

The Relationship Between Language Learning Strategies and Gender in Learning English as a Second or Foreign Language

Nguyen Thi Ngoc Tran 

Lecturer, Foreign Languages Department, Ho Chi Minh City University of Food Industry, HCM City, Vietnam

✉ **Corresponding Author:** Nguyen Thi Ngoc Tran, **E-mail:** tranntn@hufi.edu.vn

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Received: May 08, 2021

Accepted: June 04, 2021

Volume: 3

Issue: 6

DOI: 10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.6.17

KEYWORDS

Language learning strategies,
gender in language learning

ABSTRACT

In Viet Nam and many other nations, people tend to make general assumptions about language learning like that “Females are better at language learning than males”, “Languages are females’ subjects”. Those assumptions have caused a negative impression on males about language learning. As a result, there is a remarkable worldwide inequality in the number of male and female English majors. Are females really superior to males in language learning? Do their different ways in language learning play an important role in their success? If the differences in learning methods are said to be responsible, their learning strategies may account for their different level of success in language learning. Those questions inspired the author to determine whether there are any significant differences in learning strategies due to gender. The paper first synthesized previous research to have an overview of learning strategies males tend to prefer and those that females favour. Then, from the awareness of the differences, some pedagogic implications were raised for English teachers who share the same interest in dealing well with learners of each sex.

1. Introduction

In the last decades, through globalization and integration, English has become an international language widely used in all fields of society, ranging from formal to informal ones. Thus, teaching and learning English has been paid great attention. In many attempts to seek better teaching methods and learning English for non-native learners, people have observed a considerable shift in focus from the teacher to the learner. It has become clearer that the individual learners themselves are responsible for their success or failure in language learning. Among the factors making an individual language learner are gender and language learning strategies.

The study of gender and its significance in language learning has recently emerged with some research on biological differences, raising awareness of stereotyping effects on the language learning environment. Meanwhile, in language learning strategies, since the late 1970s there have been many efforts in identification, classification of those terms, and suggestions for teaching and learning English as a second or foreign language (ESL/EFL). Studies in second language acquisition have pointed out that acquiring a new language does not just depend on how early a person starts to learn or expose to the language but also depends on the strategies they employ consciously or unconsciously in the learning process. Moreover, it is believed that autonomous learning will be enhanced by the language learner’s conscious use of learning strategies. There are also many studies carried out to investigate the strategic use of ESL/EFL learners. However, due to the lack of thorough studies on gender as a factor affecting strategy use, there has not been a clear-cut interaction between different learning strategies and gender in second language acquisition. In fact, according to Oxford (in Carter & Nunan, 2001) there have been several studies on the association between gender and strategy use which show that females usually report greater strategy use than males. However, according to her, in other research done by Dadour and Robbins in 1996 in two Middle Eastern cultures and by Nordin-Eriksson in 1999 among Serbo-Croatian refugees in Sweden, the results were reversed. Those results suggest that gender-role socialization might be a factor in these differences. Also, in this book, Oxford (p.172) recommended that “the frequent gender differences in English learning as a second or foreign language strategy research deserve further investigation”.

2. Literature Review

This section is devoted to present a synthesis of related theory and research in the realms of language learning strategies and gender in language learning. The synthetic view of these two perspectives will build a conceptual framework for the discussion later on their possible relationship.

2.1. Language Learning Strategies

The following part gives an overview of the literature of language learning strategies in terms of definition, classification, and factors affecting strategy choice.

Definition of language learning strategies

Over decades of studying language learning strategies (LLS), researchers have defined the term in various ways. It seems that there has not been an agreement among experts on a satisfactory definition for language learning strategies. To begin with, Tarone (1983, p.67) defined learning strategies from the perspective of language competence as "an attempt to develop linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the target language -- to incorporate these into one's interlanguage competence". Then, Ellis (1994) also advocated Tarone's definition.

Focusing on learner's autonomy, Rubin (1987, p.23) defined that learning strategies "are strategies that contribute to developing the language system that the learner constructs and affects learning directly".

