US-based KFL College Students' Korean Language Learning Strategies*

Lee, Inhye

Abstract

이인혜. 2015. 09. 30. **미국 대학 KFL 학습자의 한국어 학습 전략 연구.** *이중언어학 60,* 201-227. 본 연구는 미국 대학 KFL 학습자들의 한국어 학습 전략 양상을 분석하여 KFL 학습자의 언어 학습 전략을 이해하고 교육적 시사점을 얻고자 하였다. 이를 위해 미국 대학에서 한국어 과목을 수강 중인 127명의 학습자를 대상으로 언어 학습 전략 조사 목록(SILL)을 활용하여 학습자의 한국어 학습 전략을 조사한 후 이를 범주별, 문항별로 분석하였다.

　범주별 분석 결과, 기존 ESL/EFL 및 KSL 연구 결과와는 달리 미국 대학의 KFL 학습자들은 6개의 SILL 전략 범주 중 상위인지전략을 가장 높은 빈도로 사용하며 사회적 전략, 인지적 전략, 기억 전략, 보상 전략, 정의적 전략 순으로 한국어 학습 전략을 많이 사용하고 있는 것으로 나타났다. 또한 간접 전략을 직접적 전략보다 높은 빈도로 사용하고 있었다.

　다음으로 51개의 SILL 문항별로 분석한 결과, 18개 항목은 높은 수준, 28개 항목은 중간 수준, 5개 항목은 낮은 수준의 사용 빈도를 보였는데, 구어 관련 전략에 비해 문어 관련 전략은 상당히 낮게 나타나는 특징을 보였다. 또한 상위 10개 문항에는 4개의 상위인지 전략, 3개의 인지 전략, 2개의 사회적 전략, 1개의 기억 전략 항목이 있었으며 보상 전략 및 정의적 전략은 포함되지 않았다. 상위 10개 문항 중 한국의 문화 관련 전략이 두 항목 포함된 점이 특징적이었다. 또한 자신의 학습을 관리하는 측면의 상위인지전략은 상위 10개 문항에 다수 포함된 반면, 학습과 관련해서 스스로 자신에게 상을 주거나 학습 과정의 느낌을 표현하는 정의적 측면의 항

목들은 하위 10개 문항에 포함되었다. 이러한 범주별, 항목별 전략 사용 빈도 양상은 미국 내 KFL 학습자 및 학습 환경의 특성을 반영하는 것으로 볼 수 있다.

  그 동안 한국어 교육 연구에서는 대부분 KSL 환경에서 언어 학습 전략 연구가 이루어져 왔고 영어를 L1으로 하는 학습자에 대한 전략 연구는 드물었다. 따라서 이러한 미국 내 KFL 학습자의 한국어 학습 전략에 대한 연구는 학습자에 대한 이해의 폭을 넓혀 줄 수 있으며, 학습자들이 자신의 학습 전략을 인식하고 보다 적극적으로 활용할 수 있도록 하는 교육적 자료가 될 것이다. **(고려대학교)**

1. Introduction

This study investigated US-based KFL students' Korean language learning strategies (KLLS) and aimed to provide useful results for developing curriculum and teaching methodology. The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), a 51 question survey, was used to measure the strategies employed by 127 college students studying Korean in the US.

Learning strategies for individual students can work together with or against a given instructional methodology. If there is harmony between the students and the instructional methodology and materials, then the student is likely to perform well, feel confident, and experience low anxiety. However, if clashes occur between them, students often perform poorly, feel unconfident, and experience significant anxiety. Sometimes such clashes lead to serious breakdowns in teacher-student interaction (Oxford, R. M., 2003:2-3). Skilled instructors can minimize clashes and help their students develop an awareness of learning strategies and guide them to a wider range of possible outcomes (Oxford, 2003:9). Used effectively,

learning strategies can enable more independent and autonomous lifelong learners (Little, D., 1991; Oxford, 2003:9). In spite of the increasing popularity of research on ESL learning strategies, the topic of learning strategies is still a new research area in Korean language education. Currently, only a few studies have been conducted on US-based KFL learning.

Gardner (2000) presented two correlated variables, "Integrativeness" and "Attitudes toward the learning situation" that influence motivation to learn a second language, and that motivation and language aptitude have an influence on language achievement. The variable Integrativeness reflects a genuine interest in learning the second language in order to come closer to the target language community. The integratively motivated individual is one who is motivated to learn the second language, has a desire or willingness to identify with the target language community, and tends to evaluate the learning situation positively (Dörnyei, Z, 2001: 5-6).

