

**GENDER VARIATION ON LANGUAGE LEARNING
STRATEGIES**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education
in Partial Fulfillment for the Master of Education in English**

**Submitted by
Durga Prasad Lamichhane**

**Faculty of Education
Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur
Kathmandu, Nepal
2010**

**GENDER VARIATION ON LANGUAGE LEARNING
STRATEGIES**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education
in Partial Fulfillment for the Master of Education in English**

**Submitted by
Durga Prasad Lamichhane**

**Faculty of Education
Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur
Kathmandu, Nepal
2010**

**T.U. Regd. No: 9-1-57-423-2001
Second Year Exam**

Roll No.:280297/065

**Date of Approval of
Proposal: 2066/12/05**

Date of Submission: 2067/02/05

RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCEPTANCE

This is to certify that **Mr. Durga Prasad Lamichhane** has prepared this thesis entitled “**Gender Variation on Language Learning Strategies**” under my guidance and supervision.

I recommend this thesis for acceptance.

Date: 2067-02-07

.....

Dr. Anjana Bhattarai (Guide)

Reader

Department of English Education

Faculty of Education

T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal

RECOMMENDATION FOR EVALUATION

This thesis has been recommended for the evaluation by the following
“**Research Guidance Committee**”.

Signature

Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra

Professor and Head

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur

.....

Chairperson

Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi

Professor

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur

.....

Member

Dr. Anjana Bhattarai (Guide)

Reader

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur

.....

Member

Date: 2067-02-09

EVALUATION AND APPROVAL

This thesis has been evaluated and approved by the following thesis
“**Evaluation and Approval Committee**”.

Signature

Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra

Professor and Head

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur

.....

Chairperson

Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi

Professor

Department of English Education

Chairperson

English and Other Foreign Languages

Education Subject Committee

T.U., Kirtipur

.....

Member

Dr. Anjana Bhattarai (Guide)

Reader

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur

.....

Member

Date: 2067-02-12

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that to the best of my knowledge this thesis is original and no part of it was earlier submitted for the candidature of the research degree to any university.

Date: 2067-02-05

.....
Durga Prasad Lamichhane

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my parents who introduced me to the joy of reading

and

Mr. Jan C. Stuurman who taught me that the best kind of knowledge to have is
that which is learned for its own sake.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No research endeavour is ever carried out in solitude. So many people have encouraged and supported me throughout the writing of this thesis. At first, I would like to express my deep gratitude to my thesis supervisor **Dr. Anjana Bhattarai**, Department of English Education, for her advice, insightful criticism and patient encouragement which aided the writing of this thesis in innumerable ways. She did not just inspire me through her lectures, but also gave herself to supervise this work throughout the time of writing. She meticulously and with great care and attention advised and motivated me to produce the final product. Without supervision of this quality, the thesis would never have been completed in a satisfactory manner.

It is my pleasure to thank **Dr. Chandreswor Mishra**, Professor and Head of the Department of English Education, for his co-operative behavior. I wish to express my appreciation for his kind heart, wisdom, patience, encouragement, positive criticism and assistance in every work that we take to the department. I will remember throughout my life for what I learnt from you, sir.

I am also greatly indebted to **Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi**, Professor, Department of English Education and Chairperson of English and Other Foreign Languages Education Subject Committee, whose inspiration and passion in his lectures inspired me always. I feel proud to be a student of such a great personality.

Similarly, I am grateful to respected Gurus and Gurumas **Prof. Dr. Govinda Raj Bhattarai, Prof. Dr. Tirth Raj Khaniya, Prof. Dr. Anju Giri, Mr. Vishnu S. Rai, Dr. Bal Mukunda Bhandari, Dr. L.B. Maharjana, Mrs. Tapasi Bhattacharya, Mrs. Madhu Neupane, Mr. Prem Bahadur Phyak, Mrs. Saraswati Dawadi, Mr. Bhesh Raj Pokharel, Mrs. Hima Rawal** and other members of the Department of English Education for their co-operation which proves to be of a great value when the matter of accomplishment of this work arises.

My thanks go to the campus chiefs, teachers and students of the sampled campuses of Kathmandu valley where I had been to collect data for my research. Without their help, hospitality, co-operation; I would not be able to complete this thesis.

I also want to acknowledge my dear colleagues and course mates at Tribhuvan University with whom I shared much encouragement during the research study. My special thanks go to dear friend **Khem Raj Joshi** who always provided me a good company and supported me when I faced difficulty. I am grateful to my friends **Mani Ram Chalise, Gokul Sharma, Durga Prasad Shrestha, Dilip Kumar Sharma, Kishor Bhattarai, Sagar Bhattarai, Rajiv Manjgaiyan, Surya Devkota**, for their help in giving materials, collecting data, and sharing their ideas relevant to the research study. Thank you all my friends.

I am also indebted for the help provided to me by **Mrs. Madhavi Khanal**, Librarian of Central Department of English Education. I am grateful to her help.

Last, but not the least, I thank my brother **Upendra Lamichhane** who listened my complaints and frustrations and always reminded that my research should be useful. Similarly my sister in law **Ratna Lamichhane** and sister **Gita Dhakal** deserve sincere thankfulness and gratitude from my side.

Durga Prasad Lamichhane

ABSTRACT

This current study investigates the gender differences in the use of language learning strategies. This study aimed to discover gender differences in the use of language learning strategies. A total of 80 students from six campuses of Kathmandu valley were taken as sample in the study. Data was collected using a questionnaire adapted and modified from SILL (Oxford 1990). The findings of the study show that female students tend to use overall language learning strategies more often than the males but there is no significant gender difference in the use of language learning strategies as a whole. For categories of language learning strategies, there are significant differences between genders in the use of social strategies with females using them more often.

The study consists of four chapters. The first chapter encompasses general background, definition of language learning strategies, its classification and characteristics, the good language learner, factors affecting the use of language learning strategies, learning strategies and language teaching. Furthermore, this chapter consists of review of related literature, objectives of the study, significant of the study and procedures for data analysis. Chapter two deals with methodology. It encompasses sources of data, population of the study, sampling procedure, tools for data collection, process of data collection and limitations of the study. Likewise, the third chapter of the study comprises analysis and interpretation of the data. The data was analyzed and interpreted on the basis of frequency and percentage. The fourth chapter consists of the outcomes of the analysis and interpretation of the data. It encompasses findings and recommendation. The final part presents the references and the appendices which provide the information to support as the evidence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Declaration	i
Recommendation for Acceptance	ii
Recommendation for Evaluation	iii
Evaluation and Approval	iv
Dedication	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Abstract	vii
Table of Contents	ix
List of Tables	xi
List of Symbols and Abbreviations	xii
 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1.1. General Background	1
1.1.1 Defining Learning Strategies	2
1.1.2 Classification of Language Learning Strategies	5
1.1.3 Characteristics of Learning Strategies	16
1.1.4 The Good Language Learner	18
1.1.5 Factors Affecting the Use of Language Learning Strategies	20
1.1.5.1 Proficiency	21
1.1.5.2 Motivation	22
1.1.5.3 Learning Styles	24
1.1.5.4 Age	25
1.1.5.5 Beliefs	26
1.1.5.6 Cultural Background	27
1.1.5.7 Gender	27
1.1.6 Learning Strategies and Language Teaching	28
1.2 Review of Related Literature	30

1.3 Objectives of the Study	35
1.4 Significance of the Study	35
1.4 Definition of the Specific Terms	35

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

2.1 Sources of Data	36
2.1.1 Primary Sources of Data	36
2.1.2 Secondary Sources of Data	36
2.2 Population of the Study	36
2.3 Sampling Procedure	36
2.4 Tools for Data Collection	37
2.5 Process of Data Collection	37
2.6 Limitations of the Study	37

CHAPTER THREE: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

3.1 Gender differences in Memory Strategies	38
3.2 Gender differences in Cognitive Strategies	40
3.3 Gender differences in Compensation Strategies	44
3.4 Gender differences in Meta-cognitive Strategies	45
3.5 Gender differences in Affective Strategies	47
3.6 Gender differences in Social Strategies	49

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Findings	51
4.2 Recommendations	52

References

Appendices

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Oxford's Language Learning Strategy System	15
Table 2:	Comparison Between Males and Females in the Use of Memory Strategies	38
Table 3:	Comparison Between Males and Females in the Use of Cognitive Strategies	41
Table 4:	Comparison Between Males and Females in the Use of Compensation Strategies	44
Table 5:	Comparison Between Males and Females in the Use of Meta-cognitive Strategies	46
Table 6:	Comparison Between Males and Females in the Use of Affective Strategies	48
Table 7:	Comparison Between Males and Females in the Use of Social Strategies	49

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

%	Percentage
B.Ed.	Bachelor in Education
Dr.	Doctor
e.g.	For example
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELT	English Language Teaching
etc.	Et Cetera
i.e.	that is
M.Ed.	Master in Education
Nos.	Numbers
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
SILL	Strategy Inventory for Language Learning
S.N.	Serial Number
T.U.	Tribhuvan University
Viz	Namely

CHAPTR ONE

INTRODUCTION

The current study is about the “Gender Variation on Language Learning Strategies”. This chapter includes general background, definitions of language learning strategies, its classification and characteristics, the good language learner, factors affecting the use of language learning strategies, learning strategies and language teaching. Further, it includes the review of related literature, objectives of the study and finally, the significance of the study.

1.2. General Background

Within the field of education during the last three decades, a gradual but significant shift has taken place, resulting in less stress on teachers and teaching and greater emphasis on students and learning. One consequence of this shift is an increasing awareness and interest in resources for learning styles and language learning strategies in foreign and second language teaching and learning. Applying the ideas to language learning, language learning itself is a life-long task, and language-learning strategies are important skills for students’ self-directed learning. It appears that successful language students have the ability to orchestrate and combine particular types of language learning strategies in effective ways, according to their own learning needs. Thus, to facilitate students’ learning, language-learning strategies are a key point for instructors to which one must pay attention.

Considering the fact that language learning strategies can enhance language achievement and that knowledge about these strategies may improve instruction; it is important to study how students from different/particular group use the learning strategies. As gender is an issue with important theoretical and pedagogical implications in second language learning, it has received some attention in language learning strategy research. This study intends to explore

how such learners differ in their learning in terms of their gender and the use of different strategies for their learning.

1.1.1 Defining Learning Strategies

Since the works by researchers such as Rubin (1975) and Stern (1975) in the mid seventies, awareness in the field of language learning strategies has been rapidly growing process. It can be clear from the proverbial that a horse led to water remains thirsty if it does no drink. In the same way, however, best the teachers and methods are; it is the students who can actually do the learning. As Nyikos and Oxford (1993, p. 11) put it that learning begins with the learner. It is largely dependent upon what strategies the learners use in their learning. So, first it becomes relevant to describe what learning strategies are.

The term “strategy” as defined by Online Cambridge University Dictionary (3rd ed.) is “a detailed plan for achieving success in situations such as war, politics, business, industry or sport, and of course, learning”. Thus, planfulness or goal orientation is an essential part of any definition of “strategy”. Planfulness as a feature of learning strategies is reflected in various terms used by different researchers. These terms include “goal,” “intention,” purpose,” “conscious action,” “awareness,” or “control.” For instance, Pressly and McCormick (1995) argue that learning strategies are consciously “controllable” as means for learners to achieve their goals (p.28). Even if none of the terms above is explicitly used in a given definition of learning strategies, the form of the definition of “learning strategy” is usually something like this: “a learning strategy is ‘X (in order) to achieve language.’” This form naturally implies a goal, purpose, or intention (Lan, 2005, p. 16).

