

Formulating hypotheses on language learning strategy use: A diary study*

YABUKOSHI, Tomoko

Graduate School of Kansai University

TAKEUCHI, Osamu

Kansai University

Abstract

本研究では、日記法を用いた質的研究手法により、外国語学習方略（以下、方略）の使用パターンとそれに影響を与える要因についての仮説形成を行った。被験者は4名の学生で、大学院生の“T”と“S”は、過去に3つの外国語学習経験があり、今回の目標言語（TL）は第5言語（L5）であった。一方、大学1年生の“Y”と“N”は、過去に経験した外国語学習は英語のみで、今回のTLはL3であった。日記データの収集は、外国語学習環境（FL）と第二言語学習環境（SL）の2つの学習環境で行われた。被験者“T”、“Y”、“N”による日記は、FL学習環境での韓国語学習に関するもので、被験者“S”による日記は、SL学習環境でのオランダ語学習に関するものであった。日記には、1) 学習内容、2) 学習方法・学習活動、3) 学習の際に気になったことが詳細に述べられており、これをデータ源として、方略使用とそれに影響を与える要因を分析した。その結果、FLとSLという学習環境や、学習者の過去の言語学習経験や学習スタイルの違いによって、使用される方略の種類や、方略の使用法が異なっていることが示唆された。最後に、本研究から形成された仮説をまとめて提示し、今後の研究の方向性を示した。

1. Introduction

A great deal of research on language learning strategy (LLS) has been accumulated thus far. Based on the early studies, it has been clarified that each learner's pattern of strategy use is affected by several variables (e.g., Gu, 1996; Takeuchi, 2003b). Among these variables, the learning context such as the contexts of foreign language (FL) and second language (SL) has been considered to be one of the important variables that influence people's learning strategies¹. LoCastro (1994), for instance, argued that the strategies utilized by Asian FL students are different to those used by SL learners in the North America mainly due to the FL and SL environmental differences. More recently, Takeuchi (2003a) identified strategies especially favored by Japanese FL learners in his qualitative study. This study proposes a more contextualized approach to strategy research.

In addition to the FL and SL contextual differences, situational differences such as

language learning with or without instruction are also one of the variables influencing learners' strategy use. In other words, learners apply a different strategy in the classroom compared to that in more naturalistic learning settings. For instance, Yabukoshi (2004) analyzed the patterns of strategy use in and outside the classroom in Japanese FL context. This study revealed that instructor's teaching methods were directly associated with the learners' strategy use in the classroom settings. Outside the classroom, on the other hand, the learners were found to self-direct their use of strategies frequently. Such situational variables should be taken into account in LLS research.

Another vital variable affecting the patterns of strategy use is learner differences such as the learners' past language learning experiences and their learning styles. Concerning the first variable, several studies attempted to uncover the differences between multilingual and monolingual learners in terms of the learning process and their approach to language learning (i.e., learning strategies). For example, Nayak et al. (1990) analyzed the protocols of multilingual and monolingual learners' use of strategies. They found that the multilinguals were more able to switch their learning strategies according to the task requirements than their monolingual counterparts.

Regarding learners' learning styles, Oxford (2003: 273) argues that learners' choice of strategies is related to their learning style differences such as "sensory style dimensions (visual/auditory/hands-on)", "social style dimensions (extroverted/introverted)", and so forth. This issue draws greater attention from many researchers in current LLS research.

Concerning the data collection methods in the study of language learning and teaching, there exist two major approaches, i.e., quantitative and qualitative ones. In recent years, to gain more insights on individuals' language learning process, the application of qualitative approach has been increasingly used (Lazaraton, 2003). Among the methods in the qualitative approach, the diary method has gradually attracted more attention from researchers. The diary method refers to a research technique employed to investigate various aspects of individual language learning by analyzing language learning diaries recorded by learners. In diaries, learners report on "affective factors, language learning strategies, and their own perceptions—facets of the language learning experiences which are normally hidden or largely inaccessible to an external observer" (Bailey & Ochsner, 1983: 189)². The diary method usually involves a small number of subjects and thereby allows the researchers to examine individual language learning very carefully. Unlike quantitative studies, whose main purpose is hypotheses-testing, the aim of diary studies is generating new hypotheses about language learning (Matsumoto, 1987). In the field of LLS studies, researchers have begun to utilize the diary method to describe not only what kind of strategies learners use, but also how they utilize the strategies (e.g., Carson & Longhini, 2002; Halbach, 2000; Root,

1999).

