacher, and look for consistency. The key to teaching both intuitive-random and sensing-sequential learners is to offer variety and choice: sometimes a highly organized structure for sensing-sequential learners and at other times multiple options and enrichment activities for intuitive-random students.

Thinking vs. Feeling. Thinking learners are oriented toward the stark truth, even if it hurts some people's feelings. They want to be viewed as competent and do not tend to offer praise easily – even though they might secretly desire to be praised themselves. Sometimes they seem detached. In comparison, feeling learners value other people in very personal ways. They show empathy and compassion through words, not just behaviors, and say whatever is needed to smooth over difficult situations. Though they often wear their hearts on their sleeves, they want to be respected for personal contributions and hard work. L2 teachers can help

thinking learners show greater overt compassion to their feeling classmates and can suggest that feeling learners might tone down their emotional expression while working with thinking learners.

Closure-oriented/Judging vs. Open/Perceiving. Closure-oriented students want to reach judgments or completion quickly and want clarity as soon as possible. These students are serious, hardworking learners who like to be given written information and enjoy specific tasks with deadlines. Sometimes their desire for closure hampers the development of fluency (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989). In contrast, open learners want to stay available for continuously new perceptions and are therefore sometimes called “perceiving.” They take L2 learning less seriously, treating it like a game to be enjoyed rather than a set of tasks to be completed. Open learners dislike deadlines; they want to have a good time and seem to soak up L2 information by osmosis rather than hard effort. Open learners sometimes do better than closure-oriented learners in developing fluency (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989), but they are at a disadvantage in a traditional classroom setting. Closure-oriented and open learners provide a good balance for each other in the L2 classroom. The former are the task-driven learners, and the latter know how to have fun. Skilled L2 teachers sometimes consciously create cooperative groups that include both types of learners, since these learners can benefit from collaboration with each other.

Desired Degree of Generality

This strand contrasts the learner who focuses on the main idea or big picture with the learner who concentrates on details. Global or holistic students like socially interactive, communicative events in which they can emphasize the main idea and avoid analysis of grammatical minutiae. They are comfortable even when not having all the information, and they feel free to guess from the context. Analytic students tend to concentrate on grammatical details and often avoid more free-flowing communicative activities. Because of their concern

for precision, analytic learners typically do not take the risks necessary for guessing from the context unless they are fairly sure of the accuracy of their guesses. The global student and the analytic student have much to learn from each other. A balance between generality and specificity is very useful for L2 learning.

Biological Differences

Differences in L2 learning style can also be related to biological factors, such as biorhythms, sustenance, and location. Biorhythms reveal the times of day when students feel good and perform their best. Some L2 learners are morning people, while others do not want to start learning until the afternoon, and still others are creatures of the evening, happily “pulling an all-nighter” when necessary. Sustenance refers to the need for food or drink while learning. Quite a number of L2 learners do not feel comfortable learning without a candy bar, a cup of coffee, or a soda in hand, but others are distracted from study by food and drink. Location involves the nature of the environment: temperature, lighting, sound, and even the firmness of the chairs. L2 students differ widely with regard to these environmental factors. The biological aspects of L2 learning style are often forgotten, but vigilant teachers can often make accommodations and compromises when needed.

Beyond the Stylistic Comfort Zone

L2 learners clearly need to make the most of their style preferences. However, occasionally they must also extend themselves beyond their style preferences. By providing a wide range of classroom activities that cater to different learning styles, teachers can help L2 students develop beyond the comfort zone dictated by their natural style preferences. The key is systematically offering a great variety of activities within a learner-centered, communicative approach.

Assessing L2 Learning Style

By far the most common type of assessment tool for L2 learning styles is the written survey. In surveys, students answer questions that reveal their particular style preferences. Style surveys vary in reliability and validity, but in the last few decades they have provided data from which teachers and students have begun to understand L2 styles. See Reid (1995) for examples of such surveys.

We have touched upon a number of important dimensions of L2 learning style. Now we are ready to turn to learning strategies, which are related to learning styles but are far more specific.

Learning Strategies

As seen earlier, L2 learning strategies are specific behaviors or thought processes that students use to enhance their own L2 learning. The word strategy comes from the ancient Greek word strategia, which means steps or actions taken for the purpose of winning a war. The warlike meaning of strategia has fortunately fallen away, but the control and goal-directedness remain in the modern version of the word (Oxford, 1990).