A common observation is that not only are some language learners more successful than others; but also that good language learners sometimes do different things than poorer language learners. As Gass and Selinker (2008) say “the term is commonly used in the second language acquisition literature to

refer to what learners do that underlies these differences is learning strategies” (p. 439).

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

Tarone (1983, p. 67, as cited in Lan, 2005, p. 16) defines a learning strategy as “an attempt to develop linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the target language to incorporate these into one’s interlanguage competence”. The goals expressed by Tarone in this definition are to attain various competences in the language: “develop linguistic and sociolinguistic competence” and “incorporate these into one’s interlanguage competence”. This definition focuses on the linguistics.

O’Malley et al. (1985, p.22) put their views in this way:

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

Ellis (1986) views strategies for learning and strategies for using, including communication strategies or “devices for compensating for inadequate resources” (p. 165) as quite different manifestations of a more general phenomenon even possible that successful use of communication strategies may actually present language learning since skillful compensation for lack of linguistic knowledge may obviate the need of learning.

More recent definitions reflect a greater emphasis on the effect of LLSs on the process of language learning than on language learning as a product. Cohen (1998) defines language learning strategies as:

Those processes which are consciously selected by learners and which may result in action taken to enhance the learning or use of a second or foreign language through storage, retention, recall, and application of information about that language. Such strategies include strategies for identifying the material that needs to be learned, distinguishing it from other material if need be, grouping it for earlier learning, (e.g. grouping vocabulary by category into nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs and so forth), having repeated contact with the material (e.g. through classroom tasks or the completion of homework assignments), and formally committing the material to memory when it does not seem to be acquired naturally (whether through rote memory techniques such as repetition, the use of mnemonics, or some other memory technique) (pp. 4-5).

Oxford (1990) conceptualizes LLSs as multi-faced process oriented tools that facilitate language learning and are of significance not just for autonomous learning but also for the achievement of communicative competence. She provides one of the most comprehensive definitions as follows:

Language learning strategies are operations employed by the learner to aid the acquisition, storage, retrieval, and use of information....; specific

actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations (p. 8).

In Oxford's definition several student-intended goals are evident. These are related to aspects of learning and use of information, as well as to the changed nature of learning when learning is enhanced by strategies (easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self directed . . .).

From the above definitions, we can say that learning strategies are the special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information. It focuses on the application of learning strategies to second language acquisition by students learning English as a second language as well as by students learning foreign languages.

As mentioned above, there is currently little or no debate about consciousness as an essential feature of learning strategies. However, there comes a time for some learners at which a given strategy is no longer consciously used, they can no longer be called "strategies". Cohen (1998), and Oxford and Cohen (1992) assert that when strategies become habitual and automatic, i.e., when learners no longer have the awareness of using them but continue to use these mental or observable behaviors automatically these former strategies should be called "processes".

From these definitions, a change over time may be noted: from the early focus on the product of LSS (linguistic or sociolinguistic competence); there is now a greater emphasis on the processes and the characteristics of LLS.

1.1.2 Classification of Language Learning Strategies

Even though researchers faced difficulty in classifying language learning strategies, they have classified them into several different ways.

Bialystok (1978, as cited in Lan, 2005, p. 20) presents a model that includes four types of strategies that the learner uses (1) functional practicing, (2) formal practicing, (3) monitoring, and (4) inferencing. In functional practicing, the learner uses the language in communicative situations. Meaning is of primary importance here. In formal practising, he focuses on the language codes. The learner would thus refer to grammar books, dictionaries and so on. He operates on information already in explicit knowledge for atomizing it and transferring it to implicit knowledge by means such as language drills. The learners also monitor or use the conscious knowledge of the language to examine and modify or correct linguistic output. This concept of monitoring is similar to that postulated by Krashen (1977) in his “monitor theory”. Since time is required for this conscious knowledge to be utilized, monitoring can only affect output after some delay. The learner also uses inferencing as a strategy whereby he may arrive at particular linguistic information which was previously unknown. Inferencing is an effective way to increase comprehension of linguistic material. The learner also uses inferencing in exploiting information from other knowledge, for example, getting cues from the environment, gestures and knowledge of other languages and the like inferencing from implicit knowledge may be unconscious. Inferring from explicit knowledge may occur by means of using the context of the passage or message to obtain meanings of words or forms.

Naiman et al.’s (1978) taxonomy contains five broad categories of strategies that they asserted to be used by all good language learners: (a) an active task approach, (b) realization of language as a system, (c) realization of language as a means of communication and interaction, (d) management of affective demands, and (e) monitoring of second language performance. Their classification scheme was built on data collected from interviews with a group of 34 proficient adult language learners (as cited in Lan, 2005, p. 20).

Rubin (1987), who pioneered much of the work in the field of strategies, makes the distinction between strategies contributing directly to learning and those

contributing indirectly to learning. According to her, there are three types of strategies used by learners that contribute directly or indirectly to language learning. These are:

1. Learning Strategies

They are of two main types, being the strategies contributing directly to the development of the language system constructed by the learner.

a. Cognitive Learning Strategies

They refer to the steps or operations used in learning or problem-solving that requires direct analysis, transformation, or synthesis of learning materials.

Rubin identified 6 main cognitive learning strategies contributing directly to language learning:

- Clarification / Verification
- Guessing / Inductive Inferencing
- Deductive Reasoning
- Practice
- Memorization
- Monitoring

b. Meta-cognitive Learning Strategies

These strategies are used to oversee, regulate or self-direct language learning.

They involve various processes as planning, prioritizing, setting goals, and self-management.

2. Communication Strategies

They are less directly related to language learning since their focus is on the processes of participating in a conversation and getting meaning across or clarifying what the speaker intended. Communication strategies are used by speakers when faced with some difficulty due to the fact that their

communication ends outrun their communication means or when confronted with misunderstanding by a co-speaker.

3. Social Strategies

Social strategies are those activities learners engage in which afford them opportunities to be exposed to and practise their knowledge. Although these strategies provide exposure to the target language, they contribute indirectly to learning since they do not lead directly to the obtaining, storing, retrieving, and using of language (as cited in Rubin and Wenden, 1987, pp. 23-27).

O'Malley and Chamot (1990) distinguish three types of strategies (as cited in Ellis, 1994, p. 536) in the learner to manipulate the language. Their ideas can be summed up as follows:

Cognitive strategies refer to the steps or operations used in problem solving that require direct analysis, transformation or synthesis of learning materials. They have an operative or cognitive processing function. Among the cognitive strategies listed by them are: 'repetition' (imitating a language model, either covertly or overtly), 'note taking' (writing down information presented orally) and 'elaboration' (relating new concepts to other information in memory). Cognitive strategies such as these appear to be directly linked to the performance of particular learning tasks.

Meta-cognitive strategies make use of knowledge about cognitive process and constitute an attempt to regulate language learning by means of planning, monitoring and evaluating. They have an executive function. Examples given by them are: 'directed attention' (deciding in advance to pay attention to specific aspects of language input) and 'self management' (displaying understanding of the conditions which help learning and trying to bring these about). O'Malley and Chamot (ibid) give examples from interviews with ESL learners of the kinds of behaviors that are representative of these strategies, self-management.

Social/affective Strategies concern the ways in which learners elect to interact with other learners and native speakers. They give examples as: ‘co-operation’ (working with one or more peers to obtain feedback, pool information or model a language activity) and ‘question for clarification’ (‘asking a teacher or other native speaker for repetition paraphrase, explanation and or examples).

According to Stern (1992, pp. 263-266), there are five main language learning strategies. These are summed up as follows:

1. Management and Planning Strategies

These strategies are related with the learner's intention to direct his own learning. A learner can take charge of the development of his own programme when he is helped by a teacher whose role is that of an adviser and resource person. That is to say that the learner must:

- decide what commitment to make to language learning
- set himself reasonable goals
- decide on an appropriate methodology, select appropriate resources, and monitor progress and
- evaluate his achievement in the light of previously determined goals and expectations.

2. Cognitive Strategies

They are steps or operations used in learning or problem solving that require direct analysis, transformation, or synthesis of learning materials. Stern (ibid) gives the similar examples for this category as given by Rubin (1975), as mentioned previously.

3. Communicative - Experiential Strategies

Communication strategies, such as circumlocution, gesturing, paraphrase, or asking for repetition and explanation are techniques used by learners so as to

keep a conversation going. The purpose of using these techniques is to avoid interrupting the flow of communication.

4. Interpersonal Strategies

They should monitor their own development and evaluate their own performance. Learners should contact with native speakers and cooperate with them. Learners must become acquainted with the target culture.

5. Affective Strategies

It is evident that good language learners employ distinct affective strategies. Language learning can be frustrating in some cases. In some cases, the feeling of strangeness can be evoked by the foreign language. In some other cases, L2 learners may have negative feelings about native speakers of L2. Good language learners are more or less conscious of these emotional problems. Good language learners try to create associations of positive affect towards the foreign language and its speakers as well as towards the learning activities involved. Learner training can help students to face up to the emotional difficulties and to overcome them by drawing attention to the potential frustrations or pointing them out as they arise.

Cohen (1996, pp. 3-4) divides language learning strategy into four categories as follows:

1. Retrieval Strategies

‘Retrieval strategies’ would be those strategies for retrieving the subjunctive forms when the occasion arises in or out of class, and for choosing the appropriate forms. For those learners who keep a list of verbs taking the subjunctive, a strategy may involve visualizing the list in their mind's eye and crosschecking to make sure that the verb that they wish to use in the subjunctive form actually requires the subjunctive. Likewise, a language use

strategy would entail using the keyword mnemonic in order to retrieve the meaning of a given vocabulary word.

2. Rehearsal Strategies

These constitute another subset of language use strategies, namely, strategies for rehearsing target language structures (such as form-focused practice). An example of rehearsal would be form-focused practice, for example, practicing the subjunctive forms for different verb conjugations.

3. Cover Strategies

This category includes those strategies that learners use to create the impression that they have control over material when they do not. They are a special type of compensatory or coping strategies which involve creating an appearance of language ability so as not to look unprepared, foolish, or even stupid. A learner's primary intention in using them is not to learn any language material, nor even necessarily to engage in genuine. An example of a cover strategy would be using a memorized and not fully-understood phrase in an utterance in a classroom drill in order to keep the action going. Some cover strategies reflect efforts at simplification (e.g., a learner uses only that part of a phrase that they can deal with), while other such strategies complexity the utterance because this is actually simplest for the learners (e.g., saying something by means of an elaborate and complex circumlocution because the finely-tuned vocabulary is lacking or to avoid using the subjunctive)--both cases representing an attempt to compensate for gaps in target language knowledge.

4. Communication Strategies

This constitutes a fourth subset of language use strategies, with the focus on approaches to conveying meaningful information that is new to the recipient. Such strategies may or may not have any impact on learning. For example, learners may use a vocabulary item encountered for the first time in a given

lesson to communicate a thought, without any intention of trying to learn the word. In contrast, they may insert the new vocabulary item into their communication without intending to learn or communicate any particular aspect of the target language simply in order to promote their learning of it.