2. Research Design

2.1 Objective

The rest of this paper will report on a study conducted with Japanese adult learners learning an L3 or L5 as a new language in two learning contexts (i.e., FL or SL) by means of the diary method with the aim of generating new hypotheses on variables affecting the patterns of strategy used by learners, and consequently testing the hypotheses in future quantitative studies.

2.2 Participants

A total of four learners participated in this diary project. Two of them were graduate students who had studied three languages before starting their target language (TL). One of the students (called “T”) was the first author of this paper majoring in foreign language education and research. The subject “T” was a female student and she had studied English, French, and Dutch in both FL and SL learning contexts before she had started studying Korean as her L5 in Japanese FL context. The other student (called “S”) was a male student, majors in English linguistics and he had studied English, Spanish, and German in both FL and SL learning contexts before he had started learning Dutch as his L5 in a Belgian SL context³. Two female students, “Y” and “N”, who took the same Korean language courses as the subject “T”, also participated in the present diary project. They were both first-year undergraduate students majoring in Japanese language and literature. They had studied only one language previously, i.e., English for six years in the Japanese FL context before being admitted to the university. Furthermore, they had no overseas experience beforehand. Korean was, therefore, their L3. (See also Table 1 in 2.4.)

2.3 Settings

The subjects “T”, “Y”, and “N” enrolled in the Korean as FL courses, which were mainly targeted for freshmen and beginning learners of Korean at the university. The courses were taught by two co-ordinated teachers, a Japanese instructor of Korean and a native speaker of Korean. The course syllabus was based on the grammar-translation method. The instructor often introduced each grammatical item by first writing down a rule and its explanation on the blackboard. Each class was composed of 37 students. The courses met twice a week, 90 minutes per lesson.

The subject “S”, on the other hand, started a summer intensive program of Dutch as a SL in Belgium. The course met 80 hours for one month and was taught by means of the direct

method instructed by a native Dutch speaker. The purpose of the language course was to improve the learners' linguistic and communicative language skills and the teacher employed a communicative approach in her classroom. There were seventeen students from a variety of countries in the class.

Besides the FL and SL contextual difference, this study also makes a distinction between inside and outside the classroom learning settings, and focuses especially on the classroom learning settings in the FL or the SL contexts.

2.4 Data Collection

Regarding data collection, two sets of diary data were collected for the present study. The one was from FL learning diaries kept by the subjects "T", "Y", and "N" while they were taking the Korean language courses at the university. The other was the SL learning diary recorded by the subject "S" while he was taking part in the summer intensive Dutch course in Belgium. On their journals⁴, they recorded what and how they had learned the TL inside and also outside the classroom. Those entries also included their thoughts, feelings, and/or reactions towards the language learning experiences, their approach to learning, instructors, the methods of instruction, the TL cultures, and the TL speakers with whom they had actual interactions. Before starting a diary-keeping, they were given a set of sub-directions⁵ (see Appendix for the journal instructions) and several examples of language learning diaries, so that they could have an idea of what they were expected to write. The language in which these records were kept was the diarists' first language, that is, Japanese, to ensure that detailed and comprehensive descriptions of the language experiences were possible.

The learning diary was handwritten in a notebook. Each entry in the diary varied from several pages to a few short paragraphs. The inconsistent amount of writing was due to the fact that their language learning was affected by various factors, such as a tight schedule in their daily lives, the degree of motivation towards studying the new language during long-term periods of learning, and so forth. In addition to the diary-keeping, two questionnaires were implemented to the subjects "T" and "S" to observe their strategy use and learning styles objectively. The questionnaires used were *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL, version 5.1: Oxford, 1990)* and *Style Analysis Survey (SAS: Oxford, 1998)*. The participants and the data collection procedures are summarized as shown in Table 1.