From the view that learning involves information processing, Weinstein and Mayer (1986, p.315) described learning strategies as "behaviours and thoughts that a learner engages in during learning...intended to influence the learner's encoding process". Later, Mayer (1988, p.11) gave the same definition for learning strategies as "behaviors of a learner that are intended to influence how the learner processes information". In her seminal study, Chamot (1990, p.1) considered learning strategies as "techniques, approaches, or deliberate actions that students take in order to facilitate the learning and recall of both linguistic and content area information".

The publication of Oxford's book for teacher (Oxford, 1990a) has added an important new dimension to our understanding of learner strategies. The following helpful definition, which was given in her subsequent research (1992/1993, p.18), shows that language learning strategies are not merely used with the aim of learning the language but also with some underlying effective purposes.

...language learning strategies -- specific actions, behaviours, steps, or techniques that students (often intentionally) use to improve their progress in developing L2 skills. These strategies can facilitate the internalization, storage, retrieval, or use of the new language. Strategies are tools for the self-directed involvement necessary for developing communicative ability.

Also, in terms of cognitive learning, Nunan (1999, p.171) defined learning strategies as "the mental and communicative procedures learners use to learn and use language". Cohen (1998) referred to learning strategies as 'processes' that learners use consciously to enhance the storage, retention, recall, and application of knowledge about the language they are learning. Later, the definition was modified by adding that "learning strategies referred to the conscious and semi-conscious thoughts and behaviors used by learners with the explicit goal of improving their knowledge and understanding of a target language" (Cohen & Dornyei, p.2002).

In short, it is obvious that there are still some overlaps among those more or less different definitions. Of those definitions to date, the one given by Oxford is perhaps the most comprehensive and detailed. Thus, it is adopted in this study as the theoretical background. Moreover, according to Lessard-Clouston (1997, p.2), a change over time may be noted in those definitions of language learning strategies: "from the early focus on the product of language learning strategies (linguistic or sociolinguistic competence), there is now a greater emphasis on the processes and the characteristics of language learning strategies". Also, he suggested that we should distinguish language learning strategies from learning styles, which refer more broadly to a learner's "natural, habitual, and preferred way(s) of absorbing, processing, and retaining new information and skills" (Reid, 1995, p. viii), though there appears to be an obvious relationship between one's language learning style and his or her usual or preferred language learning strategies.

Classification of language learning strategies

Similar to the situation of defining the term, conflicts in its classification are inevitable. There have been a variety of language learning strategy classification systems which, according to Oxford (1994), have been classified into the following groups: (1) systems related to successful language learners, which featured Rubin's work in 1975; (2) systems based on psychological functions (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990); (3) linguistically based systems dealing with guessing, language monitoring, formal and functional practice (Bialystok, 1981) or with communication strategies like paraphrasing or borrowing (Tarone, 1983); (4) systems related to separate language skills (Cohen, 1990); and (5) systems based on different styles or types of learners (Sutter, 1989).

Rubin (1987), one of the pioneers in the field of language learning strategies research, suggested three groups of strategies that contribute directly or indirectly to language learning: learning strategies, communication strategies, and social strategies. Later, Brown and Palinscar (1982) and O' Malley et al. (1983) separated two major kinds of learning strategies: metacognitive and cognitive strategies.

Then came the works of Oxford (1990), which significantly contributed to the present typology of language learning strategies. She (1990, p.37-135) distinguished between direct language learning strategies, "which directly involve the subject matter", and indirect language learning strategies, which "do not directly involve the subject matter itself, but are essential to language learning nonetheless". These two broad classes are divided into six groups: memory, cognitive, and compensation under the direct class; metacognitive, affective and social under the indirect class. According to Oxford (1990, p.71), Memory strategies "aid in entering information into long-term memory and retrieving information when needed for communication". Meanwhile, Cognitive strategies "are used to form and revise internal mental models and receive and produce messages in the target language". Then, Compensation strategies "are needed to overcome any gaps in knowledge of the language". The other three types of indirect language learning strategies were pointed out as Metacognitive strategies, which "help learners exercise 'executive control' through planning, arranging, focusing, and evaluating their own learning", Affective strategies which "enable learners to control feelings, motivations, and attitudes related to language learning", and social strategies which "facilitate interaction with others, often in a discourse situation". Theoretical distinctions can be made among these six types; however, as Oxford stated (1990), the boundaries are fuzzy because of a large overlap among them. A more detailed overview of these six main sorts of language learning strategies is found in Oxford's later work, in which she further divided them into 19 strategy sets and 62 subsets.