All of these researchers made strenuous efforts in designing, interpreting and classifying various strategies. These taxonomies provide insights into the rich repertoire of potential LLs, Even though these classifications were useful, there was need to develop a more comprehensive classification system.

Based on this synthesis of previous research and on factor analytic questionnaire, based studies of LLs among adult learners, Oxford developed one of the widely accepted classification taxonomies in the language learning areas. Oxford (1990) model of language learning strategies consists of six categories: memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, meta-cognitive strategies, affective strategies and social strategies. These six categories (which underline Strategies Inventory for a great deal of research in the learning strategies field) are further divided into direct strategies and indirect strategies. In Oxford's view, direct strategies refer to "strategies that directly involve the target language and require mental processing of the language" (Oxford, 1990, p. 37). The three groups that belong to the direct strategies are memory, cognitive, and compensation. Indirect strategies are those which "provide indirect support for language learning through focusing, planning, seeking opportunities, controlling anxiety, increase cooperation and empathy and other means" (Oxford, 1990, p. 151). The three groups belonging to this category are meta-cognitive, affective, and social strategies. Here a brief introduction of each group will help explain them.

a. Direct Language Learning Strategies

The direct strategies are beneficial to the students because they help store and recover information. These strategies help learners to produce language even

when there is gap in knowledge. They also help to understand and use the new language.

1. Memory Strategies

Memory strategies are specific devices (mnemonics) used by learners to make mental linkages that will allow new information, most often vocabulary, to enter and remain in long term memory. Examples of memory strategies are to make associations with what has already been learned, to draw pictures to help remember new words, and to repeatedly pronounce or write new words in order to remember them. Although memory strategies could easily be viewed as cognitive strategies, their purpose is limited to memorization and involves mostly surface processing. Prior research shows that memory strategies operate differently from many cognitive strategies in terms of frequency of use.

2. Cognitive Strategies

Cognitive strategies help the learners to process and use the language for learning or for accomplishing a task involving the language, e.g., watch TV in English. Listen to radio/CDs in English, use English computer programs, and find similarities between first and second languages. Compared with memory strategies, purpose of cognitive strategies is not simply memorization but instead deeper processing and use of the language. This category is commonly used for research on second language learning.

3. Compensation Strategies

Compensation strategies are intended to make up for missing knowledge with listening, speaking, reading, or writing, For example, use gestures or body language(for speaking), rephrase (or speaking of writing), ask for help(for listening , reading, speaking, or writing) and make guesses based on the context (for listening and reading). The last strategy could also be listed as a

cognitive strategy, but it is included here as a compensation strategy because it makes up for a gap in knowledge.

b. Indirect Language Learning Strategies

Indirect language learning strategies work together with the direct strategies. They help learner regulate the learning process. These strategies support and manage language learning without direct engagement and therefore called indirect strategies.

1. Meta-cognitive Strategies

Meta means “above” or “beyond” So meta-cognitive means “beyond” the cognitive. Meta-cognitive strategies encompass the planning, organizing, evaluation, and monitoring of one’s own language learning, e.g., organize time for learning, check one’s progress, and analyze one’s mistakes and try not to make them again. This category is widely used in the second language field.

2. Affective Strategies

Affective strategies help the learner deal with his or her own emotions, motivations, and attitudes while (or about) learning English. Examples of such strategies are take risks, try to relax when feeling anxious about learning, and reward oneself for succeeding. This category, sometimes combined with social strategies, is often involved in strategy work in second language learning.

3. Social Strategies

Social strategies refer to how learners interact with other people in the context of learning languages and related culture. Social strategies include, among others, ask someone to speak slowly, practice with others and show interest in learning about the culture of English speaking countries. This category, sometimes combined with affective strategies, is often part of strategy research. Oxford has summarized above mentioned strategies in the following table:

Table No. 1
Oxford's Language Learning Strategy System

Type	Primary strategies	Secondary strategies
Direct Strategies	1. Memory strategies	A. Creating mental linkages B. Applying images and sounds C. Reviewing well D. Employing action
	2. Cognitive strategies	A. Practicing B. Receiving and sending messages C. Analyzing and reasoning D. Creating structure for input and output
	3. Compensation strategies	A. Guessing intelligently B. Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing
Indirect strategies		
	1. Meta-cognitive strategies	A. Centering your learning B. Arranging and planning your learning C. Evaluating your learning
	2. Affective strategies	A. Lowering your anxiety B. Encouraging yourself C. Taking your emotional temperature
	3. Social strategies	A. Asking questions B. Co-operating with others C. Empathizing with others

(Oxford, 1990, p.17)

“Although Oxford’s taxonomy is perhaps the most comprehensive classification of learning strategies to date” (Ellis, 1994, p.539), it is still of necessity, somewhat selective since “dozens and perhaps hundreds of such strategies exist”(Oxford, Lavine and Crookall, 1989, p.29).

However, Oxford (1990) clarifies that:

There is no complete agreement on exactly what strategies are; how many strategies exist; how they should be defined, demarcated, and categorized and whether it is - or even will be - possible to create a real, scientifically validated hierarchy of strategies... classification conflicts are inevitable (p. 17).

Amid this welter of overlapping materials and conflicting opinion, the process of establishing definition and classification system for language learning strategies is far from straight forward. In the face of the learning strategy field, whatever term may be defined or classified it is inevitably going to come into conflict with one or other of the competing terms, definitions and classification system.

1.1.3 Characteristics of Learning Strategies

Although the terminology is not always uniform, with some writers using the terms "learner strategies" (Rubin and Wenden , 1987), others "learning strategies" (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; Chamot and O'Malley, 1994), and still others "language learning strategies" (Oxford, 1990, 1996); there are a number of basic characteristics in the generally accepted view of LLS. First, LLS are learner generated; they are steps taken by language learners. Second, LLS enhance language learning and help develop language competence, as reflected in the learner's skills in listening, speaking, reading, or writing the L2 or FL. Third, LLS may be visible (behaviors, steps, techniques, etc.) or unseen (thoughts, mental processes). Fourth, LLS involve information and memory (vocabulary knowledge, grammar rules, etc.).

Some characteristics of learning strategies include such notions as effortful, goal directed, intentional. But perhaps the useful way of thinking of strategic learning in terms of a larger goal (learning a set of vocabulary items) and the steps that one might take to achieve that goal (tactical steps), for example, putting them on cards, coloring them, visualizing, etc. Thus, strategic learning involves an overall goal (become proficient in a second language), a plan to accomplish that goal (learn 10 vocabulary words a day), and the steps needed to achieve the goal (coloring, flashcards). (Gass and Selinker, 2008, p. 439)

Oxford (1990, p. 9) describes these characteristics as features which:

- contribute to the main goal, which, for many learners, is communicative competence.
- allow learners to become more self-directed and independent learners.
- they expand the role of teachers.

In addition to the characteristics noted above, the following are others:

- Learning strategies are a set of processes and a routine for organizing those processes.
- LLS allow learners to become more self-directed (Oxford, 1990, p. 9). They are a desire for control and autonomy of learning on the part of the learner.
- Only conscious strategies are LLS, and there must be a choice involved on the part of the learner.
- They may be visible as they are “specific actions or techniques” (Green and Oxford, 1995, p. 262) or invisible as they can involve “mental processing”.
- Learning strategies use is determined at a meta-cognitive level.
- Learning strategies are under the active, strategic control of the student while in use.

- Learning strategies have certain broad dimensions relating to their functions, their generalizability across texts, the scope of the learning task, and the extent to which they demand cognitive effort.
- Transfer of a strategy from one language to another or from a language skill to another is related to the goal of LLS.

1.1.4 The Good Language Learner

People who are good at languages might tackle L2 learning in different ways from those who are not so good or they might behave in the same way but more efficiently. Most researchers have rejected the notion of a single profile of the “good language learner” because over the years research studies have shown that there can be striking differences among equally successful language learners. Rather than limiting the description of the good language learner to one that is prescriptive and ignores learner differences, the more recent and inclusive view is that there are various ways that language learners can be successful. For the most part, these learners are strategic in their learning. Rubin (1975) identified the following strategies used by good language learners:

- Making reasoned guesses when not sure;
- Making an effort to communicate and to learn through communication;
- Finding strategies for overcoming inhibitions in target language interaction;
- Practicing the language whenever possible;
- Monitoring their speech and that of others;
- Attending to form (i.e. grammar); and
- Paying attention to meaning (as cited in Griffiths, 2008, pp. 85-87).

These strategies, as Rubin (1975) pointed out, will vary according to a number of factors including the task, the learning stage, the learner's age, the learning

context, learning style, and cultural differences. Rubin concluded by suggesting that knowledge about good language learners "will lessen the difference between the good learner and the poorer one" (p.50).

Naiman et al. (1978, as cited in Cook, 1996, pp. 79-80) tried to see what people who were known to be good at learning languages had in common. They found six broad strategies shared by good language learners:

- Find a learning style that suits you.
- Involve yourself in the language learning process.
- Develop an awareness of language both as system and as communication.
- Pay constant attention to expanding your language knowledge.
- Develop the L2 as a separate system.
- Take into account the demands that L2 learning imposes.

Ellis (1985, p.122) lists characteristics of good language learner as follows:

- Be able to respond to the group dynamics of the learning situation so as not to develop negative anxiety and inhibitions;
- Seek out all opportunities to use the target language;
- Make maximum use of the opportunities afforded to practice listening to and responding to speech in the L2 addressed to him and to others- this will involve attending to meaning rather than to form;
- Supplement the learning that derives from direct contact with speakers of the L2 with learning that derived from the use of study techniques (such as making vocabulary lists) – this is likely to involve attention to form;
- Be an adolescent or an adult rather than a young child, at least as far as the early stages of grammatical development are concerned;
- Possess sufficient analytic skills to perceive, categorize, and store the linguistic features of the L2, and also to monitor errors;

- Possess a strong reason for learning the L2 (which may reflect an integrative or an instrumental motivation) and also develop a strong ‘task motivation’ (i.e. respond positively to the learning tasks chosen or provided);
- Be prepared to experiment by taking risks, even if this makes the learner appear foolish; and
- Be capable of adapting to different learning conditions.

The important thing to realize about this list or other more recent lists is that good language learners do not necessarily use the same language strategies. Even if they use the same strategies, they may not use them for the same purposes or in the same way. For example, one learner focuses on form only while reading and writing, while another does so while listening and speaking as well. While the first learner focuses on form in a global way, the second learner is far more analytical and pays attention to minute details associated with the forms and rules associated with their use.

1.1.5 Factors Affecting the Use of Language Learning Strategies

The vast literature on LLSs points to a number of factors believed to correlate with learners’ use of LLSs either in ESL or EFL contexts with a rather high exposure to the foreign language. Rubin (1975) points out that learner strategies may vary with the task, the learning stage, the age of the learner, the context, individual styles and cultural differences in cognitive learning styles (p.50). Bialystok (1979) speculated that such factors might relate to “characteristics of the learner, such as language learning aptitude, attitude, and motivation, personality variables; or relate instead to characteristics of the learning situation, such as length of exposure to the language, the teaching method employed” (p. 272).