2.5 Data Analyses

After finishing the data collection, the handwritten journal entries were typed into a

Table 1. Summary of data collection

Learners	TL	L _n	Contexts	Duration of data collection	The number of journal entries	Questionnaires
“T”	Korean	L5	FL	34 weeks	77	<i>SILL, SAS</i>
“Y”	Korean	L3	FL	15 weeks	28	<i>NA</i>
“N”	Korean	L3	FL	18 weeks	19	<i>NA</i>
“S”	Dutch	L5	SL	4 weeks	15	<i>SILL, SAS</i>

word processing format. The names of people mentioned in the diaries were changed to keep their anonymity in entering the data. Then, the descriptions that contained learning strategies were underlined by the first author and they were divided into four strategy groups such as cognitive, metacognitive, social-affective, and communication strategies based on the taxonomies by O’Malley and Chamot (1990) and Oxford (1990)⁶.

In addition to classifying strategies into the four groups, the combined use of strategies was also examined since it has come into the focus in recent LLS research (e.g., Vandergrift, 2003). Two types of combined use of strategies were identified according to the following categories (Yabukoshi, 2004):

- a) Successive use of strategies: several types of strategies are used by a learner in a consecutive manner while s/he is engaging in a language task/activity, or (not engaging in it but) thinking about his/her language learning; and
- b) Simultaneous use of strategies: several types of strategies are applied by a learner at the same time while s/he is working on a language task/activity, or (not working on it but) thinking about his/her language learning.

Finally, the strategies recorded in the diaries were, then, counted for the quantitative processing of data. To minimize the effects of subjectivity in the identification and the categorization, a portion of samples was randomly selected and checked by another researcher. The consensus on the analyses achieved approximately 90 %.

3. Results & Discussion

In the learners’ diaries, a total of 1,387 comments were identified as pertaining to learning strategies. Through the analysis of those comments, the authors realized that each subject described different patterns of strategy use in their journal entries. For instance, regarding cognitive strategies, the subject “T” often employed the *writing down strategy*. On

the other hand, the subject “S” frequently utilized the *reading aloud strategy*. Another example is some students employed more than one strategy in an orchestrated way at a time; the others did not combine several strategies but employed only one strategy at a time. In the following sub-sections, these specific patterns of strategy use were examined in relation to the following variables: learning contexts (i.e., FL or SL); and learner variables (i.e., past language learning experiences and learning styles).

3.1 Learning Contexts

This sub-section concerned with the specific patterns of strategy use related to the FL and the SL classroom learning contexts. As was mentioned above, some learners employed more than one strategy at a time when they were engaging in language tasks/activities. These orchestrated use of strategies seemed to be different in the FL as compared to the SL classrooms. Table 2 shows the frequencies and the percentages of orchestrated use of strategies in a successive way by the learners in the classroom settings. The results indicate that, unlike the FL learners “T”, “Y”, and “N”, the SL learner “S” often combined the use of more than one cognitive strategy in a successive manner (see Excerpt A for an instance).

Excerpt A (August 11, written by “S”)

. . . I have learned verb inflections . . . The instructor gave me a handout which included many verbs. Then, I tried to classify the verbs in terms of the same inflection patterns (*Cognitive “grouping”*). I then practiced changing the verbs into the appropriate inflected forms by using a drill book (*Cognitive “rule-exercising”*) . . .
(Italics and translation are ours.)

Table 3 shows the frequencies and the percentages of orchestrated use of strategies in a simultaneous way by the learners in the classroom learning settings. According to the results, the subject “S” often combined a social-affective and a cognitive strategy in a simultaneous manner, as shown in Excerpt B.

Excerpt B (August 12, written by “S”)

. . . I have learned how to ask and show directions. This section was very complicated for me. First of all, I looked over the relevant expressions to the topic. Then, I made a pair and practiced the expressions (*Social-affective “cooperating”*). One student asked a direction and the other showed the direction by using a real map (*Cognitive “naturalistic practicing”*). . .
(Italics and translation are ours.)