To sum up, through the existence of a variety of distinct strategy taxonomies, we can obviously see a major issue in the research area of second/foreign language learning strategies: lack of a coherent, well-accepted system for describing these strategies. To this stage in the research history, Oxford's categorization is probably the most accepted one because many researchers in the field have widely utilized her suggested Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). We should take for granted that despite a problem in classifying strategies, strategies are proved to enhance learners' learning and become more autonomous, more proficient.

Influences on strategy choice

Research shows that factors influencing second/foreign language learning strategies use include motivation, the language learning environment, career/academic orientation, cultural background, the nature of the language task, age and stage of language learning/proficiency, learning style, and gender.

Oxford synthesized existing research on how those factors influence the choice of strategies used among students. In term of motivation, as concluded by Oxford and Nyikos (1989), Chamot *et al.* (1996), more motivated students tend to use more strategies than less motivated students. Also, the language learning environment affects strategy to use, with students in ESL environments using strategies more frequently than those in EFL environment. Career or academic orientation plays a role in strategy choice: engineering students, for example, choose more analytic strategies than those selected by humanities students. The cultural background also has a strong effect on how students learn. For instance, Asian students are said to employ rote memorization and other forms of memorization more frequently than students from other cultural backgrounds.

As indicated by Bialystok (1981), O'Malley and Chamot (1990), the nature of the task helps determine the strategies chosen to carry out the task. Studies show that students of different ages and stages of language learning use different strategies and. More strategies are employed by older or more advanced students in view of age and stage of learning or proficiency. According to Ely (1989) and Reid (1995), learning style often determines the choice of learning strategies. For instance, students with analytic learning style preferred contrastive analysis, rule-learning, and dissecting words and phrases, while global students favour guessing, scanning strategies, and non-verbal strategies to get through communication.

In addition, research has shown that gender has a "profound effect on strategy choice" (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989, p. 294). Since the effect of gender in strategy use is the major concern of this study, a thorough review of related studies will be presented in the next part.

2.2. Gender in language learning

To begin the discussion on gender differences in language learning, it is significant to distinguish between sex and gender. According to Goddard and Patterson (2000), sex relates to biological characteristics, whereas gender refers to socially expected characteristics. However, Bergvall (1999) and Butler (1990) believed that a straightforward distinction between sex and gender is probably unfeasible(especially in the case of stereotypes. According to these two authors, stereotypical views of males and females (often pertaining to the dimension of sex, i.e., biology) usually link social aspects of gender (assumptions about

personality traits or social roles associated with femininity and masculinity) to a biological individual. Overall, gender stereotypes are a blend of biological, social, and psychological dimensions.

There has long been a belief that men and women process incoming information in fundamentally different ways. This belief is inherently valid in language learning, which leads to the perception that gender is an important factor in the acquisition and use of language. In term of biological differences, Begley (2009, p.46), in her article about sex, race and IQ, writes that "As for sex, there are indeed structural and biochemical differences between male and female brains". Research has suggested that language appears to be located in the left hemisphere of the brain for most people. However, the left lateral brain works differently in each sex for language learning.

Melville (2006) presented a study by neuroscientists from Georgetown University Medical Center, which indicates that boys and girls use different parts of their brains to process some basic aspects of grammar in language learning. These specialists state that girls mainly use a system that is based around memorizing words and associations between them, whereas boys rely primarily on a system that governs the rules of language. Explicitly, Michael Ullman, the neuroscientist from this center, has pointed out "Although the two sexes seem to be doing the same thing, and doing it equally well, they are using two different neurocognitive brain processes to do it". Similarly, researchers from Northwestern University and the University of Haifa show that areas of the brain associated with language work harder in girls than in boys during language tasks and that boys and girls rely on different parts of the brain when performing these tasks.