Motivation to learn a second language can be different depending on several variables. The KFL/KSL setting might have an effect on motivation to learn a second language due to the accessibility to the target language community being different. Therefore, the motivation levels of KFL learners like those of Korean learners in the US, can fluctuate and the rewards of their achievements often do not have an immediate impact on their lives compared to KSL students. In addition, some students find it difficult to spend the required time to study Korean compared to students in a KSL setting.

Learning their own study habits can help KFL students become independent learners who use direct and indirect language learning strategies more effectively.[1] This research reviews KFL language learning

strategies and offers practices that can be implemented in educational and classroom environments.

2. Review of Literature

2.1. Concept of Language Learning Strategies

Rigney, J. W. (1978), an early advocate of learning strategies, defined them as operations employed by the learner for acquiring, retaining, retrieving, and performing the learned language. Since his initial writings, others have developed his definition in the field (e.g. O'Malley, J. M. et al., 1985). Cohen, A. D. (1998) and Griffiths, C. (2003) assert that the conscious choice factor is important to the language strategy concept. Oxford (1990) expands this definition by saying: "learning strategies are specific actions taken by the learner[2] to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, more transferable to new situations (Griffiths, 2003:368).

According to Oxford (1993, 1996, 1999, 2003), learning strategies can be classified into six groups: memory-related, cognitive, metacognitive,

---

1) Direct strategies are those behaviors involving the direct use of the language; memory strategies for entering information into memory and retrieving it; cognitive strategies for manipulating the language for reception and production of meaning; and compensation strategies for overcoming limitations in existing knowledge. Indirect strategies support language learning although they do not directly involve using the language; metacognitive strategies for organizing and evaluating learning; affective strategies for managing emotions and attitudes; and social strategies for learning with others. Direct and indirect strategies are equally important (Ehrman, M. & Oxford, R., 1990:312).

2) In this study, learners commented on the learning strategies they actually employed rather than what they prefer in general.

compensatory, affective, and social. The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) consists of these six categories. Each category has strategy statements (items). SILL conceptualizes LLS in a broad way to include the social and affective sides of the learner as well as the more intellectual (cognitive) and "executive-managerial" (metacognitive) side (Oxford, 1996:30). Table 1 shows the six strategies of SILL.

<Table 1> Six categories of SILL[3]

Memory -related strategies	Memory-related strategies help learners link a L2 item or concept with another but do not necessarily involve deep understanding and do not always positively relate to L2 proficiency.	Direct strategy
Cognitive strategies	Cognitive strategies enable the learner to manipulate the language material in direct ways, e.g., through reasoning, analysis, note-taking, summarizing, synthesizing, outlining, reorganizing information to develop stronger schemas, practicing in naturalistic settings, and practicing structures and sounds formally.	Direct strategy
Meta cognitive strategies	Metacognitive strategies are employed for managing the learning process overall. (e.g., identifying one's own learning style preferences and needs, planning for an L2 task, gathering and organizing materials, arranging a study space and a schedule, monitoring mistakes, and evaluating task success, and evaluating the success of any type of learning strategy)	Indirect strategy
Compensa tory strategies	Compensatory strategies help the learner make up for missing knowledge. (e.g., guessing from the context in listening and reading; using synonyms and "talking around" the missing word to aid speaking and writing; and strictly for speaking, using gestures or pause words)	Direct strategy
Affective strategies	Affective strategies are employed for managing emotion and motivation. (e.g., identifying one's mood and anxiety level, talking about feelings, rewarding oneself for good performance, and using deep breathing or positive self-talk)	Indirect strategy

3) Lee, K. R. & Oxford, R. L. (2008:12), Oxford (2014:12-14)

Social strategies	Social strategies (e.g., asking questions to get verification, asking for clarification of a confusing point, asking for help in doing a language task, talking with a native-speaking conversation partner, and exploring cultural and social norms) help the learner work with others and understand the target culture as well as the language.	Indirect strategy

2.2. Research into Language Learning Strategies in KSL/KFL

Several studies have been done about Korean language learning strategies. The studies were usually about learning Korean as a second language (KSL) in Korea (Kang, S. H., 1996; Shon, S. H., 2011; Hong, J. M., 2012, 2013, 2014; Lee, K. A., 2015, etc.). Kang (1996), the first researcher to study the strategy used by Korean language learners used the interview method. On the other hand, Shon (2011) used the revised version of SILL to investigate KSL learners' strategy use. Based on the research, significant differences are present according to L1, gender, exposure to other languages, and Korean proficiency of the learners. In addition, those learners with high Korean achievement use metacognitive strategies actively on their own by determining, solving and self-evaluation in learning Korean. Hong (2014) analyzed language learning strategies used by Vietnamese female immigrants in Korea. The Vietnamese female immigrants most often used social strategies and metacognitive. According to the learner's residency period and academic background, differences were seen in how KLLS was used.