Table 2. Numbers and percentages of successive use of strategies in the classroom settings

Learners	Learning contexts	Ln	Types of combination						Sum
			Meta-Cog	Meta-Meta	Cog-Cog	Meta-S.A	S.A-Cog	Cog-Com	
"T"	FL	L5	48 (38.7 %)	41 (33.1%)	12 (9.7 %)	13 (10.5 %)	6 (4.8 %)	4 (3.2 %)	124
"Y"	FL	L3	3 (25.0 %)	4 (33.3 %)	2 (16.7 %)	2 (16.7 %)	1 (8.3 %)	0	12
"N"	FL	L3	4 (57.1 %)	2 (28.6 %)	1 (14.3 %)	0	0	0	7
"S"	SL	L5	33 (50.0%)	6 (9.1 %)	21 (31.8 %)	3 (4.5 %)	3 (4.5 %)	0	66

Note. Cog = cognitive strategies; Meta = metacognitive strategies; S.A = social-affective strategies; Com = communication strategies

Table 3. Numbers and percentages of simultaneous use of strategies in the classroom settings

Learners	Learning contexts	Ln	Types of combination				Sum
			Meta + Cog	Cog + Cog	S.A + Cog	Com	
"T"	FL	L5	36 (47.4 %)	23 (30.3 %)	16 (21.2 %)	1 (1.3 %)	76
"Y"	FL	L3	4 (80.0 %)	0	1 (20.0 %)	0	5
"N"	FL	L3	6 (54.5 %)	1 (9.1 %)	4 (36.4 %)	0	11
"S"	SL	L5	5 (13.5 %)	11 (29.7 %)	21 (56.8 %)	0	37

Note. Cog = cognitive strategies; Meta = metacognitive strategies; S.A = social-affective strategies; Com = communication strategies

These results might be caused by the nature of the language activities introduced in the each classroom. As mentioned in the previous section, the SL classes were conducted on the basis of communicative approach, and many communicative language tasks and activities were introduced in the classroom. This situation seemed to induce the subject “S” to use the strategies in an orchestrated manner. The FL classroom was, on the other hand, based on the grammar-translation method. The FL learners had fewer varieties of language tasks, and they did not often cooperate with other learners in the classroom, which resulted in lesser use of orchestrated strategies.

According to these findings, the following hypothesis was generated:

Learning contexts, especially types of tasks and activities introduced in the classroom, affect the patterns of strategy use by the learners.

3.2 Learner Differences

This sub-section turns to examine the specific patterns of strategy use in relation to individual learner differences such as their past language learning experiences and their learning styles.

3.2.1 Past Language Learning Experiences

There were considerable differences in the ways between the L5 learners approached their language learning and the L3 learners did. For example, the L5 learners “T” and “S” used a wider variety of different strategies and combined more than one strategy in their language learning than did the L3 counterparts. As Tables 2 and 3 show, the L5 learners “T” and “S” frequently employed more than one cognitive strategy in successive and simultaneous ways than did the L3 learners “Y” and “N”. This result is consistent with the findings reported by Nayak et al. (1990), who found that the multilingual subjects showed 1) a wider range of different strategies in the rule-discovery and 2) a greater flexibility in shifting strategies than did the monolingual subjects.

Furthermore, the subject “S” often employed the *reading aloud strategy* when he self-studied at home. According to Takeuchi (2003a), *reading aloud* is the strategy especially favored by the Japanese EFL learners. The subject “S”, who was learning the TL in the SL context, seemed to transfer the strategy which he had been accustomed to using in his previous FL learning in Japan. This reasoning is supported by his own remark that he repeatedly read aloud English textbooks and memorized the sentences in his English (L2) learning.

The findings above, thus, lead the authors to make the following hypothesis:

Learners who have learned many languages have a wider variety of strategies and can also combine more than one strategy in more orchestrated ways in their use.