In another approach to gender differences in language learning, Sommers and Lawrence (1992), through examining differences in classroom participation, noted that males took far more turns than females in mixed-sex groups, produced greater quantities of talk, and tended to interrupt their female counterparts. Meanwhile, females tended to wait, listen, acknowledge, and confirm other students' contributions.

In short, it is clear that males and females learn languages in their distinctive ways due to their differences in biological characteristics. However, according to Begley (2009), it is worth noticing that since boys and girls, men and women, live very different lives and are treated differently first by parents and then by society, it is impossible to attribute those differences to innate biology rather than experiences. Thus, to understand gender differences and reflect on possible implications for language learning and teaching, English language teachers, researchers, and teacher educators need to take into account individual learners and their respective positioning in particular social and cultural contexts.

2.3. A review of studies on language learning strategies and gender

In the strategy research history, the relationship between gender and strategy use has received the greatest attention in the work of Rebecca Oxford. In an early attempt to examine the learning strategies of 1200 university students, Oxford and Nyikos (1989) found that females showed greater strategy use than males for general study strategies, formal-rule related practice and conversational/input elicitation strategies, while males showed no greater strategy use than females on any factors.

Oxford and Ehrman (1988) also replicated those findings in a study involving 78 adults, including language students, language instructors, and professional language trainers at the United State Foreign Service Institute. As in the previous study, gender differences in strategy use were remarked. Gender differences were greatest in the use of strategies for general study, authentic language use, searching for and communicating meaning, and self-management strategies. These differences were also related to psychological type, with women appeared to favour intuition and to feel overthinking, whereas the reverse was generally true for men. Then, in a study conducted at the University of Puerto Rico with 374 students, Oxford and Green (1995) found that female learners used more strategies than male counterparts.

Also, the differences in strategy use due to gender have been reflected in the works of other researchers. For example, in Politzer's study of language learning strategies (1983), females reported a significantly greater propensity than males to engage in second language social interactions with others outside of class. Recently, Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006), in a study to find out the overall language learning strategy use of English learners enrolled in a college Intensive English Program (IEP), acknowledged that females tended to use affective and social strategies more frequently than males. In the latest study with 75 international students at a Midwestern university in the United States, Nguyen Ngan (2008) reported the same finding that females tended to use more strategies than males, especially memory strategies.

Besides the consistent trend of difference in strategy use between male and female learners, few studies showed a fluctuation. For instance, Alakbari and Hayatzadeh (?) studied the effect of gender on the variation of language strategies among Iranian English students, revealing that male students reported a higher frequency of strategy use than female students. Nevertheless, they concluded that gender performed no significant in the use of strategies. Consequently, the conflict between the finding and their conclusion made their argument less convincing.

In general, through the history of studies on language learning strategies and gender, regardless of some exceptions, people have observed a steady tendency on differences, favouring female learners in the frequent use of strategies.

3. Methodology

First and foremost, I would like to emphasize that this study is a library research paper, which is a factual review of what other researchers have written about language learning strategies, gender in language learning, and their relationship.

In order to carry out such a library research paper, the author first began her work by spending a considerable amount of time collecting the information on the subject matter from books, journals, websites, etc. Then, as a characteristic of a conceptual paper, reading and analyzing material, which aims to give the author a critical and synthetic view of the literature, is the main part of her work. A reflection on existing theory on language learning strategies and gender is then given, accompanied with some pedagogic implications.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1. Interpreting gender differences in strategy use

As mentioned above, findings in previous research have supported the notion that female and male learners tend to use different language learning strategies. According to Oxford (1988), women's tendency to use more social interaction and conversational strategies in language learning can be explained by reference to research that has pointed to females' greater social orientation by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974). Their work on sex differences suggests that

Females are superior to, or at least very different from, males in many social skills, with females showing a greater social orientation.... We think that social orientation is highly related to communication in both first and second languages.... Because social learning strategies have been particularly important for exposing the learner to the target language, increasing the amount of interaction with native speakers, and enhancing motivation, it is reasonable to anticipate enhancing verbal learning. (Ehrman & Oxford, 1990, p. 1)

Similarly, Tannen (1986) advocated that compared with men, women are more likely to try to reach an agreement through negotiation. Coates (1986, in Graham, 1997) reported the same finding that women seem to ask more questions than men. Likewise, Bardwick (in Ehrman & Oxford, 1989) distinguished between the "male mind", which is oriented to separation and "the female mind", which orientates to relatedness and noted that females are more likely to show a continuing need for social approval and acceptance.