A given strategy is neither good nor bad; it is essentially neutral until the context of its use is thoroughly considered. What makes a strategy positive and helpful for a given learner? A strategy is useful if the following conditions are present: (a) the strategy relates well to the L2 task at hand, (b) the strategy fits the particular student's learning style preferences to one degree or another, and (c) the student employs the strategy effectively and links it with other relevant strategies. Strategies that fulfill these conditions "make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations" (Oxford,

1990, p. 8). Learning strategies can also enable students to become more independent, autonomous, lifelong learners (Allwright, 1990; Little, 1991).

Yet students are not always aware of the power of consciously using L2 learning strategies for making learning quicker and more effective (Nyikos & Oxford, 1993). Skilled teachers help their students develop an awareness of learning strategies and enable them to use a wider range of appropriate strategies.

Strategy Use Often Relates to Style Preferences

When left to their own devices and if not encouraged by the teacher or forced by the lesson to use a certain set of strategies, students typically use learning strategies that reflect their basic learning styles (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989; Oxford, 1996a, 1996b). However, teachers can actively help students “stretch” their learning styles by trying out some strategies that are outside of their primary style preferences. This can happen through strategy instruction, as discussed later in this chapter.

Conscious Movement Toward Goals

Learning strategies are intentionally used and consciously controlled by the learner (Pressley with McCormick, 1995). In our field, virtually all definitions of strategies imply conscious movement toward a language goal (Bialystok, 1990; Oxford, 1990, 1996a). Let us consider Divna, whose goal is to conduct research in chemistry with the help of articles written in the L2. She is a busy professional without a lot of extra time for reading journals, but she needs the information contained in them. To meet the need, she plans a manageable task: finding and reading one L2 article per week on chemistry until she develops a rapid reading rate and is able to identify and understand published research findings. Other strategies to help Divna accomplish this task might include scheduling time each week to search for an article in

the library or on the Internet, as well as preparing herself by looking at articles on related topics in her own language. In addition, she could use strategies such as skimming for the main points, reading carefully for supporting details, keeping a notebook for L2 scientific vocabulary, using the dictionary to look up difficult words, guessing the meaning of words from the context, and making a written outline or summary if needed. The well-orchestrated set of strategies used by Divna might be called a strategy chain, i.e., a set of interlocking, related, and mutually supportive strategies.

Positive Outcomes from Strategy Use

In subject areas outside of L2 learning, the use of learning strategies is demonstrably related to student achievement and proficiency (Pressley & Associates, 1990). Research has repeatedly shown this relationship in content fields ranging from physics to reading and from social studies to science. In light of this remarkable association between learning strategy use and positive learning outcomes, it is not surprising that students who frequently employ learning strategies enjoy a high level of self-efficacy, i.e., a perception of being effective as learners (Zimmerman & Pons, 1986).

In the L2 arena, early studies of so-called “good language learners” (Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern, & Todesco, 1975; Rubin, 1975) determined that such learners consistently used certain types of learning strategies, such as guessing meaning from the context. Later studies found that there was no single set of strategies always used by “good language learners,” however. Those studies found that less able learners used strategies in a random, unconnected, and uncontrolled manner (Abraham & Vann, 1987; Chamot et al., 1996), while more effective learners showed careful orchestration of strategies, targeted in a relevant, systematic way at specific L2 tasks. In an investigation by Nunan (1991), more effective learners differed from

less effective learners in their greater ability to reflect on and articulate their own language learning processes. In a study of learners of English in Puerto Rico, more successful students used strategies for active involvement more frequently than did less successful learners, according to Green and Oxford (1995). The same researchers also commented that the number and type of learning strategies differed according to whether the learner was in a foreign language environment or a second language setting. In their review of the research literature, Green and Oxford discovered that second language learners generally employed more strategies (with a higher frequency) than did foreign language learners.

Strategy Instruction Research

To increase L2 proficiency, some researchers and teachers have provided instruction that helped students learn how to use more relevant and more powerful learning strategies. In ESL/EFL studies, positive effects of strategy instruction emerged for proficiency in speaking (Dadour & Robbins, 1996; O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Küpper, & Russo, 1985) and reading (Park-Oh, 1994), although results for listening were not significant (O'Malley et al., 1985). Chamot et al. (1996), Cohen et al. (1995), and Cohen and Weaver (1998) investigated the effects of strategy instruction among native-English-speaking learners of foreign languages and found some positive results mixed with neutral findings. In other studies, strategy instruction led to increased EFL learning motivation (Nunan, 1997) and, among native-English-speaking learners of foreign languages, greater strategy use and self-efficacy (Chamot et al., 1996).