3.2.2 Learning Styles

This sub-section discusses another learner difference, i.e., learning styles⁷ and its influence on the patterns of strategy use. Table 4 shows the results of the *SAS* scores of the subjects “T” and “S”. As indicated by the scores, their learning styles were rather contrastive. The subject “T” was considered to be a visual and extroverted learner. On the other hand, the subject “S” seemed to be an auditory and introverted learner.

Table 4. Results of *SAS* implemented to the subjects “T” and “S”

Learners	Visual	Auditory	Extroverted	Introverted
“T”	<u>2.3</u>	1.1	<u>1.8</u>	1.1
“S”	1.2	<u>1.5</u>	0.5	<u>1.7</u>

(*SAS*: Range: 0-3)

Concerning the strategy use, their diary data show that they seemed to use the strategies consistent with their respective learning styles. First, the visual learner “T”, who tended to learn a new language by eye than by ear, described her preference on the cognitive strategies such as *writing down strategy* in her journal entries as in Excerpt C.

Excerpt C (July 4, written by “T”)

. . . When the instructor “K” let us practice Korean by writing individually, I practiced very hard. This is because I can memorize words better by writing them down (*Cognitive “writing down”*) . . . (Italics and translation are ours.)

On the other hand, the auditory learner “S”, who prefers learning by ear than by eye, commented in his diary that he often paid attention to the pronunciation of the TL and employed metacognitive strategies such as self-monitoring as in Excerpt D.

Excerpt D (July 31, written by “S”)

. . . We have learned short vowels and long vowels by using the same vowels in contrast. For example, (the vowel) “a” is used for “man” (as a short vowel) and “maan” (as a long vowel) . . . The teacher pronounced these words and I followed her and read them aloud (*Cognitive “reading aloud”*). Then, I tape recorded my pronunciation and, after that, I listened to the tape and checked my pronunciation (*Metacognitive “self-monitoring”*). . .

(Italics, parentheses, and translation are ours.)

Another pattern of strategy use was related to whether the learner is extroverted or introverted. For example, the extroverted learner “T”, who was good at working with others, often employed social-affective strategies. According to her journal entries, she was enthusiastic about selecting her language partner, and she attempted to seek out a more proficient partner in the classroom. She also looked for a TL speaker outside the classroom to practice the language. The following Excerpts E and F show her use of social-affective strategies in and outside the classroom.

Excerpt E (September 26, written by “T”)

. . . (With a proficient learner “R” in the classroom) I talked to “R” and sat down next to her. . . “R” was very sensitive to the pronunciation in learning a foreign language, and she often tried to correct my pronunciation. She corrected my pronunciation of *ㅏ* (it is pronounced [t'a], including the glottalized “t” sound in English) (*Social-affective “cooperating”*) . . .

(Italics, parentheses, and translation are ours.)

Excerpt F (September 8, written by “T”)

. . . (Meeting a native Korean speaker “S” outside the classroom), we learned Korean together. He said to me short sentences in Korean and I interpreted their meaning. If I didn’t know the meaning, he gave me an answer orally. When I was not able to understand the answer, I asked him to write it down (*Social-affective “cooperating” and “asking questions”*) . . .

(Italics, parentheses, and translation are ours.)

The introverted learner “S”, on the other hand, did not frequently employ social-affective strategies outside the classroom. In other words, even though he stayed in the SL learning context, where there would be more opportunities to use and to practice the TL in his daily life, he did not make extra efforts to associate with the TL speakers outside the classroom.

The following hypothesis is then proposed from these results:

Students’ learning styles have a greater impact on their choice of strategies than their learning contexts have.

3.3 Comparison of Diary Data and *SILL* Data

The results of the diary data and the *SILL* scores were compared in terms of the frequencies of strategy use. Table 5 shows: 1) the frequencies and the percentages of strategies commented in their diaries; and 2) the average scores for the different sections of the *SILL*. The comparison of these results indicates that the types of strategy which show higher frequency in their diaries nearly corresponded to the types of strategy which show

higher frequency in their *SILL*. For instance, the subject “T” described her use of metacognitive strategies most frequently in her diary. This result matched the result of her *SILL*. By looking at the subject “S”, again, the type of strategies found to be most frequent in the diary study coincided with those in the *SILL*. These results indicate that the frequencies of strategy use recorded in their diaries were consistent with their *SILL* scores.