In another study, Ellis (1994) hypothesizes that second or foreign language learning poses a threat to learner's identity and assumes that women can cope with that threat more readily than men.

Girls are more likely to stress co-operation and... learn to deal sensitively with relationships, whereas boys emphasize establishing and maintaining hierarchical relations and asserting their identity. The female "culture" seems to lend itself more readily to dealing with the inherent threat imposed to identity by L2 learning. (Ellis, 1994, p. 204)

In investigating women's speech, Cameron (1992, p.45), the feminist researcher, points out the feature that "women use cooperative and supportive strategies in conversation, whereas men are more competitive". What makes the boundary between gender's psychology clearer are common beliefs about the traditional man and the traditional woman, which center on the competency-independence pole and the warmth-expressive pole (Breakwell, 1988; Jordan & Weedon, 1995). According to these authors, women are considered characteristically expressive, whereas men are considered characteristically competent.

In conclusion, through these findings on the orientation of men and women, we can expect females to use more language learning strategies than males in language learning, especially social strategies. This tendency can be explained by women's desire for social approval and acceptance in an academic setting. Meanwhile, male learners anticipate more analytic strategies due to their cognitive orientation and their competitive manners. After all, it seems that each sex has its own ways of language learning, and both will reach their ultimate goals with their distinctive ways. Thus, in my view, the competence for success in learning the language in general and learning English in particular are equal for both sexes. Also, it is worth knowing that gender stereotypes in language learning are the actual factor that affects the learners' success and attitudes towards language learning.

4.2. Implications for teaching and recommendations for further research

The issues mentioned in this study have far-reaching implications for classroom practice. Firstly, ESL/EFL teachers need to assess their students' strategy use. Especially through open assessment, teachers, as well as learners, can recognize the preferred learning strategies of each sex. Then, from the awareness of gender-differentiated strategy use, teachers can give appropriate instructions to enhance the learning of both sexes. Obviously, the more teachers know about their students' current strategy, the more effectively they can deal with the specific needs of their students. Another significant point for English teachers and learners to consider is the necessity of making explicit gender stereotypes of the particular community they are in. Thanks to this

knowledge, they can understand why females learn this way, whereas males learn that way. Taking Asian learners as an example, there is a commonly held stereotype that Asians are quiet and passive, and Asian girls' participation in classrooms is far less frequent than boys. Teachers in such community should discuss and challenge such stereotypes with their students.

In term of recommendations for further research on language learning strategies and gender, Sunderland (2000, in Schmenk) points out that many of the available research findings refer to North American, Australian, and British contexts, fewer to Continental European, and fewer still to Asian contexts. Particularly, there is a lack of studies examining the relationship between language learning strategies and gender in a specific academic setting in the context of Vietnam. Thus, after my conceptual review of the literary works, I highly expected to conduct empirical research on the discussing issue.

5. Conclusion

To sum up, what the paper has contributed to the field of second/foreign language learning strategies is a critical review of previous studies on the impact of gender on strategy choice. The study has been briefly presented, with the first part introducing the current background of the study, rationale, and purposes. Then comes the literature review of language learning strategies and gender in the language learning environment, which provides the readers with a basic understanding of these terms as well as an overview of relevant studies on the issue. Finally, the references provide the readers with a rich source of material for further reading.

Through a review of existing research, it can be seen that females tend to use more language learning strategies than males in language learning, especially social strategies, due to their desire for social approval. Meanwhile, male learners employ more analytic strategies due to their cognitive orientation and their competitive manners.