However, little research has been done on the strategies used by US-based KFL learners despite the increasing numbers KFL learners in the US.4) KFL learning strategies are different from KSL strategies since

their learning environment and conditions are different. In addition, US-based KFL learners are mostly native English speakers unlike KSL learners in Korea. Since this research focuses on US-based KFL learners, it can provide useful information about the strategy use of KFL students in the US. This research can also assist in filling in gaps about US-based KFL learners, which has been largely missing in the research on Korean language learning strategies.

Research focused on KFL leaners' strategy use in the US is rare (Kim, S. H., 2000; Murray, B. K., 2010). Kim (2000) used self-reporting, open interviews, and participant observation to investigate two Korean learners' strategy use. From the two students, the heritage student used learning strategies to maximize his exposure to Korean. The other student, who was a non-heritage student referred to and applied what he had learned as his main strategies in class. Even though this research used several methods and examined the students in-depth, the small sample size limits its effectiveness.

Murray (2010) examined the relationships between KLLS and the proficiency of 66 KFL students who are native English speakers. It is meaningful that this study used SILL to measure US-based KFL learners' KLLS and the relationship between subscale and total SILL. However, this study focused on the correlation Coefficients rather than the strategy use itself.[5] Therefore, it may be difficult provide detailed information

---

4) Korean enrollments showed the highest percentage change between 2009 and 2013 of all the commonly taught languages, at 44.7%. In 2009, Korean registered 8,449 enrollments, which rose to 12,229 in 2013 (Goldberg, D., Looney, D. and Lusin, N., 2013:2).

5) Murray (2010) found that cognitive strategies showed the strongest correlation with proficiency. The result suggested that the deep processing element in these

about US-based Korean leaners' KLLS.

In this study, there was a bigger sized sample with not only six categories, but additionally 51 individual SILL items were analyzed. Therefore, this study will offer more useful and detailed information for designing syllabi and developing teaching materials, and will reduce the conflict between instructional methodology and students.

3. Research Methods

This Study asked the following questions: (1) What are the aspects of US-based KFL learners' strategy use according to the six categories of SILL? (2) What are the aspects of US-based KFL learners' strategy use according to the 51 SILL individual strategies? (3) What are the most/least used SILL individual strategies according to frequency?

One hundred and twenty seven non-heritage Korean learners participated in this study.[6] All were taking a Korean course at the university in the US. SILL has been a tool for investigating language learners' strategy use. Compared with other strategy assessment

---

strategies such as "analyzing, looking for patterns, and adjusting understanding in light of new information" was responsible for this higher correlation with proficiency.

6) Demographic description of participants

Gender	n	%
Female	95	74.8
Male	32	25.2
Course level	n	%
First year	80	63.0
Second year	20	15.7
Third year	19	15.0
Fourth year	8	6.3

techniques, student-completed, summative rating scales have a number of advantages. These self-report scales are easy and quick to give, provide a general assessment of each students' typical strategies across a variety of possible tasks, and are almost completely nonthreatening when administered using paper and pencil (or computer) under conditions of confidentiality. Moreover, many students discover a great deal about themselves from taking a strategy scale, especially one like SILL that is self-scoring and provides immediate learner feedback (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995:2).[7] In this study, the revised version 7.0 of the SILL (Shon, 2011) is used to investigate US-based KFL learners' KLLS.[8] For this study, Cronbach's alpha reliability indicated a .902, which means the revised SILL reliability with 127 KFL learners was high.[9]

Students responded to 51 strategy items using a Likert scale of 1 through 5 to reveal the frequency with which they used the strategy. On

---

7) However, a disadvantage of the SILL and other strategy scales is that they do not describe in detail the language learning strategies a student uses in response to any specific language task (as does the more time-consuming think-aloud protocol.) (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995:2).

8) Shon (2011) revised the SILL version 7.0 to investigate KSL learners' learning strategy use. In this study, revised the version of SILL is also used to examine US-based KFL learners' strategies.

9) Alpha was developed by Lee Cronbach in 1951 to provide a measure of the internal consistency of a test or scale; it is expressed as a number between 0 and 1. Internal consistency describes the extent to which all the items in a test measure the same concept or construct and hence it is connected to the inter-relatedness of the items within the test. Squaring this correlation and subtracting from 1.00 produces the index of measurement error. For example, if a test has a reliability of 0.80, there is 0.36 error variance (random error) in the scores (0.80x0.80 = 0.64; 1.00 - 0.64 = 0.36). As the estimate of reliability increases, the fraction of a test score that is attributable to error will decrease (Tavakol, M. & Dennick, R., 2011:53).