Accordingly, the authors could say that the diary method seems to be a reliable research tool to measure a learner’s use of strategies, and it also enables researchers to investigate the combined use of strategies, which is not observable in questionnaires such as the *SILL*.

Table 5. Comparison: the results of diary data and of the *SILL*

Learners	Data	Cognitive		Metacognitive	Social-Affective		Communication	Sum
		(Memory)	(Cognitive)	(Metacognitive)	(Social)	(Affective)	(Compensation)	
“T”	Diary		372	461	107		14	954
	<i>SILL</i>	2.5	3.2	4.2	3.3	3.3	2.6	
“S”	Diary		145	73	32		1	251
	<i>SILL</i>	2.1	3.4	2.2	2.0	2.3	2.0	

(*SILL*: Range 1-5)

4. Conclusion

This paper attempted to explore the influences of learning contexts and learner differences on the learners’ choice of strategies by means of the diary method. Before concluding, a few limitations of the present study should be mentioned. First, the small number of the participants, although this is pertaining to diary method, should be pointed out. Second, the different number of journal entries collected from the subjects, which is also inherent in the diary method, should be another limitation. With those limitations in mind, the authors would like to conclude this article by presenting major research hypotheses generated from this study:

- 1) *Learning contexts, especially types of tasks and activities introduced in the classroom, influence the patterns of strategy use by the learners;*
- 2) *Learners who have learned many languages have a wider variety of strategies and can use strategies in more orchestrated ways; and*

3) Learners' learning styles have a greater impact on their choice of strategies than their learning contexts have.

The present study raises interesting questions on the links between strategy use by learners and learning contexts, especially in the classroom settings (Hypothesis 1). Taken in light of the second and the third hypotheses, however, the following hypothesis can also be made:

4) Individual differences, i.e., learners' past language learning experiences and learning styles, have a greater influence on their choice of strategies than the learning contexts have.

Hypotheses that are generated in qualitative studies should be tested in quantitative studies. The hypotheses formulated in this study, therefore, should be examined in rigorous quantitative studies in the future. These examinations will hopefully lead to identifying more effective strategy use and consequently to better language learning.

Notes

*This article is a revised version of the paper presented by the authors at the 44th Annual Conference of the Japan Association for Language Education and Technology (LET) held at Fukuoka.

1. The authors make a distinction between foreign language (FL) and second language (SL) in this paper. The former refers to the TL being learned in and outside the classroom settings in the countries where it is not spoken. On the other hand, SL refers to the TL being learned in either formal or informal settings in the places where it is spoken.
2. There are two types of diary studies in terms of their analytical procedures (Matsumoto, 1987). One is introspective studies in which a researcher keeps a language learning diary, and s/he analyzes his/her own journal entries. The other is non-introspective studies in which a researcher analyzes other diarists' diaries and investigates their learning processes.
3. Dutch is spoken as one of the first languages in Belgium.
4. The terms, "diary" and "journal" are used interchangeably in this paper.
5. These instructions were adapted from other diary studies (e.g., Brown, 1985; Takeuchi, 1991).
6. Memory strategies and compensation strategies identified by Oxford (1990) were

adapted in the present study as follows: 1) memory strategies were integrated into cognitive strategies; and 2) compensation strategies were replaced by communication strategies except the strategy of “using linguistic clues for listening and reading”, which were included as “inferencing” in cognitive strategies. The authors also have added several strategies (e.g., reading aloud) into the present study which were not covered by those earlier taxonomies, but observed in this data collection.

- 7 Learning styles are defined here as “an individual’s natural, habitual, and preferred way(s) of absorbing, processing, and retaining new information and skills” (Reid, 1995: viii).