Based on the assumption that “explicit understanding of individual-difference dimensions can enhance the work of all teachers” (p. 188); Oxford and Ehrman

(1993) include the nine factors: aptitude, motivation, anxiety, self-esteem, tolerance of ambiguity, risk-taking, language learning styles, age, and gender. A number of factors are assumed to affect the types, numbers, and frequency of the use of language learning strategies: cultural background, language studied, stage of learning, age, motivation, language learning goals, EFL versus second language (SL) settings, previous language learning experience, language learning styles, gender, anxiety, lack of inhibition, and career or academic specialization.

1.1.5.1 Proficiency

A high level of proficiency has been associated with an increased use of both direct and indirect strategies .More specifically; cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies show high correlations with high language proficiency levels. O'Malley et al. (1985, as cited in Rahimi et al., p. 35), for example, studied the range, type and frequency of LLSs used by beginning and intermediate high school L2 learners. Their results revealed that while both groups used more cognitive than meta-cognitive strategies, intermediate students used more meta-cognitive strategies than the beginners. On the other hand, a translation strategy was used more by beginners, whereas contextualization was used more by the intermediate level students.

Green and Oxford (1995) found that about a third of the individual strategies were used more frequently by the more successful learners, almost all of them involving active use of the target language. Although they concede that this is not sufficient evidence of causality, they nevertheless suggest that a causal relationship exists here between strategy use and proficiency level, and that:

This relationship is best visualized not as a one-way arrow leading from cause to effect, but rather as an ascending spiral in which active use strategies help students attain higher proficiency, which in turn makes it more likely that students will select these active use strategies” (p.288).

Park (1997, as cited in Rahimi et al., 2004, p. 35) examined the relationship between the use of LLSs and the proficiency level of 332 Korean students learning English as a foreign language. The results of his study showed a linear correlation between LLS use and language proficiency. Furthermore, all six categories of LLSs as well as the overall strategy use were significantly correlated with the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) scores used to gauge their proficiency level

The notion that strategy use and proficiency are both causes and outcomes of each other, locked in a mutual relationship, complicates the picture: certainly the assumptions that a researcher makes about the direction of causality in this relationship between proficiency and strategy use will have implications for the way in which the study is conducted.

1.1.5.2 Motivation

Motivation, which helps students to maintain their language ability after leaving the classroom, is one of the most crucial factors that affect language learners' strategy use. Gardner and MacIntyre (1993, as cited in Sadighi and Zarafshan, 2006, p. 75) report that their undergraduate foreign language participants, who were substantially motivated, tended to adopt more learning strategies and use them more frequently when compared to those relatively less motivated. The highly motivated learners also demonstrated better results in language learning.

According to Oxford and Nyikos (1989), the degree of expressed motivation to learn is the most powerful influence on the choice and frequency of language learning strategies. In their study, highly motivated learners used four general groups of strategies (formal rule-related practice, functional practice, general study, and conversational input elicitation strategies) significantly more often than did less motivated learners. Moreover, most students in the study were motivated to get better grades rather than to develop communication

competence, as reflected by their low usage of strategies involving out of class communication practice and their high usage of formal analytic strategies helpful for discrete point testing (as cited in Teh et al., 2009, p. 72).

In their socio-educational model of language learning, Gardner and Lambert (1979) identify two major motivations for language learning: integrative and instrumental motivation. Integrative motivation refers to the learners' positive attitudes toward the target language group and their intention to integrate with members of the group (Larsen- Freeman and Long, 1999, p.173). Instrumental motivation implies functional reasons and utilitarian values in learning a target language, such as to pass a required examination or to get a career promotion (ibid).

A few studies show that integrative motivation sustains long term success in second language learning (Gardner, 1985). However, the importance of instrumental motivation has also been acknowledged as a significant factor. For example, Lukmani, (1972, p. 272) found that instrumental motivation was more important than integrative motivation in a study of female learners of English in India. Kachru (1992, as cited in Al- Buainain and Al- Emadi, 1995, p. 19) points out that instrumental purpose could help Indian learners of English to successfully acquire the language. As demonstrated by both Lukmani and Kachru, the social situation might determine the type of learners' motivation for second language learning.

Given these findings, it is easy to understand that motivation is driven by the learners' desire to achieve a particular goal, the devotion of considerable effort to achieve this goal, and deriving a sense of satisfaction from the activities associated with achieving this goal. As a matter of fact, Ellis (1994, p. 14) postulates that "motivation refers to the effort that learners put into learning a second language as a result of their need or desire to learn it". There are three major components in this definition: devoted effort, desire to learn, and

satisfaction with the task. These three components are necessary to evaluate the degree and intensity of motivation in language learning.

Although several studies have reported a strong relationship between learners' language learning strategy use and language learning motivation, it is not clear which type of motivation (integrative or instrumental) has a greater impact on LLS choice or how motivation affects LLS use.

1.1.5.3 Learning Styles

A third factor showing strong links with strategy use is learning style. Learning styles refer to the specific cognitive, affective, and physiological traits that determine how a learner processes information. These specific characteristics distinguish one learner from another which explains why some learners are visually or auditory oriented, reflective or impulsive and vary in their tolerance to ambiguity.

Learning style has a significant influence on students' choice of learning strategies, and that both the styles and strategies affect learning outcomes. Studies in this area point to the fact that an individual's learning style preferences influence the type of LLSs they use. Extroverts, for example, show a strong preference for social strategies, while introverts use meta-cognitive strategies more frequently (Ehrman and Oxford, 1989); learners who favor group study are shown to use social and interactive strategies, such as working with peers or requesting clarification (Rossi-Le, 1995).

According to Oxford (1994), learning style (general approach to language learning) often determines the choice of L2 learning strategies, for example, analytic style students preferred strategies such as contrastive analysis, rule-learning, and dissecting words and phrases, while global students used strategies to find meaning (guessing, scanning, predicting) and to converse without knowing all the words (paraphrasing, guessing).

A learner's ability and willingness to work is very much determined by his/her learning style and the learning strategies s/he employs to help him/her cope within various instructional methodologies. Understanding a learner's individual style preferences can help teachers to orient their L2 instruction and also apply appropriate strategy training.

1.1.5.4 Age

Learners of different ages approach language learning in different ways owing their significance to psychological and social differences between them. Age is an important factor to consider but it is often overlooked in strategy research. Most learning strategy studies have been with adolescents, especially undergraduates as well as adults (Oxford, 1996, as cited in Nambiar, 2009, p. 141). Most learning strategy studies with children have made use of observational data while those with adults relied on self-report data. With observations, social strategies tend to be most prominent while studies with adults emphasize cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies. What causes this difference is not clear because it could be either the age of the respondents or the methodology used.

Gunning (1997) found that successful beginning level ESL learners actually displayed a different pattern of strategy use from unsuccessful learners. Successful learners were also seen to be better in selecting strategies that were more effective and appropriate than unsuccessful learners. This is expected because if a learner chose effective strategies, the chances of success in learning are enhanced and this is a common finding even in studies involving adult learners.

Age does appear to have an influence on how learning strategies are used by learners but the findings from the studies reviewed do not point to any clear indication of how age impacts the use of strategies.

1.1.5.5 Beliefs

All learners have strong beliefs about how languages are learned and this will determine their strategy use because researches have shown that their strategy use is consistent with the beliefs they have about learning.

Yang (1999) investigated how learner beliefs about language learning are related to their learning strategy use and found that learners' self-efficacy beliefs about learning English did influence their use of functional practice strategies. For spoken English, their belief about the value and nature of learning was in turn related to the use of formal oral practice strategies. Yang proposes a cyclical relationship between beliefs and strategy use in her study.

Hong (2006) compared strategy use and beliefs about language learning among monolingual Korean and bilingual Korean-Chinese university students. Using the SILL and BALLI Bilinguals, it was found that learners had stronger beliefs about learning and, thus, reported a higher use of learning strategies.

Yin (2008) explored the relationship among 1, 201 Chinese university students' use of language learning strategies, attitudes, motivations, beliefs about language learning, and English language proficiency. Findings suggest that ability beliefs and motivational orientations were powerful sources of influence on learners' use of learning strategies which accounted for a significant variance in proficiency among the learners.

The studies reviewed here explored the relationship between beliefs and strategy use with some claiming cyclical relationships between the two variables (Yang, 1999); higher use of strategies among learners with stronger beliefs (Hong, 2006) and how even with the use of other variables, beliefs are still powerful influences on strategy use (Yin, 2008). It is, therefore, accurate to argue that learner beliefs comprise a strong influence on the type and range of strategies learners use to help them in their learning.

1.1.5.6 Cultural Background

Cultural factor is too broad and complex factor to be dealt with, within which quite a lot of aspects could lead to the variety of strategy use. It is clearly felt that the strategies deployed by Nepali learners differ considerably from those widely advocated in western EFL literatures. In a classroom setting, for instance, Nepali learners rely more on note-taking strategy and ask teachers more frequently for repetition, paraphrasing, examples and explanation. On the contrary, their western peers tend to employ more cooperation strategies, like seeking feedback and pooling resources. Such tendency of Nepali learners in strategy use is closely related to their cultural identity. Although memorization is not playing an overwhelming part in learning nowadays, mnemonic strategies like note-taking remain one of the most reliable learning techniques in the classroom.

Some research findings (Huang & van Naerssen, 1987; Politzer, 1983 & McGroarty, 1985) indicate that Asians prefer strategies involving rote memorization and a focus on the linguistic code. Asians also showed more reluctance than Hispanics to try new learning techniques and did not respond well to strategy training. Reid (1987) found differences among ESL students of different cultural backgrounds in their tendency to use or avoid certain strategies or approaches to learning.

1.1.5.7 Gender

Men and women have distinct characteristics, which they bring into the classroom; and this relationship between gender and learning has been the focus of many studies and, although they may have not all been conclusive, there have been some interesting relationship.

Gender is a factor of social nature. Gu (2002) suggests that female learners generally make better use of most of the learner strategies, particularly those helping enlarging vocabulary size, and present higher overall EFL proficiency

than their male counterparts. However, there are some boys who do show distinguished language ability; moreover, boys as a whole usually demonstrate more flexibility and creativity in language learning. Sy (1994) concluded that female EFL students in China showed greater use of cognitive, meta-cognitive, and social strategies. In another Asian study, Hashim and Sahil (1994) found that Malaysian females favored affective strategies more than males.

Oxford (1996) cautions it might be that males and females are different in how they report their strategies retrospectively but is not in reality all that different whenever they actually use the strategies.

While we know the importance of SLLs, there is still gap in our knowledge about the differences between males' and females' use of them, especially at the university level. More specifically, questions still exist pertaining to whether or not males and females significantly differ in terms of the type of learning strategies they use and the frequency with which they use them. As Chavez (2001) suggested, studying such questions is important because if gender disparities are found, they may lead teachers and researchers to seek ways to minimize them, thus affording both genders maximum opportunities to achieve high level of L2 literacy.

1.1.6 Learning Strategies and Language Teaching

Once the range of possible learner strategies has been obtained, the teacher would be able to provide an environment which would enable students to identify those strategies that work best for them. Any strategy sincerely adopted by the learners is more likely to help them if they consider assuming responsibility for their own learning a fundamental requirement for success in language learning. Some learner strategies are better than others. The learner will improve his command of the language by using efficient strategies in performing a particular task.