a five point scale 1 represents "Never or almost never true of me" and 5 represents "Always or almost always true of me." Students' scores were averaged over six different categories and ranged from 1 to 2.4 (low usage), 2.5 to 3.4 (medium usage), and 3.5 to 5 (high usage) (Oxford, 1990, Murray, 2010: 627-628). SPSS version 22.0 was used to calculate descriptive statistics.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Overall Strategy Use of the Six SILL Categories

As can be seen in Table 2, a breakdown of the results of the six strategy categories in the SILL survey show in order of most commonly used to least commonly used: metacognitive, social, cognitive, memory-related, compensatory, and affective strategies. Of these strategies, metacognitive, social, and affective are indirect strategies whereas cognitive, memory-related, and compensatory are direct strategies. Accordingly we see that by comparison, the surveyed US-based KFL learners utilization of indirect strategies is much more common.

The metacognitive strategy category (M=3.56)[10] was reported by the students with a mean of high frequency usage.[11] Metacognitive strategies are employed for managing the overall learning process. For college level

---

10) "M=3.56" means the mean is 3.56.

11) The participants in the present study appeared familiar with the need to manage their learning processes and indicated they were in control of planning, organizing, focusing, and evaluating their own learning, behaviors inherent in most definitions of metacognition (Borkowski et al., 1987; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006: 408).

KFL students, using more metacognitive strategies could lead to more effective and long-term studying.[12)]

Five other strategy categories were reported with a mean of medium frequency usage. These results are different from Shon (2011) and Hong's (2013) study which examined KSL learners who have different backgrounds.[13)] In those two studies, social strategies were the most commonly used strategies, with metacognitive strategies as second mostly used. The results may show that the setting of "KFL" and "KSL" effect students' KLLS and imply that KFL learning strategies are also necessary. Due to the easy accessibility of the Korean native speakers, social strategies tend to be used more commonly in KSL settings.

<Table 2> Descriptive statistics for students' reported KLLS of six categories

Categories of strategy		Mean	Use of strategy	Rank
Direct	Memory-related	3.17	Medium	4
	Cognitive	3.27	Medium	3
	Compensatory	2.94	Medium	5
Indirect	Metacognitive	3.56	High	1
	Affective	2.69	Medium	6
	Social	3.49	Medium	2
Total SILL		3.23	Medium	

Notes: N=127, SILL scores out of 5.

---

12) On the contrary, affective strategies used the least in this study. Since several ESL/EFL studies indicated that affective strategies have shown to be significantly related to L2 proficiency (Dreyer and Oxford, 1996; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995), US-based KFL learners may need to use affective strategies more, however, research indicating the correlation between affective strategies and the proficiency of US-based KFL students should be conducted.

13) The participants in Shon (2011) were mostly Chinese students who study in a language center at the University in Korea and those in Hong (2013) were married immigrants mostly from Asian countries.

As shown in Table 2, the mean of memory-related strategies was 3.17. This is similar to Murray (2010), which revealed a 3.15 in the same category. It is higher than Shon (2011) where English L1 speakers' mean was 2.83, Chinese L1 speakers' mean was 2.99. This result is related to the tendency that US-based KFL students focus on memorizing vocabulary with less input and opportunity to use the target language.

Memory-related strategies help learners link L2 items or concepts with each other but do not necessarily involve a deep understanding. Nor do they always positively relate to L2 proficiency. In fact, the use of memory-related strategies in a test-taking situation had a significant negative relationship to learners' test performance in grammar and vocabulary (Purpura, 1997). The probable reason for this is that memory strategies are often used for memorizing vocabulary and structures in initial stages of language learning, and that learners need such strategies much less when their arsenal of vocabulary and structures have become larger (Oxford, 2003:13). In this study, the mean of the beginning level (3.22) was higher than the intermediate levels' (3.04) and third year levels' (2.97). The results supported the previous studies' results.

In both Kim, Y. M. (1995) and Lee, K. O (2003)'s study, compensatory strategies were most commonly used by Korean adults learning English as a second language. However, in the present study, compensatory strategies were ranked fifth among six categories. The difference shows that the aspects of using strategies can be adopted differently depending on which target language they learn. Due to the fact that the instructors of Korean whose L1 is Korean and they acquired Korean in a very natural way, their learning experience of Korean is different from KFL learners even though the instructors are experts of

Korean language education. The instructors may reflect their own L2 learning strategies such as learning English as a foreign language to understand or facilitate students' strategies. As we know, learning strategies of students and instructors can be harmonious but can also cause conflict. Therefore, it is necessary to be aware of students' KLLS to interact with students and help them perform well.

4.2. The Aspects of Strategy Use for Individual SILL Items

4.2.1. The Use of Strategies for 51 Individual SILL Items

Table 3 presents the mean, the rank of items within six SILL categories, and the rank of 51 individual SILL items. There were 18 high usage items, 28 medium usage items, and 5 low usage items among the items.