References

- Bailey, K.M., & Ochsner, R. (1983). A methodological review of the diary studies: Windmill tilting or social science? In K.M. Bailey, M.H. Long, & S. Peck (Eds.), *Second language acquisition studies*. Rowley: Newbury House, 188-198.
- Brown, C. (1985). Requests for specific language input. In S.M. Gass, & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Rowley: Newbury House, 272-281.
- Carson, G.J., & Longhini, A. (2002). Focusing on learning styles and strategies: A diary study in an immersion setting. *Language Learning*, 52(2), 401-438.
- Halbach, A. (2000). Finding out about students’ learning strategies by looking at their diaries: A case study. *System*, 28(1), 85-96.
- Gu, Y. (1996). Robin Hood in SLA: What has the learner strategy research taught us? *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6, 1-29.
- Lazaraton, A. (2003). Evaluating criteria for qualitative research in applied linguistics: Whose criteria and whose research? *Modern Language Journal*, 87(1), 1-12.
- LoCastro, V. (1994). Learning strategies and learning environment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 409-414.
- Matsumoto, K. (1987). Diary studies of second language acquisition: A critical overview. *JALT Journal*, 9(1), 17-34.
- Nayak, N., Hansen, N., Krueger, N., & McLaughlin, B. (1990). Language-learning strategies in monolingual and multilingual adults. *Language Learning*, 40(2), 221-244.
- O’Malley, J.M., & Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Oxford, R. (1998). Style analysis survey (SAS): Assessing your own learning and working styles. In J.M. Reid (Ed.), *Understanding learning styles in the second language*

- classroom*. NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Oxford, R. (2003). Language learning styles and strategies: Concepts and relationships. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 41(4), 271-278.
- Root, E. (1999). *Motivation and learning strategies in a foreign language setting: A look at learner of Korean*. Working Paper #14. Center for Advance Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Reid, J.M. (1995). *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom*. New York: Heinle & Heinle.
- Takeuchi, O. (1991). Case study report. A term paper submitted to Second Language Acquisition 532, Monterey Institute of International Studies, CA, USA.
- Takeuchi, O. (2003a). What can we learn from good foreign language learners? A qualitative study in the Japanese foreign language context. *System*, 31(3), 385-392.
- Takeuchi, O. (2003b). *Yoriyoi gaikokugo gakushuhouhou wo motomete: Gaikokugo gakushu seikousha no kenkyu*. [In search of good language learning strategies: Studies on good language learners in the Japanese FL context.] Tokyo: Shohakusha.
- Vandergrift, L. (2003) Orchestrating strategy use: Toward a model of the skilled second language listener. *Language Learning*, 53(3), 463-496.
- Yabukoshi, T. (2004). Profiling patterns of strategy use by analyzing diaries of Japanese learners of Korean: A case study. Unpublished MA thesis submitted to Kansai University, Osaka, Japan.

Appendix: Journal Instructions

Please write in your diary the following items related to your Korean (or Dutch) language learning in and outside the classroom: 1) the contents of learning; 2) the contents of learning tasks/activities; and 3) your feelings and reactions towards 1) and 2).

To be more precise . . .

- a) Write what you have learned as specifically as possible.
(e.g., pronunciation, words, useful expressions, grammar, Korean culture, etc.)
- b) Write how you have learned these items as clearly as possible: what you have done; and what you have thought during the learning tasks/activities. (e.g., writing down, reading aloud, guessing, etc.)
- c) Write your feelings and reactions related to language learning including teaching methods and learning tasks/activities. (e.g., It was enjoyable, but sometimes boring especially when I was reading aloud sentences in pair.)

- d) Write you feelings and reactions towards your language partner as well as your classmates if necessary
- e) If there were quizzes, write your feelings and reactions towards them.

In addition, verbal instructions were given to the subjects as follows:

- f) Write as if this were your personal diary about your language learning experience.
- g) Diary-keeping will help you with your language learning. As you write about what you think and feel as a language learner, you will understand yourself and your learning experience better.
- h) You do not have to write something new each time. If appropriate, you can repeat similar descriptions in your diary.
- i) Your identity and the identity of others you may write about will be unknown to anyone except the researcher.