The most effective strategy instruction appears to include demonstrating when a given strategy might be useful, as well as how to use and evaluate it, and how to transfer it to other related tasks and situations. So far, research has shown the most beneficial strategy instruction

to be woven into regular, everyday L2 teaching, although other ways of doing strategy instruction are possible (Oxford & Leaver, 1996).

Six Main Categories of L2 Learning Strategies

Six major groups of L2 learning strategies have been identified by Oxford (1990). Alternative taxonomies have been offered by O'Malley and Chamot (1990) and others.

Cognitive strategies enable the learner to manipulate the language material in direct ways, e.g., through reasoning, analysis, note-taking, summarizing, synthesizing, outlining, reorganizing information to develop stronger schemas (knowledge structures), practicing in naturalistic settings, and practicing structures and sounds formally. Cognitive strategies were significantly related to L2 proficiency in studies by Kato (1996), Ku (1995), Oxford and Ehrman (1995), Oxford, Judd, and Giesen (1998), and Park (1994), among others. Of these studies, three were specifically in EFL settings: Ku (Taiwan), Oxford, Judd, and Giesen (Turkey), and Park (Korea). The other two studies involved the learning of Kanji by native English speakers (Kato, 1996) and the learning of various foreign languages by native English speakers (Oxford & Ehrman, 1995).

Metacognitive strategies (e.g., identifying one's own learning style preferences and needs, planning for an L2 task, gathering and organizing materials, arranging a study space and a schedule, monitoring mistakes, and evaluating task success, and evaluating the success of any type of learning strategy) are employed for managing the learning process overall. Among native English speakers learning foreign languages, Purpura (1999) found that metacognitive strategies had "a significant, positive, direct effect on cognitive strategy use, providing clear evidence that metacognitive strategy use has an executive function over cognitive strategy use in task completion" (p. 61). Studies of EFL learners in various countries (e.g., in South Africa,

Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; and in Turkey, Oxford, Judd, & Giesen, 1998) uncovered evidence that metacognitive strategies are often strong predictors of L2 proficiency.

Memory-related strategies help learners link one L2 item or concept with another but do not necessarily involve deep understanding. Various memory-related strategies enable learners to learn and retrieve information in an orderly string (e.g., acronyms), while other techniques create learning and retrieval via sounds (e.g., rhyming), images (e.g., a mental picture of the word itself or the meaning of the word), a combination of sounds and images (e.g., the keyword method), body movement (e.g., total physical response), mechanical means (e.g., flashcards), or location (e.g., on a page or blackboard) (see Oxford, 1990 for details and multiple examples). Memory-related strategies have been shown to relate to L2 proficiency in a course devoted to memorizing large numbers of Kanji characters (Kato, 1996) and in L2 courses designed for native-English speaking learners of foreign languages (Oxford & Ehrman, 1995). However, memory-related strategies do not always positively relate to L2 proficiency. In fact, the use of memory strategies in a test-taking situation had a significant *negative* relationship to learners' test performance in grammar and vocabulary (Purpura, 1997). The probable reason for this is that memory strategies are often used for memorizing vocabulary and structures in initial stages of language learning, but that learners need such strategies much less when their arsenal of vocabulary and structures has become larger.

Compensatory strategies (e.g., guessing from the context in listening and reading; using synonyms and “talking around” the missing word to aid speaking and writing; and strictly for speaking, using gestures or pause words) help the learner make up for missing knowledge. Cohen (1998) asserted that compensatory strategies that are used for speaking and writing (often known as a form of communication strategies) are intended only for language use and

must not be considered to be language learning strategies. However, Little (personal communication, January, 1999) and Oxford (1990, 1999a) contend that compensation strategies of any kind, even though they might be used for language use, nevertheless aid in language learning as well. After all, each instance of L2 use is an opportunity for more L2 learning. Oxford and Ehrman (1995) demonstrated that compensatory strategies are significantly related to L2 proficiency in their study of native-English-speaking learners of foreign languages.