The most frequently used strategy with a mean of 4.19 belonged to the metacognitive strategy category of "I pay attention when someone is speaking Korean." The least frequently used strategy with a mean of 1.28 belonged to the affective category "I write down my feelings in a language learning diary."

Metacognitive strategies, the most frequently used category, were reported with five high strategy items, four medium strategy items, and no low strategy items among nine items. The most highly used metacognitive strategy item is "I pay attention when someone is speaking Korean. (M=4.19)" In addition, "I think about my progress in learning Korean. (M=3.91)" "I have clear goals for improving my Korean skills. (M=3.57)" are also commonly used. These two individual items are related to the

metacognitive strategies setting a goal and planning and managing the progress of learning. In the second highest metacognitive strategy, "I notice my Korean mistakes and use that information to help me do better. (M=3.87)", however, is positively correlated with reflecting on feedback whether from teachers, peers, or self-feedback. As shown in several studies on feedback (Cohen, 1987; Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; McCurdy, 1992; Ferris, 1995, 1997; Choi, 2010), students who reflect other's feedback or look to correct mistakes while striving not to make the same mistake twice, tend to perform better in learning L2.

There were four medium use strategies; "I try to find as many ways as I can to use my Korean. (M=3.35)" "I look for people I can talk to in Korean. (M=3.15)" "I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study Korean. (M=3.13)" "I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in Korean. (M=2.91)" Overall, US-based KFL learners may be trained to manage their own learning progress as college level students. In addition, the result of "I try to find out how to be a better learner of Korean. (M=3.35)" shows US-based KFL learners' desire to be better language learners.

In a social strategy category, three high strategies, four medium strategies, and no low strategies were reported. "I try to learn about the culture of Korean speakers. (M=4.13)" demonstrates the high level of interest among KFL students. "If I do not understand something in Korean, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again. (M=4.08)" and "I ask Korean speakers to correct me when I talk. (M=3.52) were also commonly used.

However, "I ask questions in Korean. (M=2.98)" was less frequently used. This result may be related to similar circumstances faced by L1

students enrolled in Korean classes in the US. This is especially the case for beginning classes that use a lot of English in KFL classes. Allowing KFL students to use their native language has pros and cons. Pros: it helps students to understand more clearly and effectively, lower anxiety, and link their L1 knowledge or strategies to L2. Cons: students often revert to their native language rather than challenge themselves to use Korean. In short, KFL students' native language often becomes a "security blanket," which prevents students from actively engaging in Korean. Therefore, instructors should encourage students to attempt to use the target language more, even if they make mistakes, while gradually reducing the percentage of English in class.

Under cognitive strategies, the third commonly used had seven high usage items, seven medium usage items, and one low usage item. Under high usage, "I watch Korean language TV shows spoken in Korean or go to movies spoken in Korean. (M=3.78)" indicates that Korean popular media may be a variable in learning Korean in the US. Korean popular media such as K-dramas and K-pops have become important reasons why some learners started learning Korean at the first place.[14] It might be time consuming and hard to find appropriate TV shows or songs as teaching materials, however, it could provide effective content. By using the target language with cultural resources, KFL students who have difficulty understanding the target language may learn when and how to

---

14) In this study, 107 (84.25%) students among 127 students indicated that they are Korean TV show "watchers" while 20 students are non-watchers. In addition, 96 (76.59%) students indicated that their interest in learning Korean started from popular Korean culture. In addition, only ten among 127 students (7.87%) chose "to enter a graduate school in Korea" for the reason of studying Korean.

use the language in more natural settings. Also, it can help KFL students be exposed to the outside of the classroom.

Under cognitive strategies, I noticed a disparity between speaking and listening and writing and reading. The items related to speaking and listening such as "I try to talk like native Korean speakers. (M=3.63)" "I practice the sounds of Korean. (M=3.82)" indicate high mean of usage. The items related to writing and reading such as "I read for pleasure in Korean. (M=2.13, Rank 46)" "I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in Korean. (M=2.50, Rank 49)" show low mean of usage. This result shows that US-based learners of Korean focus on oral proficiency much more than written proficiency. However, it is important to develop all four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. As Korean language learners communicate with others via social network services such as Facebook, reading and writing skills are not only important in the academic field, but also communicating with Korean native speakers or other Korean language learners. Communications via social network services engage students to study Korean.