Due to the limited time, the study has merely discussed and interpreted the relationship between language learning strategies and gender based on the findings and views of other researchers. Nevertheless, the paper may serve as a postulate for action research to be conducted. Hence, what is extremely anticipated in implications and recommendations is action research that investigates gender-differentiated strategy use in the Vietnamese context of teaching and learning English.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Alakbari, M. & A. Hayatzadeh (?). Variation of Language Strategies among Iranian English students: The Effect of Gender. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*. Retrieved on May, 12, 2021 from the World Wide Web: <http://jpl.e-contentmanagement.com/archives/vol/4/issue/3/article/2792>
- [2] Begley, S. (2009). Sex, Race and IQ: Off Limits? *Newsweek Magazine*. Vol. CLIII, No. 17, 46.
- [3] Bergvall, V. L. (1999). Toward a comprehensive theory of language and gender.
 - a. *Language in Society*, 28, 273–293.
- [4] Bialystok, E. (1981). The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency. *Modern Language Journal*, 65, 24-35.
- [5] Butler, J.(1990). Gender trouble. *Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- [6] Cameron, D. (1997). Performing gender identity: Young men's talk and the construction of heterosexual masculinity. In Sally Johnson & Ulrike Hanna Meinhof (eds.), *Language & Masculinity*. Oxford: Blackwell. 47-64.
- [7] Carter, R. and D. Nunan. (2001). *The Cambridge guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Chamot, A. U. (1987). The learning strategies of ESL students. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin(Eds.),
 - a. *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [9] Cohen, A. D. (1990). *Language learning: Insights for learners, teachers, and researchers*. New York: Newbury House Publishers.
- [10] Cohen, A., & Dornyei, Z. (2002). Focus on the language learner: Motivation, styles and strategies. In N. Schmidt (Ed.), *Applied linguistics: An introduction to* (170-190). New York: Arnold.
- [11] Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. L. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 1 - 13.
- [12] Ehrman, M. & Oxford, R. L. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *Modern Language Journal*, 74: 311-327.
- [13] Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [14] Ely, C. M. (1989). Tolerance of ambiguity and use of second language learning strategies. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22/5: 437-445.
- [15] Goddard, A. & L. M. Patterson (2000). *Language and Gender*. London: Routledge.
- [16] Graham, S. (1997). *Effective language learning*. Multilingual Matters.
- [17] Green, J. & Oxford, R. L. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 Proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 261-297.
- [18] Hong-nam, K., & Leavell, A.G. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System* 34, 399-415.
- [19] Maccoby, E. E. & C. N. Jacklin (1974). *The Psychology of Sex Differences*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- [20] Mayer, R. (1988). Learning strategies: An overview. In Weinstein, C., E. Goetz, & P. Alexander (Eds.), *Learning and Study Strategies: Issues in Assessment, Instruction, and Evaluation* (pp. 11-22). New York: Academic Press.

- [21] Nguyen, N. (2008). Characteristics influencing language learning strategy use of English learners in ESL context. Retrieved on June, 12, 2009
- [22] Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- [23] O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: CUP
- [24] Oxford, R.L., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(3), 291–300.
- [25] Oxford, R.L. (1990a). Language learning strategies and beyond: A look at strategies in the context of styles. In S.S. Magnan (Ed.), *Shifting the instructional focus to the learner* (pp. 35-55). Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- [26] Oxford, R. (1990b). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- [27] Oxford, R. (1992/1993). Language learning strategies in a nutshell: Update and ESL suggestions. *TESOL Journal*, 2(2), 18-22.
- [28] Palinscar, A. S. & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1, 117-175.
- [29] Politzer, R. L. (1983). An exploratory study of self-reported language learning behaviors and their relation to achievement. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 6/1: 54-65. New York: Newbury House/Harper Collins.
- [30] Reid, J. (Ed.). (1995). *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL Classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- [31] Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9, 41-51.
- [32] Rubin, J. (1987). Learner strategies: Theoretical assumptions, research history and typology. In A. Wenden, & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning*. (15-30). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall International.
- [33] Sutter, W. (1989). *Strategies and styles*. Aalborg, Denmark: Danish Refugee Council.
- [34] Tannen, D. (1986). *That's Not What I Meant! How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Your Relation with Others*. New York: William Morrow.
- [35] Tarone, E. (1983). Some thoughts on the notion of "communication strategy." In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 61-74). London: Longman.
- [36] Weinstein, C., & Mayer, R. (1986). The teaching of learning strategies. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, 3rd Edition (pp. 315-327). New York: Macmillan.