Affective strategies, such as identifying one's mood and anxiety level, talking about feelings, rewarding oneself for good performance, and using deep breathing or positive self-talk, have been shown to be significantly related to L2 proficiency in research by Dreyer and Oxford (1996) among South African EFL learners and by Oxford and Ehrman (1995) among native English speakers learning foreign languages. However, in other studies, such as that of Mullins (1992) with EFL learners in Thailand, affective strategies showed a negative link with some measures of L2 proficiency. One reason might be that as some students progress toward proficiency, they no longer need affective strategies as much as before. Perhaps because learners' use of cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategies is related to greater L2 proficiency and self-efficacy, over time there might be less need for affective strategies as learners progress to higher proficiency.

Social strategies (e.g., asking questions to get verification, asking for clarification of a confusing point, asking for help in doing a language task, talking with a native-speaking conversation partner, and exploring cultural and social norms) help the learner work with others and understand the target culture as well as the language. Social strategies were significantly associated with L2 proficiency in studies by the South African EFL study by

Dreyer and Oxford (1996) and the investigation of native-English-speaking foreign language learners by Oxford and Ehrman (1995).

Assessing Learners' Use of Strategies

Many assessment tools exist for uncovering the strategies used by L2 learners. Self-report surveys, observations, interviews, learner journals, dialogue journals, think-aloud techniques, and other measures have been used. Each one of these has advantages and disadvantages, as analyzed by Oxford (1990) and Cohen and Scott (1996). The most widely used survey, the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (an appendix in Oxford, 1990), has been translated into more than 20 languages and used in dozens of published studies around the world.

Various learning strategy instruments have disclosed research results beyond those that have been mentioned above. These additional findings include the following: L2 learning strategy use is significantly related to L2 learning motivation, gender, age, culture, brain hemisphere dominance, career orientation, academic major, beliefs, and the nature of the L2 task. A number of these findings have been summarized in Oxford (1999a, 1999b).

Implications for L2 Teaching

The research synthesized in this chapter has four implications for classroom practice: assessing styles and strategies in the L2 classroom, attuning L2 instruction and strategy instruction to learners' style preferences, remembering that no single L2 instructional methodology fits all students, and preparing for and conducting strategy instruction.

Assessing Styles and Strategies in the L2 Classroom

L2 teachers could benefit by assessing the learning styles and the strategy use of their students, because such assessment leads to greater understanding of styles and strategies.

Teachers also need to assess their styles and strategies, so that they will be aware of their preferences and of possible biases. Useful means exist to make these assessments, as mentioned earlier. Teachers can learn about assessment options by reading books or journals, attending professional conferences, or taking relevant courses or workshops.

Attuning L2 Instruction and Strategy Instruction to Learners' Style Needs

The more that teachers know about their students' style preferences, the more effectively they can orient their L2 instruction, as well as the strategy teaching that can be interwoven into language instruction, matched to those style preferences. Some learners might need instruction presented more visually, while others might require more auditory, kinesthetic, or tactile types of instruction. Without adequate knowledge about their individual students' style preferences, teachers cannot systematically provide the needed instructional variety.

Remembering that No Single L2 Instructional Methodology Fits All Students

Styles and strategies help determine a particular learner's ability and willingness to work within the framework of various instructional methodologies. It is foolhardy to think that a single L2 methodology could possibly fit an entire class filled with students who have a range of stylistic and strategic preferences. Instead of choosing a specific instructional methodology, L2 teachers would do better to employ a broad instructional approach, notably the best version of the communicative approach that contains a combined focus on form and fluency. Such an approach allows for deliberate, creative variety to meet the needs of all students in the class.

Preparing for and Conducting L2 Strategy Instruction

L2 teachers should consider various ways to prepare to conduct strategy instruction in their classes. Helpful preparatory steps include taking teacher development courses, finding relevant information in print or on the Internet, and making contacts with specialists.

Although we do not yet know all we wish to know about optimal strategy instruction, there is growing evidence that L2 teachers can and should conduct strategy instruction in their classrooms. For some teachers it might be better to start with small strategy interventions, such as helping L2 readers learn to analyze words and guess meanings from the context, rather than with full-scale strategies-based instruction involving a vast array of learning strategies and the four language skills, i.e., reading, writing, speaking and listening. (See Oxford, 1990, for a table of L2 strategies based on the six categories cross-indexed by the four language skills.)

Other teachers might want to move rapidly into strategies-based instruction. Strategies-based instruction is not so much a separate “instructional method” as it is sound strategy instruction interwoven with the general communicative language teaching approach noted above. Chamot and O’Malley (1996) describe the CALLA model, a form of strategies-based instruction for ESL learners that includes explicit strategy instruction, content area instruction, and academic language development. Cohen (1998) presents a different but somewhat related version of strategies-based instruction for native English speakers learning foreign languages. In evaluating the success of any strategy instruction, teachers should look for individuals’ progress toward L2 proficiency and for signs of increased self-efficacy or motivation.