Next, among the eight memory-related strategy items, three were high usage, four were medium usage, and one was low usage. The high usage items were "I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in Korean. (M=4.11)" "I use new Korean words in a sentence so I can remember them. (M=3.64)", and "I connect the sound of a new Korean word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word. (M=3.54)" On the contrary, "I physically act out new Korean words. (M=1.95, Rank 50)" was the second least used item among the 51 SILL items. The results indicate that US-based KFL students prefer "sensory learning style" to other learning styles (e.g. visual, auditory,

hands-on or tactile-kinesthetic).

The medium usage strategies, "I use flashcards to remember new Korean words. (M=3.02)" is a commonly used teaching method in beginning level Korean classrooms in Korea for drill practices to automatize conjugation of verbs and adjectives and the memorization of vocabulary. Traditionally, making their own flashcards is a language learning strategy for US-based students. However, these days some students use flashcard smartphone applications. If Korean instructors are familiar with these new applications, they can introduce them to the classroom, or even give students the opportunity to introduce applications they found useful.

Another medium usage strategy, "I remember a new Korean word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used. (M=3.11)" is an important strategy concerning the pragmatic meaning of the word. It can help the students when and how to use the word within context. Since it is not highly used, it might be a good way to introduce this strategy during the class.

The second least used category, compensatory strategy category consisted of six items. It had no high usage strategy and five medium usage strategy and one low usage strategy. The most commonly used strategy in this category was "To understand unfamiliar Korean words, I make guesses. (M=3.46)" On the other hand, "I read Korean without looking up every new word. (M=2.54) showed low usage. The results indicate that the inferencing strategy is commonly used in the vocabulary level, but not in the text level. This means that students might not have enough reading strategies such as skimming and scanning. In order to develop "Interactive reading strategy", and not only "bottom-up reading

strategy", more interactive reading instructions are needed.[15]

Lastly, the least frequently used category, affective strategies had only four medium usage and two low usage strategies. The affective strategies in Oxford's (1990) taxonomy can be divided into "self-encouragement/reward strategies" and "self-feeling control (anxiety reduction) strategies" (Hong, 2013:249). As shown in Table 3, US-based college level KFL students use "I encourage myself to speak Korean even when I am afraid of making a mistake. (M=3.39)" as a common self-encouragement/reward strategy. As self-feeling control (anxiety reduction) strategy, "I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using Korean. (M=3.41)" was commonly used.

On the other hand, "I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in Korean. (M=2.27)" (self-encouragement/reward strategy), "I write down my feelings in a language learning diary. (M=1.28)" (self-feeling control strategy) was significantly less used.

<Table 3> The use of strategies for 51 individual SILL items

Category	Item	Statement	Mean of item	Rank within category	Rank within 51 items	Low/ Medium /High	Mean of category
Memory -related Strategies	1	I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in Korean.	4.11	1	3	H	3.17
	2	I use new Korean words in a sentence so I can remember them.	3.64	2	11	H	
	3	I connect the sound of a new Korean word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.	3.54	3	17	H	

15) "Integrated Korean" textbooks which are the most widely being used textbooks in the US, include "Narration" as listening and reading texts in every chapter. However, there are no instructions toward reading strategies such as skimming and scanning. As a supplementation, teachers may guide students to skim first to identify the topic and main idea of the text and not to read every word intensively at the first time.

	4	I remember a new Korean word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	3.11	4	33	M	
	5	I use flashcards to remember new Korean words.	3.02	6	36	M	
	6	I physically act out new Korean words.	1.95	8	50	L	
	7	I review Korean lessons often.	3.07	5	35	M	
	8	I remember new Korean words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	2.88	7	41	M	
Cognitive Strategies	1	I say or write new Korean words several times.	3.56	7	16	H	3.27
	2	I try to talk like native Korean speakers.	3.63	4	12	H	
	3	I practice the sounds of Korean.	3.82	1	8	H	
	4	I use the Korean words I know in different ways.	3.40	9	24	M	
	5	I start conversations in Korean.	2.72	13	42	M	
	6	I watch Korean language TV shows spoken in Korean or go to movies spoken in Korean.	3.78	2	9	H	
	7	I read for pleasure in Korean.	2.13	15	49	L	
	8	I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in Korean.	2.50	14	46	M	
	9	I first skim a Korean passage (read over the passage quickly), then go back and read carefully.	3.01	11	37	M	
	10	I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in Korean.	3.49	8	19	M	
	11	I try to find patterns in Korean.	3.78	2	9	H	
	12	I find the meaning of a Korean word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	3.58	5	13	H	
	13	I try not to translate word-for-word.	3.10	10	34	M	
	14	I make summaries of information that I hear or read in Korean.	3.01	11	37	M	
	15	When listening to Korean, I take note of important words.	3.57	6	15	H	
Compensatory Strategies	1	To understand unfamiliar Korean words, I make guesses.	3.46	2	21	M	2.94
	2	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in Korean, I use gestures.	3.39	3	26	M	
	3	I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in Korean.	2.18	6	48	L	
	4	I read Korean without looking up every new word.	2.54	5	45	M	
	5	I try to guess what the other person will say next in Korean.	2.61	4	43	M	