A classroom teacher knows his/her students best. Therefore, investigations into learner strategies can easily be conducted by the teachers. He/ she can observe both the active and the inactive students and find out the strategies the language learners use in learning. Poor students are those who depend much on the teacher and are least able to fend for themselves. The students must be encouraged to develop independence inside and outside the classroom. Partly, this can be achieved through 'learner training'- equipping the students with the means to guide themselves by explaining strategies to them. The idea of learner training shades over into self-directed learning, in which the students take on responsibility for their learning. They choose their goals; they control the teaching methods and materials; they assess how well they are doing themselves.

Teachers can also make learners aware of learning strategies through discussions and comments as a means of helping the learners decide on the strategies to use with materials given. Learners can be asked to describe the strategies they employ and rate them in terms of frequency of use, enjoyment, usefulness and efficiency.

Rubin 1987 (as cited in Tunku Mohtar, 1991, p.14) provides some helpful guidelines in making use of students' reports of their own strategies. This serves as a means of recording possibilities of what a learner might do in the future. It can also help the learner increase his techniques by discovering strategies used by others. Teachers can also encourage their students to develop learning strategies which are efficient in ensuring successful learning. Teachers should allow students to give feedback on their learning difficulties so that teaching strategies could be designed to develop certain learning strategies.

According to O'Malley et al. (1985, p. 43) :

Classroom interaction has the potential to influence a wide range of skills to which the strategies can be applied... teachers can go beyond their traditional role of providing information and create circumstances in

which students become acquainted with and apply strategies to an expanded range of language activities and materials so that the strategies are transferred to new activities and are used by students independently of the teacher's support.

Learning strategies can be taught to learners. Strategies which are effective in enhancing learning can then be suggested to learners. However, learners need to be informed of the value and significance of the strategies. They need to be taught both the meta-cognitive and cognitive strategies. If the teaching strategies are compatible with the learner strategy, then learning is facilitated, if not, then learning will be impeded.

1.2 Review of Related Literature

In the last three decades, there have been numerous studies of learning strategies used by language learners. These studies have been conducted mainly to find out what strategies learners use as well as what factors affect these choices. Although there have been many reports on findings concerning learner strategy use among ESL/EFL learners; it has been difficult to compare these findings. One reason is that many of these studies have been conducted among mixed groups of learners with different backgrounds and experiences. More importantly, studies that have reported the effects of factors such as language proficiency, motivation, gender, learning styles, cultural background, as major variables in strategy use have employed different criteria when determining the nature of these variables.

Regarding the use of learning strategies, several studies have been done outside Nepal. So, this section integrates the review of some of the studies on strategies particularly that focus on gender variability.

Politzer (1983) studied learning strategies of 90 undergraduate foreign language students enrolled in French, Spanish and German courses in the U.S.

and found that female students used social learning strategies more often than males.

Also the study by Tran (1988) sought the differences in the use of strategies with variation to gender. The study discovered that Vietnamese male immigrants to the U.S. used more strategies than did females. He claimed that employment situation may influence the use of strategies as well as gender.

Oxford and Nyikos (1989) studied the strategies of native English-speaking foreign language students at a large American university. Two-thirds of the students were first-year language students with no foreign language background. All students were studying European languages. Instead of reporting overall results, categorical results, and individual results, Oxford and Nyikos conceived of the SILL's items as fitting into one of five factors: (1) formal-rule practice strategies; (2) functional practice strategies; (3) independent strategies; (4) general study strategies; and (5) conversational input elicitation strategies. The results indicated that females used significantly more strategies than males on factors one, four, and five; males did not exhibit a higher degree of strategy use on any of the factors.

Bacon's (1992) study investigated strategies that learners used when listening to authentic second language texts of two levels of difficulty. She found that women reported using a significantly higher proportion of meta-cognitive strategies than men. They were more likely to plan for the listening, monitor their comprehension and evaluate their strategy use than men. On the other hand, men reported more bottom-up strategies than women. Men also reported a significantly greater use of translation strategies than women. They appeared to be in more favor of cognitive strategies than meta-cognitive strategies.

Oxford (1993, p. 83) summarizes the gender related LLS research in the following manner: Whenever strategy research has considered gender, it has usually demonstrated gender differences in strategy frequency, with females

choosing to use particular sets of strategies more often than males. Females especially tended to use general study strategies, social strategies, affective strategies and certain conversational or functional practice strategies more frequently than males across a number of studies, usually showing a greater range of frequently used strategy categories.

Dreyer and Oxford (1996) examined South African students' utilization of strategies in a SILL-based study. The participants consisted of 305 studying English at Potchefstroom University in South Africa, all of whom were native speakers of Afrikaans. Overall, women used a significantly higher number of strategies than did men. In terms of strategy categories, women exhibited a higher use of social strategies and meta-cognitive strategies.

Goh and Foong (1997) also used the SILL, but this time the focus of study was Chinese learners of English. Participants consisted of 175 students (female=50; male=125) studying at the beginning, intermediate, and high levels at a Singaporean university. Significant differences were found between males and females in the categories of compensation and affective strategies, yet not in the other four categories. However, regardless of whether or not significant differences were found in each category, females used more strategies in all of them.

In the Malaysian context, Embi (2000) conducted a study to investigate whether or not differences exist between female and male Arabic students in the use of language learning strategies. A total of 457 students at thirteen secondary schools in Terengganu, Malaysian participated in the study. The finding of the study showed that there was significant gender difference in the use of language learning strategies as a whole. Female students tend to use overall language learning strategies more often than males. For categories of language learning strategy, there were found to have significant differences between genders in the use of affective and metaphysic strategies with females using them more often.

Wharton (2000) studied learning strategies of 678 university students learning Japanese and French as foreign language in Singapore. Unexpectedly, the results showed that LLS were used significantly by males. Wharton (2000) speculated that when the subjects were very experienced second language learners, gender difference in the use of strategies was not significant.

Some studies provided contradictory evidence regarding gender difference in language learning strategies use. In research on EFL students in Taiwan, Chou (2002) failed to find significant differences in the frequency of LLS use between male and female students.

Chang (2003) investigated the use of LLS by a group of high school students in Taiwan who were learning English. The study found that females significantly surpassed males in the use of LLS as a whole. The results also showed that females significantly used cognitive, compensation, meta-cognitive, and social strategies more frequently than males.

Shmais (2003) studied the strategies used by 99 (male=19; female=80) Palestinian college students majoring in English. Although the number of male participants was small, there were no significant overall differences between them, nor were there significant differences between them on any of the SILL subscales.

In the Department of English Education, T.U, Nepal, some studies have been done on learning strategies, though not directly concerned to the gender variation in the use of such strategies. The studies are reviewed here:

Devkota (2003) conducted a research entitled “A Study of Learning Strategies Used in Studying Literature” to the students of B.Ed. in English specialization. He concluded that while studying text, the learners immediately note down the difficult words and consult dictionary and in some cases, translate difficult words into their native language.

Rain (2006) carried out a research on “Learning Strategies Used by Maithili Learners of English at Secondary Level.” He found that the learners used very few techniques to learn English language. They did not use communicative approach to learn English. He further stated that English teacher as well as students used GT method which has been replaced by communicative approach.

Raut (2007) carried a research entitled “ A Study on Strategies Use in Teaching Vocabulary: A Case of Lower Secondary Level English Teaching.” His research showed that many teachers used real objects, pictures, synonyms, antonyms, actions, definitions, word analysis, minimal pairs, modeling, copying, blackboard sketches, facial expression, phonetic transcription and translation while teaching vocabulary.

Shrestha (2007) conducted a research entitled “Strategies Adopted by Xth Graders in Learning English Vocabulary.” He found that the most frequently used strategies were verbal repetition and learning by heart. The other common strategies employed were keeping the vocabulary note book, learning the meaning of an idiom together, asking to the teacher to translate into Nepali and taking notes of the difficult words in the classroom.

Chaudary (2009) carried a research entitled “Learning Strategies Used by class Toppers.” It was found that meta-cognitive (rehearsal) strategies were used by the class toppers of higher education to a great extent.

The findings thus far provided rich insights into interpreting the gender issues in the studies of LLS. However, since the results are inconclusive, further studies in different setting and learning conditions are deemed necessary.

Regarding the context of Nepal, no research has been done relating the effect of gender in the use of language learning strategies, to which mine is concerned. However, some of the researches have been done in the foreign context on the topic related to mine.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were as follows:

- a. to discover the gender differences in the use of language learning strategies.
- b. to recommend some pedagogical implications on the basis of the findings.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study could provide useful information for the teachers and students of university level, more particularly those who are studying and teaching at Bachelor level.

Furthermore, this study will be significant to the students, teachers, teacher trainers, learner trainers, English language experts, textbook writers, curriculum designers, others who want to carry out researches on this area and who are directly or indirectly involved in language teaching- learning activities.

1.5 Definition of the Specific Terms

Learning Strategy: It refers to the specific actions, plans, operations, styles that students adopt to make their learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more directed, more effective and more transferable to new situation.

SILL: It refers to set of questionnaire designed by Oxford (1990) to identify the strategies that make students more effective language learners.

SLA: It refers to any language that is learnt as a subsequent to mother tongue.

Motivation: It refers to the efforts that the learners put into learning a second language as a result of their need or desire to learn it.

Learning Style: It refers to the specific cognitive, affective, and physiological traits that determine how a learner processes information.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

To meet the objectives of the study, the following methodology was used in this study:

2.1 Sources of Data

Both the primary and secondary sources of the data were used. They were as follows:

2.1.1 Primary Sources of Data

The primary sources of the data were B. Ed. third year students from the different campuses of Kathmandu valley.

2.1.2 Secondary Sources of Data

Various books like Ellis (1985, 1994, 2000), O'Malley and Chamot (1990), Oxford (1990, 1996), Larsen- Freeman and Long (1991), Cook (1992), Stern (1992), Brown (1994), Kumar (1996), Gass and Selinker (2008), Griffiths (2008); the journals like Journal of MELTA, Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching (2004), articles and websites were used as the secondary sources of data.

2.2 Population of the Study

The population of this study was B Ed. third year students from six different campuses of Kathmandu valley.

2.3 Sampling Procedure

The researcher purposively selected Kathmandu valley as the study area. Using the same procedure, six campuses were selected. Then, he selected equal

number of male and female students as sample from each of the campuses randomly.

2.4 Tools for Data Collection

The main tool for the data collection of this study was questionnaire. It was based on ‘Strategy Inventory for Language Learning’ (SILL) designed by Oxford (1990). This is a name given to the questionnaire by her, which was meant to investigate learners’ frequency of use of many language learning strategies, clustered into six categories introduced in the previous sections.

2.5 Process of Data Collection

The following process was used for the collection of primary data:

- The researcher went to the field and asked for the consent of the campus administration.
- Then, he explained them the purpose of the study.
- After that, he selected equal number of male and female students randomly.
- Then, he distributed questionnaires. Samples spent about 50 minutes to answer those questions.
- Finally, the researcher collected the filled questionnaire.

2.6 Limitations of the Study

This study had the following limitations:

- a. It was limited to two T.U. constitute and four T.U. affiliated campuses.
- b. It was limited to B. Ed third year students.
- c. The sample population was confined to 80 students.
- d. It was limited to the questionnaire based on SILL, as a tool for data collection.