References

- Abraham, R., & Vann, R., 1987: Strategies of two learners: A case study. In A.L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning* (pp. 85-102). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Allwright, D., 1990: *Autonomy in Language Pedagogy*. CRILE Working Paper 6. Centre for Research in Education, University of Lancaster, U.K.
- Bialystok, E., 1990: *Communication Strategies: A Psychological Analysis of Second-language Use*. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell.
- Chamot, A.U., Barnhardt, S., El-Dinary, P., & Robbins, J., 1996: Methods for teaching learning strategies in the foreign language classroom. In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-cultural Perspectives* (pp. 175-188). Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.
- Chamot, A.U., & O'Malley, J.M., 1996: Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA). In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-cultural Perspectives* (pp. 167-174). Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.
- Cohen, A.D., 1998: *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language*. Essex, U.K.: Longman.
- Cohen, A.D. & Scott, K., 1996: A synthesis of approaches to assessing language learning strategies. In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-cultural Perspectives* (pp. 89-106). Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.

- Cohen, A.D. & Weaver, S.J., 1998: Strategies-based instruction for second language learners. In W.A. Reyandya & G.M. Jacobs (Eds.), *Learners and Language Learning*. Anthology Series 39. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Center, pp. 1-25.
- Cohen, A.D., Weaver, S.J. & Yi, T.Y., 1995: *The Impact of Strategies-Based Instruction on Speaking a Foreign Language*. Research Report. Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA: National Foreign Language Research Center.
- Cornett, C., 1983: *What You Should Know about Teaching and Learning Styles*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Dadour, E.S. & Robbins, J., 1996: University-level studies using strategy instruction to improve speaking ability in Egypt and Japan. In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-cultural Perspectives* (pp. 157-166). Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.
- Dreyer, C. & Oxford, R., 1996: Learning strategies and other predictors of ESL proficiency among Afrikaans-speakers in South Africa. In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-cultural Perspectives* (pp. 61-74). Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.
- Dunn, R. & Griggs, S. (1988). *Learning Styles: Quiet Revolution in American Schools*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Ehrman, M., 1996: *Second Language Learning Difficulties: Looking Beneath the Surface*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ehrman, M. & Oxford, R., 1989: Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adults' language learning strategies. *Modern Language Journal*, 73(1), 1-13.

- Ehrman, M. & Oxford, R., 1990: Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *Modern Language Journal*, 74, 311-326.
- Green, J. & Oxford, R.L., 1995: A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 261-297.
- Kato, F., 1996: Results of an Australian study of strategy use in learning Japanese Kanji characters. Unpublished manuscript, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.
- Ku, P.N., 1995: *Strategies Associated with Proficiency and Predictors of Strategy Choice: A Study of Language Learning Strategies of EFL Students at Three Educational Levels in Taiwan*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, USA.
- Little, D., 1991: *Learner autonomy 1: Definitions, issues, and problems*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Little, D., 1999, Jan. Personal communication.
- Mullins, P., 1992: *Successful English Language Learning Strategies of Students Enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, United States International University, San Diego, CA.
- Naiman, N., Fröhlich, M., Stern, H.H., & Todesco, A., 1975: *The Good Language Learner*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Nunan, D. 1991: *Language teaching methodology*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Nunan, D., 1997: Does learner strategy training make a difference? *Lenguas Modernas*, 24, 123-142.
- Nyikos, M., & Oxford, R.L., 1993: A factor-analytic study of language learning strategy use: Interpretations from information processing theory and social psychology. *Modern Language Journal*, 77 (1), 11-23.

- O'Malley, J.M. & Chamot, A.U., 1990: *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*.
Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley, J.M., Chamot, A.U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Küpper, L., & Russo, R., 1985:
Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. *Language Learning*, 35, 21-46.
- Oxford, R.L., 1990: *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*.
Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Oxford, R.L., 1996a: *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-cultural Perspectives*. Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.
- Oxford, R.L. 1996b: Personality type in the foreign or second language classroom:
Theoretical and empirical perspectives. In A. Horning & R. Sudol (Eds.),
Understanding Literacy: Personality Preferences in Rhetorical and Psycholinguistic Contexts (pp. 149-175). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Oxford, R.L., 1999a. *Language Learning Strategies in the Context of Autonomy*, Synthesis of Findings from the International Invitational Conference on Learning Strategy Research, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY.
- Oxford, R.L., 1999b: Relationships between learning strategy use and language proficiency in the context of learner autonomy and self-regulation. In L. Bobb (Ed.), *Learner Autonomy as a Central Concept of Foreign Language Learning*, Special Issue of *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 38, 109-126.
- Oxford, R.L., & Anderson, N., 1995: State of the art: A crosscultural view of language learning styles. *Language Teaching*, 28, 201-215.