	6	If I can't think of a Korean word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	3.47	1	20	M	
Metacognitive Strategies	1	I try to find as many ways as I can to use my Korean.	3.35	6	27	M	3.56
	2	I notice my Korean mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	3.87	4	7	H	
	3	I pay attention when someone is speaking Korean.	4.19	1	1	H	
	4	I try to find out how to be a better learner of Korean.	3.99	2	5	H	
	5	I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study Korean.	3.13	8	31	M	
	6	I look for people I can talk to in Korean.	3.15	7	30	M	
	7	I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in Korean.	2.91	9	40	M	
	8	I have clear goals for improving my Korean skills.	3.57	5	14	H	
	9	I think about my progress in learning Korean.	3.91	3	6	H	
Affective Strategies	1	I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using Korean.	3.41	1	23	M	2.69
	2	I encourage myself to speak Korean even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	3.39	2	25	M	
	3	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in Korean.	2.27	5	47	L	
	4	I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using Korean.	3.22	3	28	M	
	5	I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.	1.28	6	51	L	
	6	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning Korean.	2.59	4	44	M	
Social Strategies	1	If I do not understand something in Korean, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	4.08	2	4	H	3.49
	2	I ask Korean speakers to correct me when I talk.	3.52	3	18	H	
	3	I practice Korean with other students.	3.42	4	22	M	
	4	I ask for help from Korean speakers.	3.17	5	29	M	
	5	I ask questions in Korean.	2.98	7	39	M	
	6	I try to learn about the culture of Korean speakers.	4.13	1	2	H	
	7	I always ask questions during class if there is something I don't know.	3.13	6	31	M	

Notes: N=127, SILL scores out of 5 (L<2.5, 3.5<H)

4.2.2. The Strategies Ranking According to the Frequency

Table 4 reflects the results of the 51 individual strategies in the SILL survey. It is arranged in order of most commonly used to least commonly used. Four metacognitive strategies, three cognitive strategies, two social strategies, and one memory-related strategy are in the top ten strategies. There were no compensatory or affective strategies found in the top ten. On the other hand, three cognitive strategies, three compensatory strategies, three affective strategies, and one memory-related strategy were in the bottom ten strategies. Metacognitive strategies and Social strategies were not included.

The results show that cognitive strategies are highly used among the direct strategies. In addition, metacognitive strategies and social strategies are highly used among the indirect strategies. In Hong's study (2014) of Vietnamese female immigrants in Korea, the most used strategies in learning Korean were the metacognitive strategies and the social strategies, which is similar to the results in this study. However, the most used individual strategies in Hong's study differ from the current study.[16]

---

16) The ten most used individual strategies in Hong's study (2014).
  I try to learn about the culture of Korean speakers. (social strategy 6)
  I try to find out how to be a better learner of Korean. (metacognitive strategy 4)
  I pay attention when someone is speaking Korean. (metacognitive strategy 3)
  I watch Korean TV shows spoken in Korean or go to movies spoken in Korean. (cognitive strategy 6)
  I ask Korean speakers to correct me when I talk. (social strategy 2)
  I notice my Korean mistakes and use that information to help me do better. (metacognitive strategy 2)
  When I can't think of a word during a conversation in Korean, I use gestures. (compensatory strategy 2)
  I have clear goals for improving my Korean skills. (metacognitive strategy 8)
  I practice the sounds of Korean. (cognitive strategy3)
  I ask questions in Korean. (social strategy 5)

For example, among the top ten most used strategies, "I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in Korean. (memory-related 1)" "If I do not understand something in Korean, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again. (social 1)", and "I think about my progress in learning Korean. (metacognitive 9)" were not in the top ten strategies in Hong's study (2014).[17] The results indicate that KLLS usage tendency is related to location and the leaners' capacity, motivation, and style of learning.[18]

In assessing the individual strategies, I came up with interesting results that show two strategies related to "Korean culture" are included in the top ten strategies (e.g. I try to learn about the culture of Korean speakers (top 2), I watch Korean language TV shows spoken in Korean or go to movies spoken in Korean (top 9). Moreover, several metacognitive strategies for planning, organizing, and evaluating their own learning (Lee & Oxford, 2008:12) are included in the top ten strategies, while several affective strategies, especially, for managing emotion and giving rewards of their achievements are included in the bottom ten strategies. These results also reflects on the learners and the US-based KFL learning circumstances.