CHAPTER THREE

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the data collected from the primary source. This study aims at discovering the gender differences in the use of language learning strategies. The data was collected through questionnaire. Interpretation is divided into six main categories viz. gender differences in memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, meta-cognitive strategies, affective strategies and social strategies.

3.1 Gender Differences in Memory Strategies

There were five items in the questionnaire to find out the strategy that make mental linkages which allow new information, most often vocabulary, to enter and remain in long-term memory. The distribution of frequency and mean weightage regarding this strategy was analyzed and the overall analysis of the responses has been given below:

Table No. 2

Comparison Between Males and Females in the Use of Memory Strategies

Item No.	Responses																				Mean (M)	Mean (F)
	1				2				3				4				5					
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
1	4	10	3	7.5	6	15	-	-	14	35	18	45	6	15	10	25	10	25	9	22.5	3.3	3.55
2	6	15	2	5	4	10	8	20	11	27.5	12	30	10	25	9	22.5	9	22.5	9	22.5	3.3	3.38
3	-	-	-	-	4	10	1	2.5	12	30	8	20	14	35	7	17.5	10	25	24	60	3.75	4.35
4	10	25	8	20	8	20	10	25	18	45	17	42.5	2	5	4	10	2	5	1	2.5	2.45	2.5
5	2	5	2	5	10	25	2	5	14	35	7	17.5	11	27.5	13	32.5	3	7.5	16	40	3.08	3.98
Grand Mean																				3.18	3.55	

The first item in the questionnaire included the strategy of making mental linkage of what was known. Out of the total respondents, 35% of the male students sometimes made mental linkage whereas 45% female students did so. On the other hand, 25% of the males and 22.5% of the females always used this strategy while 15% of the males and 25% of the females often used this strategy. Only 15% of the male students rarely used while none of the females did so; whereas 10% of the males and 7.5% females never used this strategy. The mean of males in the first item is 3.3 and the mean of females is 3.55. The mean averages of both male and female students show that the students sometimes used this strategy to improve their English language learning. It also shows that the difference was found between genders in the use of this strategy but the difference was not significant.

The second item in the questionnaire included the strategy of applying images and sounds. Out of the total respondents, 27.5% of males sometimes used this strategy and 30% females used it sometimes; 25% of the males and 22.5% of the females often used this strategy. In the contrary, 22.5% of the students (both males and females) always used it while 10% and 20% of the males and females respectively used it rarely. The minority of the students i.e. 15% and 5% of males and females respectively never used this strategy. The mean of males in the second item is same as the first item i.e. 3.3 and the mean of female is 3.38. This also shows that females used this strategy more frequent than males but no significant difference was found.

The strategy included in the third item was learning a new word in a sentence. The majority of the females i.e. 60% always used it whereas only 25% of males used it regularly. Only 17.5% of females often used it, on the other hand, 35% of males often used it, 30% of males and 20% of females used it sometimes, 2.5% of females and 10% of males rarely used it. The average of male in the third item is 3.75 and the mean of female is 4.35. This indicates that females significantly use this strategy more than males.

The fourth item consisted in the questionnaire was using flash cards to memorize words. Out of the total population, 45% of the male and 42.5% of the female students used this strategy sometimes. But 20% male and 25% of female students rarely used it while 20% and 25% of males and females never used it respectively. Only 5% of males and 10% of females often used it. Moreover, 5% of males and 2.5% females always used it. The mean of male is 2.45 and the mean of female is 2.5. This shows that this strategy is the least used strategy. Only slight difference exists between genders where females surpass the males.

The last item included in memory strategy was reviewing often and memorizing new words by repeatedly writing and saying out loud. The great number of females i.e. 40% used it regularly but only 7.5% of male students used it regularly. On the other side 32.5% of females often used it whereas 27.5% males often used it; whereas 35% males opined that they used this strategy sometimes but half of the males i.e.17.5% of females used it sometimes. Only 25% of males were found to use this strategy rarely. On the other hand, only 5% of females used it rarely. Moreover, only 5% of males and females never used it. The calculated mean of males is 3.08 and the mean of females is 3.98. This also shows greater use of this strategy by females than males.

3.2 Gender Differences in Cognitive Strategies

In order to find out the differences in the cognitive strategies, nine items consisting of the strategies were included in the questionnaire. The distribution of mean weightage was analyzed to find differences.

Table No. 3

Comparison Between Males and Females in the Use of Cognitive Strategies

Item No.	Responses																				Mean (M)	Mean (F)
	1				2				3				4				5					
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
6	7	17.5	3	7.5	5	12.5	4	10	15	37.5	13	32.5	7	17.5	15	37.5	6	15	5	12.5	3	3.38
7	-	-	-	-	2	5	2	5	7	17.5	4	10	18	45	16	40	13	32.5	18	45	4.05	4.25
8	-	-	1	2.5	4	10	3	7.5	16	40	14	35	10	25	12	30	10	25	10	25	3.65	3.68
9	2	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	7.5	7	17.5	7	17.5	7	17.5	28	70	26	65	4.48	4.48
10	2	5	4	10	5	12.5	-	-	24	60	21	52.5	4	10	8	20	5	12.5	7	17.5	3.13	3.35
11	2	5	2	5	6	15	13	32.5	20	50	12	30	6	15	7	17.5	6	15	6	15	3.2	3.05
12	5	12.5	2	5	5	12.5	9	22.5	16	40	15	37.5	14	35	8	20	-	-	6	15	2.98	3.18
13	-	-	2	5	5	12.5	1	2.5	13	32.5	6	15	6	15	19	47.5	16	40	12	30	3.83	3.95
14	3	7.5	3	7.5	5	12.5	1	2.5	18	45	10	25	8	20	11	27.5	6	15	15	37.5	3.23	3.85
Grand Mean																					3.51	3.69

The sixth item in the questionnaire consisted of strategy of trying to imitate native speaker's accent. The result shows that 37.5% of males and 32.5% of females sometimes used this strategy; 37.5% of females and 17.5% of males often used it to improve their English. Only 15% of males and 12.5% females always used it. 17.5% and 7.5% of males and females respectively never used it; whereas about 12.5% of males and 10% of females rarely used it. The weighted mean of males is 3 and 3.38 of females' show that they try to imitate native speaker's accent sometimes. Gender difference was found but the difference was not significant.

The seventh item in the table was to find out their practice of the sounds of English alphabet. Out of the total informants, 45% of males and 40% of females often used it; 45% of female always used it but only 32.5% males used it always. On the other side, 17.5% of males and 10% of females used it

sometimes. Only 5% of the both males and females rarely used it. The arithmetic average of males is 4.05 and of females is 4.25. This indicates that gender difference was marginal in the use of this strategy.

Item number eight included in the questionnaire was to survey whether they watched T.V. and listened the tapes or CDs in English or not. Among all, 40% of males and 35% of females used it sometimes, 30% females and 25% of male often used it, 25% of the students always used it, 10% of males and 7.5% females rarely used it and only 2.5% females never used it. The calculated mean of male is 3.65 and the calculated mean of female is 3.68. It indicates that there was only slight difference in the use of this strategy between genders.

The ninth item comprised the strategy of reading books in English. The vast majority of students i.e. 70% males and 65% of females regularly read books in English; whereas only 17.5% of the students (both male and female) often used it. 17.5% of females and 7.5% of males used it sometimes and 5% males never used it. The same mean is calculated of males and females i.e. 4.48. This shows that there was no gender difference in the use of this strategy.

Another strategy incorporated in the tenth item was to measure their working with English computer programs. The majority of the students i.e. 60% males and 52.5% of females used it sometimes but only 12.5 of males and 17.5% of females always used it. On the other hand, 20% of females and 10% of males often used it, 12.5 of males rarely used it and 10% females and 5% of males never used it. The weighted mean of males is 3.13 and 3.35 is of females. There was only slight difference in the use of this strategy between genders.

The eleventh item included in the questionnaire was to discover whether the students tried to find out the occasions outside of school to practice English. Of all the responses, 50% of males and 30% of females used it sometimes; 32.5% of females and 15% of males rarely used it; 17.5% females and 15% of males often used it. On the other hand, 15% of them always used it; whereas only 5%

of both males and females never used it. The calculated mean of males is 3.2 and 3.05 is of females. It is one of strategies among two where males used more than the females.

Item number twelve was for finding whether or not they looked for the similarities in pronunciation between Nepali and English. Out of the total respondents, 40% of males and 37.5% of females used it sometimes. 35% of males and 20% females were found to use it often; 22.5% of females and 12.5% of males rarely used it; 12.5% males and 5% females never used it. On the other hand, only 15% females used it regularly. The mean of males is 2.98 and 3.2 is of female. This shows the greater use of the strategy by the females than the males.

Another strategy included in the questionnaire was for findings their trials to understand the main idea of what was read or heard without translating words for word. It has been found that 47.5% of females often used it but only 15% of males often used it; 40% of males and 30% of females used it regularly; 32.5% of males and 15% of females sometimes used it; 12.5% males rarely used it; whereas only 2.5% females rarely used it and 5% females never used it. The weighted mean of males is 3.83 whereas mean of females is 3.95. It implies that the females used this strategy more than the males.

The last item included in the cognitive strategies was for finding the students' efforts to figure out rules of English grammar. Out of the sampled population, 45% males and 25% of females used this strategy sometimes. Similarly; 37.5% females and 15% females used it regularly; 27.5% females and 20% of males often used it; 12.5% males and 2.5% of females rarely used it and 7.5% of both males and females never used it. The calculated mean of males is 3.23 whereas the calculated mean of females is 3.85. This shows that there was significant gender difference in the use of this strategy.

3.3 Gender Differences in Compensation Strategies

In order to find out gender differences in compensation strategies, 4 items were included in the questionnaire. Those items were intended to make up for missing knowledge with listening, reading, speaking or writing.

Table No. 4

Comparison Between Males and Females in the Use of Compensation Strategies

Item No.	Responses																				Mean (M)	Mean (F)
	1				2				3				4				5					
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
15	4	10	2	5	3	7.5	1	2.5	6	15	13	32.5	10	25	10	25	17	42.5	14	35	3.83	3.83
16	3	7.5	1	2.5	2	5	1	2.5	11	27.5	14	35	12	30	9	22.5	12	30	15	37.5	3.7	3.9
17	1	2.5	2	5	3	7.5	1	2.5	18	45	20	50	11	27.5	9	22.5	7	17.5	8	20	3.5	3.5
18	3	7.5	2	5	8	20	8	20	15	37.5	12	30	10	25	9	22.5	4	10	9	22.5	3.1	3.38
Grand Mean																					3.53	3.65

The first item included in compensation strategy was to find out whether they guessed the meaning of a new word based on the rest of the sentence. Out of the total informants, 42.5% of males used it always whereas 35% of females used it always. The equal percentage of students i.e. 25% of both males and females often used it; 32.5% females and 15% of males sometimes used it but only 5% of males and 2.5% of females rarely used it and 10% of males and 5% of females never used it. The mean of males is 3.83 and the mean of females is same as males i.e. 3.83. This shows that there was no difference in the use of this strategy between the male and the female students.