- Oxford, R.L., & Ehrman, M.E., 1995: Adults' language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *System*, 23, 359-386.
- Oxford, R.L., Judd, C., & Giesen, J., 1998: Relationships among learning strategies, learning styles, EFL proficiency, and academic performance among secondary school students in Turkey. Unpublished manuscript, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, USA.
- Oxford, R.L. & Leaver, B.L., 1996: A synthesis of strategy instruction for language learners. In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-cultural Perspectives* (pp. 227-246). Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.
- Park, G., 1994: Language learning strategies: Why do adults need them? Unpublished manuscript, University of Texas, Austin, Texas, USA.
- Park-Oh, Y.Y., 1994: *Self-Regulated Strategy Training in Second-Language Reading: Its Effects on Reading Comprehension, Strategy Use, Reading Attitudes, and Learning Styles of College ESL Students*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL.
- Pressley, M. & Associates, 1990: *Cognitive Strategy Instruction that Really Improves Children's Academic Performance*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.
- Pressley, M. with McCormick, C.B., 1995: *Advanced Educational Psychology for Educators, Researchers, and Policymakers*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Purpura, J., 1997: An analysis of the relationships between test takers' cognitive and metacognitive strategy use and second language test performance. *Language Learning*, 42 (2), 289-325.

- Purpura, J., 1999. Learner characteristics and L2 test performance. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language Learning Strategies in the Context of Autonomy*, Synthesis of Findings from the International Invitational Conference on Learning Strategy Research (pp. 61-63), Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY.
- Reid, J., 1987. The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 87-111.
- Reid, J., 1995: *Learning Styles in the ESL/EFL Classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Rubin, J., 1975: What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9, 41-51.
- Scarcella, R. & Oxford, R., 1992: *The Tapestry of Language Learning: The Individual in the Communicative Classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Zimmerman, B.J. & Pons, M.M., 1986: Development of a structured interview for assessing student use of self-regulated learning strategies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 23. 614-628.

BIOSTATEMENT: Rebecca Oxford is Professor and Director of the Second Language Education Program at the University of Maryland, College Park. Her books include Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know, 1990; Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-Cultural Perspectives, 1996; and Patterns of Cultural Identity, 1995. She edited the Tapestry ESL Program, second edition, 1999.

Discussion Questions

1. What is the difference between learning styles and learning strategies?
2. How are learning styles and strategies related?
3. Why are learning styles and strategies important for L2 teachers to understand?
4. What do we know about “optimal” strategy instruction?
5. Note-taking is sometimes thought of as an academic survival skill. What criteria would need to be present to make note-taking an actual learning strategy?

Suggested Activities

1. Find a published learning style instrument and administer it to yourself. Score it.
What kind of learner are you?
2. Write down ways that your learning style affects your teaching. Compare your findings with those of a colleague or friend. Consider in what ways you can build flexibility into your instruction to meet the needs of your students.
3. Take a strategy survey, responding according to the most recent L2 you have learned (or to which you have been exposed). What are your patterns of strategy use? Which categories of strategies do you use the most, and which do you use the least? Consider why this is so.
4. Administer a style instrument and a strategy instrument to your L2 students. Score these two instruments and compare the group’s results on both. What linkages do you see between the students’ styles and their strategies? What differences exist?
5. Start weaving strategy instruction into your L2 teaching. What effects do you see? What might you do next to strengthen strategy instruction?

For Further Reading

Cohen, A.D., 1998: *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language*. Essex, U.K.: Longman.

Ehrman, M., 1996: *Second Language Learning Difficulties: Looking Beneath the Surface*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

O'Malley, J.M. & Chamot, A.U., 1990: *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R.L., 1990: *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Oxford, R.L., 1996a [Marianne – do we remove the “a” here?]: *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-cultural Perspectives*. Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.

Reid, J., 1995: *Learning Styles in the ESL/EFL Classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.