The sixteenth item consisted in the questionnaire was to elicit whether the students used gestures to express when they wanted to say. Of them, 37.5% of females used it regularly; whereas 30% of males used it regularly; 30% of males and 22.5% of females used it often; 35% of females and 27.5% of males sometimes used it. But only 5% males and 2.5% of females rarely used and

7.5% of males and 2.5% of females never used it. The mean of males and females are 3.7 and 3.9 respectively. This also shows that there was only slight gender difference in the use of this strategy.

The seventeenth item comprised of strategy of asking for help. Half of the females i.e. 50% used it sometimes but 45% of males used it sometimes; 27.5% of males and 22.5% of females often used it; 17.5% of males and 20% females used it regularly; 7.5% of males and 2.5% of males rarely used it and 5% of females and 2.5% of males never used it. The mean is equal i.e. 3.5 for both genders. No difference was found in the use of this strategy.

The last item consisted in the compensation strategy was to discover the whether the students used to find a different way to say what they wanted to say. Out of the total informants, 37.5% of males used this strategy sometimes; whereas 30% of females used it sometimes; 25% of males and 22.5% of females used it often; 22.5% of females and only 10% of males used it regularly; 20% of both males and females rarely used it and 7.5% of males and 5% of females never used it. The mean of males is 3.1 and the mean of females is 3.38. The difference was found but the difference was only marginal.

3.4 Gender Differences in Meta-cognitive Strategies

There were five items in the questionnaire to find out gender differences in the use of meta-cognitive strategies. These items encompass the planning, organizing, evaluation, and monitoring of one's own language learning.

Table No. 5
Comparison Between Males and Females in the Use of Meta-cognitive Strategies

Item No.	Responses																				Mean (M)	Mean (F)
	1				2				3				4				5					
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
19	1	2.5	3	7.5	4	10	1	2.5	5	12.5	6	15	15	37.5	9	22.5	15	37.5	21	52.5	3.98	4.1
20	1	2.5	-	-	2	5	-	-	4	10	5	12.5	13	32.5	10	25	20	50	25	62.5	4.23	4.5
21	-	-	1	2.5	-	-	-	-	3	7.5	3	7.5	9	22.5	7	17.5	28	70	29	72.5	4.63	4.58
22	-	-	-	-	3	7.5	-	-	12	30	11	27.5	8	20	12	30	17	42.5	17	42.5	3.98	4.15
23	-	-	-	-	2	5	3	7.5	9	22.5	2	5	14	35	14	35	15	37.5	21	52.5	4.05	4.33
Grand Mean																				4.17	4.33	

The item number 19 included in the questionnaire was to discover whether the students organized their time to study English. The majority of the female students i.e. 52.5% always used it; on the other hand, 37.5% of males used it regularly. Moreover, 37.5% of males and 22.5% of females often used it; 12.5% of males and 15% of females sometimes used it; 10% of males and 2.5% of females rarely used it and only 2.5% of males and 7.5% of females never used it. The mean of males is 3.98 whereas the mean of females is 4.1. This indicates that the females used the strategy more frequently than the males but the difference was not significant.

The strategy included in the twentieth item was to find out whether or not they looked for the chances to practice in English. The majority of the students i.e. 62.5% of females and 50% of males regularly used it to improve their English; 32.5% of males and 25% of females often used it; 10% of males and 12.5% of females sometimes used it; 5% of males rarely used it and only 2.5% of males never used it. The calculated mean of males is 4.23 and 4.5 is of females. This shows that both males and females almost always used it though there was only slight gender difference in the use.

The twenty-first item included in the questionnaire was to measure whether they listened closely to someone who talks in English. The vast majority of the students' i.e. 72.5% of females and 70% of males always or almost always used it; 22.5% of males and 17.5% of females often used it; 7.5% of males and females sometimes used it; and only 2.5% of females never used it. The mean of males is 4.63 and the mean of females is 4.58. This strategy was most frequently used among all strategies. This also indicates that this strategy was used more frequently by males than that by females but the difference was not significant.

The item included in twenty second number in the questionnaire was regarding their checking of progress in English. Out of the total respondents, 42.5% of both males and females used it regularly; 30% of females and 20% of males often used it; 30% of males and 27.5% of females sometimes used it, and only 7.5% of males rarely used it. The arithmetic average of males is 3.98 and 4.15 of females. Only the marginal difference was found between genders in the use of this strategy.

The last item included in the meta-cognitive strategies was about their analysis of mistakes and the corrections of the mistakes. The majority of females i.e. 52.5% used it regularly whereas only 37.5% of males used it regularly; 35% of both males and females often used it; 22.5% of males and 5% of females used it sometimes, and only 5% of males and 7.5% of females used it rarely. The calculated mean of males is 4.05 and 4.33 is of female. This shows that students often used it to improve their English. There was marginal difference between the males and the females in the use of this strategy.

3.5 Gender Differences in Affective Strategies

There were three items in the questionnaire to find out gender differences in affective strategies. The item wise analysis and interpretation is given below:

Table No. 6

Comparison Between Males and Females in the Use of Affective Strategies

Item No.	Responses																				Mean (M)	Mean (F)
	1				2				3				4				5					
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
24	3	7.5	1	2.5	3	7.5	5	12.5	8	20	11	27.5	18	45	12	30	8	20	11	27.5	3.63	3.68
25	-	-	4	10	1	2.5	-	-	13	32.5	3	7.5	15	37.5	9	22.5	11	27.5	24	60	3.9	4.23
26	-	-	3	7.5	2	5	1	2.5	18	45	10	25	14	35	13	32.5	6	15	13	32.5	3.6	3.8
Grand Mean																				3.71	3.90	

The first item included in the affective strategies was to find whether the students relaxed if they were anxious because of speaking English. Out of the total respondents, 45% of males and 30% females often did it; 27.5% of females and 20% of males used it sometimes; 27.5% of females and 20% of males regularly used it; 12.5% of females and 7.5% of males rarely used it and only 7.5% of males and 2.5% of females never used it. The mean of males is 3.63 and the mean of females is 3.68. This shows that there was no significant gender difference in the use of this strategy.

The twenty fifth item consisted in the questionnaire was related to their trial to speak English even if mistakes were made. The majority of female students i.e. 60% always used it whereas only 27.5% male students always used it; 37.5% of males and 22.5% of females often used it; 32.5% of males and 7.5% of females used it sometimes; 10% females never used it and only 2.5% of males rarely used it. The mean of males is 3.9 and mean of females is 4.23. This shows that females used this strategy more frequently than the males.

The last item included in the questionnaire was about the students' rewarding for succeeding. Analyzing the data, 32.5% of females always used it whereas only 15% of males used it regularly, 35% of males and 32.5% of females often

used it, 45% of males and 25% of females used it sometimes, 7.5% of females never used it and only 5% of males and 2.5% of females rarely used it. The mean of males is 3.6 whereas 3.8 is of females. The difference was found in the use of this strategy but the difference was not significant.

3.6 Gender Differences in Social Strategies

In order to find out the strategies of interacting with other people in the context of learning languages and related culture, three items were included in the questionnaire. The overall analysis and interpretation of the responses regarding the strategies have been given below:

Table No. 7

Comparison Between Males and Females in the Use of Social Strategies

Item No.	Responses																				Mean (M)	Mean (F)
	1				2				3				4				5					
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
27	3	7.5	2	5	13	32.5	3	7.5	11	27.5	11	27.5	3	7.5	14	35	10	25	10	25	3.1	3.68
28	7	17.5	2	5	4	10	2	5	11	27.5	12	30	11	27.5	11	27.5	7	17.5	13	32.5	3.18	3.78
29	1	2.5	-	-	6	15	2	5	12	30	7	17.5	12	30	12	30	9	22.5	19	47.5	3.55	4.2
Grand Mean																					3.28	3.89

The twenty seventh item included in the questionnaire was to find out whether the students asked the speaker to speak more slowly, repeat, or clarify what was said. Out of the total number of sampled population, 27.5% of both males and females used it sometimes. Similarly, 25% of both the males and females always used it, 35% of females often used it; whereas only 7.5% of males often used it. 32.5% of males and only 7.5% of females rarely used it but 7.5% of males and 5% of females used it never. The arithmetic average of males is 3.1 and the arithmetic average of females is 3.68. This indicates that there was

significant difference in the use of this strategy i.e. the females used it at greater.

Another strategy incorporated in the twenty eighth item in the questionnaire was to ask the students' practice of English with parents, siblings or classmates. Of all, 32.5% of the females always used it to improve their English; whereas only 17.5% of males did so. The equal percentage i.e. 27.5% of both males and females used it often. Likewise, 30% of females and 27.5% of males used it sometimes, 17.5% males and 5% of females used it never and only 10% of males and 5% of females rarely used it. The mean of males is 3.18 and 3.78 is of females. This also shows that significant difference was found in the use of this strategy. Like the use of other strategies, females used this strategy more.

The last item included in the questionnaire was to discover whether or not the students were interested in and were willing to learn information relating to cultures in which English is the spoken language. Out of the total respondents, 47.5% of females regularly used it but only 22.5% of males always used it. Similarly, the equal percentage i.e. 30% of both males and females used it often, 30% of males and 17.5% of females used it sometimes, 15% of males and 5% of females used it rarely and only 2.5% of male used it never. The calculated mean of males is 3.55 and the calculated mean of females is 4.2. There was significant gender difference in the use of this strategy where females used it more frequently than the males.

Looking in overall, the females are found to have used more strategies than the males. The details of the findings are presented under the fourth chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of findings, recommendations, and pedagogical implications based on the analysis and interpretation obtained from the data in the chapter three. The purpose of the study was to discover gender differences in the use of language learning strategies. The data was collected from 80 students from six different campuses of Kathmandu valley using questionnaire based on SILL by Oxford (1990). The main findings are given here:

4.1 Findings

After analyzing and interpreting data, the following findings have been derived:

- (a) Memory strategies were the least used strategies among all six categories of strategies. The mean of females in the memory strategies is 3.55; whereas the mean of males is 3.18. Females used these strategies more often than the males. It also shows that there were no significant differences between genders.
- (b) The mean of females in cognitive strategies is 3.69; whereas the mean of males is 3.51. This shows that females used these strategies more than males but no significant gender differences were found.
- (c) Gender differences were also found in compensation strategies. The mean of females is 3.65; whereas 3.53 is of males. This also shows that there were no significant gender differences.
- (d) The most frequently used strategies by both male and female students among all six categories of strategies were meta-cognitive strategies. The mean of females is 4.33 and 4.17 is of males. Gender differences were found but the differences were marginal.

- (e) Gender differences were also found in the use of affective strategies. The mean of females is 3.90 and the mean of males is 3.71. It indicates that no significant differences were found between genders.
- (f) For categories of language learning strategies, there were significant differences between genders in the use of social strategies, females using them more often. The mean of females is 3.89; whereas the mean of males is 3.28. This indicates that females are more social than males. The gender differences may have been associated with females' greater social orientation and greater conformity to norms.

4.2 Recommendations

- (a) The study proved that gender has been a classic and significant predictor in the fields of education, psychology and linguistics research. Therefore, teacher should recognize the factors affecting strategy use among their students. For example, this study showed that females might differ from males in their strategy choices and uses. The identification of LLS based on such factor can provide a useful guidance for students to come closer to successful language learners.
- (b) Teachers should raise students' awareness about LLS and their usefulness. Greater student awareness about LLS can help them to become more self confident and successful language learners. Students should be made aware that a wider repertoire of LLS and higher frequency of their use are both effective in language learning. Therefore, Teachers should encourage female students not only to profit from strategies that they are already using but also to expand their range of LLS. The encouragement is even more needed for male students.
- (c) One important implication of this study relates to the infrequent use of memory strategies. Although Nepali learners are reputed to have a strong tradition of memorizing texts, it is obvious that the students do not fully

exploit the range of memory strategies listed in the SILL. It is recommended that teachers capitalize on Nepali learners' willingness and ability to commit things to memory by providing specific training in memory skills. Nepali ESL learners would, therefore, benefit greatly from training in the use of all learning strategies. Since many of these strategies would be new and perhaps even unnatural to some learners, teachers would have to be very sensitive to the existing mindsets of learners. Teachers will also need to offer their students a great deal of guidance in order to help them experiment with these new strategies and decide on the types of strategies that suit them.

- (d) As the results in this study are based on answers to the questionnaire, the strategies reported are those that the subjects perceived themselves as using. Further research is therefore needed to determine if these strategies are in fact used during language learning.
- (e) More research is needed to understand students' selection of strategies within each major group of strategies. In particular, a further analysis of why Nepali male and female ESL learners vary in their choice of individual strategies would be useful. This would help identify those strategies that could enhance language learning, but which are not fully exploited by students due to a number of factors.
- (f) Finally, it is hoped that the findings reported in this study can be used, together with those obtained in other studies of Nepali learners in similar situations, to learn more about one of the emerging populations of English language learners in the world.

References

- Bacon, S.M. (1992). The relationship between genders, comprehension, processing strategies, cognitive, and affective response in foreign language listening. *The modern language journal*, 76, 160-178.
- Best, J.W. and Kahn, J.V. (2004). *Research in education*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.
- Bialystok, E. (1979). The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency. *Canadian modern language review*, 35, 372-394.
- Brown, H.D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Chamot, A. (2004). Issues in language learning strategy research and teaching. *Electronic journal of foreign language teaching*, 1, 14-26.
- Chang, Y.P. (2003). *Factors affecting language learning strategy choice: a study of EFL senior high school students in Taiwan*. An unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University.
- Chaudhary, G. (2009). *Learning strategies used by class toppers*. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis, T.U., Kathmandu.
- Chavez, M. (2001). *Gender in the classroom*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Chou, Y. (2002). *An exploratory study of language learning strategies and the relationship of these strategies to motivation and language proficiency among EFL Taiwanese technological and vocational college students*. An unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa.
- Cook, V. J. (1992). *Second language learning and second language teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Devkota, H.P. (2003). *Learning strategies: An attitudinal study*. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis, T.U., Kathmandu.

- Ehrman, M. E. and Oxford, R.L. 1989. Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *The modern language journal*, 73 (1), 1-13.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: OUP.
- Embi, A. M. (2000). *Language learning strategies: A Malaysian context*. Bangi: Penerbit University Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Gass, S. M. and Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. London : Routledge.
- Goh, C. and Foong, K. (1997). Chinese ESL students' learning strategies: A look at frequency, proficiency, and gender. *Hong Kong journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(1), 39-53.
- Green, M.J. and Oxford, R L. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28 (2), 261- 290.
- Griffiths, C. (2008). *Lesson from good language learners (eds.)*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Gu, Y. (2002). Gender, academic major, and vocabulary learning strategies of Chinese EFL learners. *RELC journal*, 33 /1, 35-54.
- Gunning, P. (1997). *The learning strategies of beginning ESL learners at the Primary Level*. An unpublished Master's thesis, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada.
- Hong, K. (2006). *Beliefs about language learning and language learning strategy use in an EFL context: A comparison study of monolingual Korean and bilingual Korean- Chinese University students*. An unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas.
- Huang, X. and Van, N. M. (1987). Learning strategies for oral communication. *Applied Linguistics*, 8, 287-307.

- Kumar, R. (1996). *Research methodology*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Lan, R. L. (2005). *Language learning strategies profiles of EFL elementary school students in Taiwan*. An unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Maryland - U.S.A.
- Larsen Freeman, D. and Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London: Longman.
- Nambiar, R. (2009). Learning strategies research- Where are we now? *The reading matrix*, 9, 132-149.
- Nyikos, M. (1990). Gender-related differences in adult language learning: Socialization and memory factors. *Modern language journal*, 74(3), 273-287.
- Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Oxford, R.L. (1993). Instructional implications of gender differences in second/foreign language learning styles and strategies. *Applied Language Learning*, 4, 65-94.
- Oxford, R. L. (ed.) (1996). *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross cultural perspectives*. Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.
- Oxford, R. L. and Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern language journal*, 73(2), 291-300.
- O'Malley, J. M. and Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: CUP
- Politzer, R. L. (1983). An exploratory study of self reported language learning behaviors and their relation to achievement. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 6(1), 54-68.
- Pressley, M. and McCormick, C.B. (1995). *Advanced educational psychology for educators, researchers, and policymakers*. New York: HarperCollins.

- Rain, Md. G. (2006). *Learning strategies used by Maithili learners of English*. An unpublished M. Ed thesis, T.U., Kathmandu.
- Raut, I.R. (2007). *A study on the strategies used in teaching vocabulary: A case of secondary level teachers*. An unpublished M. Ed. thesis, T.U., Kathmandu.
- Reid, J. M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 87-111.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the good language learner can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9 (1), 41- 51.
- Shmais, W. A. (2003). *Language learning strategy use in Palestine*. Retrieved March 5, 2010 from <http://writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej26/a3.html>
- Shrestha, W.A. (2007). *Strategies adopted by Xth grader in teaching English vocabulary*. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis, T.U., Kathmandu.
- Stern, H. H. (1975). What we can learn from the good language learner? *Canadian modern language review*, 31, 304-318.
- Teh, K. et al. (2009). Language learning strategies and motivation among religious secondary school students. *The international journal of language society and culture*. Retrived February 28, 2010 from <http://www.educ.utas.edu.au/users/tle/JOURNAL/>
- Teh, K. et al. (2009). A closer look at gender and Arabic language learning strategies use. *European journal of social sciences*, 9, 399-407.
- Tran, T. (1988). Sex differences in English language acculturation and learning strategies among Vietnames adults aged 40 and over in the United States. *Sex Roles*, 19, 747-758.
- Wenden, A and Rubin J. (1987). *Learners strategies in language learning*. London: prentice.
- Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning*, 50, 203-243.

Yang, N. D. (1999). The relationship between EFL learners belief and learning strategy use. *System*, 27,515-535

Yin, C. (2008). *Language learning strategies in relation to attitudes, motivations and learner beliefs: investigating learner variables in the context of English as a foreign language in China*. An unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Appendix- A

Questionnaire

Name:

Gender:

College:

Level:

Please circle the responses that you think and find are true in the case of your learning.

1 = Never or almost never

2 = Usually not

3 = Sometimes

4 = Often

5 = always or almost always

Part-I: Memory Strategies

1. I make links with what I know.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

2. I draw a picture in my head or on paper to remember a new word.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

3. I learn a new word in a sentence

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

4. I use flash cards to memorize words.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

5. I review often and memorize new words by repeatedly writing and saying them out loud.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

Part-II: Cognitive Strategies

6. I try to imitate native speaker's accent.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

7. I practice the sounds of the English alphabet.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

8. I watch TV in English or listen to English tapes or CDs.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

9. I read books in English.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

10. I work with English computer programs

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

11. I try to find occasions outside of school to practice English

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

12. I look for similarities in pronunciation between Nepali and English.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

13. I try to understand the main idea of what I read or hear without translating words for word.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

14. I try to figure out rules of English grammar.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

Part-III: Compensation Strategies

15. I guess the meaning of a new word based on the rest of the sentence.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

16. I use gestures to express when I want to say.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

17. I ask for help.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

18. I find a different way to say what I want to say.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

Part-IV: Meta-cognitive Strategies

19. I organize my time so I can study English often.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

20. I look for chances to practice English.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

21. I listen closely to someone who talks to me in English.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

22. I check my progress in English.

Never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

23. I analyze my mistakes and try not to make them again.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

Part-V: Affective Strategies

24. I try to relax if I am anxious because of speaking English.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

25. I try to speak English even if I make mistakes

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

26. I reward myself for succeeding.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

Part-VI: Social Strategies

27. I ask the speaker to speak more slowly, repeat, or clarify what was said.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

28. I practice English with parents, siblings or classmates.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

29. I am interested in and willing to learn information relating to cultures in which English is the spoken language.

never or almost never	1	2	3	4	5	always or almost always
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

Thank you.

Appendix- B
Summary of Likert Scale Responses

Item No.	Frequency										Average M	Average F
	1		2		3		4		5			
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F		
1	4	3	6		14	18	6	10	10	9	3.3	3.55
2	6	2	4	8	11	12	10	9	9	9	3.3	3.38
3			4	1	12	8	14	7	10	24	3.75	4.35
4	10	8	8	10	18	17	2	4	2	1	2.45	2.5
5	2	2	10	2	14	7	11	13	3	16	3.08	3.98
6	7	3	5	4	15	13	7	15	6	5	3	3.38
7			2	2	7	4	18	16	13	18	4.05	4.25
8		1	4	3	16	14	10	12	10	10	3.65	3.68
9	2				3	7	7	7	28	26	4.48	4.48
10	2	4	5		24	21	4	8	5	7	3.13	3.35
11	2	2	6	13	20	12	6	7	6	6	3.2	3.05
12	5	2	5	9	16	15	14	8		6	2.98	3.18
13		2	5	1	13	6	6	19	16	12	3.83	3.95
14	3	3	5	1	18	10	8	11	6	15	3.23	3.85
15	4	2	3	1	6	13	10	10	17	14	3.83	3.83
16	3	1	2	1	11	14	12	9	12	15	3.7	3.9
17	1	2	3	1	18	20	11	9	7	8	3.5	3.5
18	3	2	8	8	15	12	10	9	4	9	3.1	3.38
19	1	3	4	1	5	6	15	9	15	21	3.98	4.1
20	1		2		4	5	13	10	20	25	4.23	4.5
21		1			3	3	9	7	28	29	4.63	4.58
22			3		12	11	8	12	17	17	3.98	4.15
23			2	3	9	2	14	14	15	21	4.05	4.33
24	3	1	3	5	8	11	18	12	8	11	3.63	3.68
25		4	1		13	3	15	9	11	24	3.9	4.23
26		3	2	1	18	10	14	13	6	13	3.6	3.8
27	3	2	13	3	11	11	3	14	10	10	3.1	3.68
28	7	2	4	2	11	12	11	11	7	13	3.18	3.78
29	1		6	2	12	7	12	12	9	19	3.55	4.2

Appendix-C

Student Selection from the Campuses

S.N.	Name of Collèges	Nos. selected	
		Male	Female
1.	Mahendra Ratna Campus, Tahachal	10	10
2.	Sanothimi Campus, Sanothimi	10	10
3.	Gramin Aadarsa Multiple Campus, Nepaltar	8	8
4.	Janamaitri Campus, Kathmandu	4	4
5.	Kathmandu Shiksha Campus, Ramshahpath	4	4
6.	Shahid Ramnatha Multiple Campus, Kathmandu	4	4
	Total	40	40