---

17) In contrast, some of the top ten strategies in Hong's study (2014); "I ask Korean speakers to correct me when I talk. (social 2)" "When I can't think of a word during a conversation in Korean, I use gestures. (compensatory 2)" "I have clear goals for improving my Korean skills. (metacognitive 8)" and "I ask questions in Korean. (social 5)," were not listed in the ten most commonly used strategies in the current study.

18) In this study, individual variables in the participants group such as students' gender, proficiency, L1 were not considered to focus on US-based KFL students' KLLS. It will be dealt with in another study.

<Table 4> The strategy ranking according to the frequency

Rank within 51 SILL items		Category number	Statement	Mean
Top Ten	1	Metacognitive 3	I pay attention when someone is speaking Korean.	4.19
	2	Social 6	I try to learn about the culture of Korean speakers.	4.13
	3	Memory-related 1	I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in Korean.	4.11
	4	Social 1	If I do not understand something in Korean, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	4.08
	5	Metacognitive 4	I try to find out how to be a better learner of Korean.	3.99
	6	Metacognitive 9	I think about my progress in learning Korean.	3.91
	7	Metacognitive 2	I notice my Korean mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	3.87
	8	Cognitive 3	I practice the sounds of Korean.	3.82
	9	Cognitive 6	I watch Korean language TV shows spoken in Korean or go to movies spoken in Korean.	3.78
	9	Cognitive 1	I try to find patterns in Korean.	3.78
Bottom Ten	42	Cognitive 5	I start conversations in Korean.	2.72
	43	Compensatory 5	I try to guess what the other person will say next in Korean.	2.61
	44	Affective 6	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning Korean.	2.59
	45	Compensatory 4	I read Korean without looking up every new word.	2.54
	46	Cognitive 8	I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in Korean.	2.5
	47	Affective 3	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in Korean.	2.27
	48	Compensatory 3	I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in Korean.	2.18
	49	Cognitive 7	I read for pleasure in Korean.	2.13
	50	Memory-related 6	I physically act out new Korean words.	1.95
	51	Affective 5	I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.	1.28

5. Conclusion

   This study shows the aspects of US-based KFL students' language learning strategies. The results of the six strategy categories in the SILL survey in order of the most commonly used to the least commonly used

are: metacognitive, social, cognitive, memory-related, compensatory, and affective strategies. Of these strategies, metacognitive, social, and affective are indirect strategies whereas cognitive, memory-related, and compensatory are direct strategies. Accordingly we see that by comparison, the surveyed US-based KFL learners utilization of indirect strategies is more common. In addition, the Correlation Coefficients for SILL categories were significant. Cognitive strategies showed the strongest correlation with other strategies.

As a result of analyzing the use of 51 individual SILL items, 18 high usage items, 28 medium usage items, and 5 low usage items were indicated among the 51 items. The most frequently used strategy was "I pay attention when someone is speaking Korean." which belonged to the metacognitive strategy category. The least frequently used strategy was "I write down my feelings in a language learning diary." which belonged to the affective category. Five metacognitive strategies, three cognitive strategies, two social strategies, and one memory-related strategy were in the top ten strategies. The results show that cognitive strategies are highly used strategies among the direct strategies while metacognitive strategies and social strategies are highly used among the indirect strategies. In addition, the results show that US-based learners of Korean focus on oral proficiency much more than written proficiency and commonly use "Korean culture" related strategies. Moreover, several metacognitive strategies are included in the top ten strategies, while several affective strategies are included in the bottom ten strategies.

Knowledge of learning strategies of students can help instructors to understand their students, provide useful information for designing syllabi and developing teaching materials, and reduce the conflict between

instructional methodology and students. Furthermore, identifying learning strategies can help students become more active and independent leaners in KFL settings. Therefore, developing teaching methodology based on the results above and encouraging students to share their useful strategies can help students to use a variety of strategies, even if they are not commonly used.

<References>

Choi, E. J. (2010). An analysis of interaction in EFL classrooms: teachers' feedback and learners' uptake. Master's Thesis, University of Seoul.

Cohen, A. D. (1987). Student processing of feedback on their compositions, In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin(Eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, 57-69.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*, London: Longman.

Cohen, A. D. & M. C. Cavalcanti(1990). Feedback on compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports, In B. Kroll(Ed.) *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom,* New York: Cambridge University Press, 155-177.

Dörnyei, Z (2001). *Motivation and second language acquisition,* 23, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Ehrman, M. E. & Oxford, R. L. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting, *The modern language journal,* 74(3), 311-327.

Ferris, D. R. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms, *TESOL Quarterly,* 29(1), 33-53.

Goldberg, D., Looney, D., & Lusin, N. (2013). Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, *The Modern Language Association of America*. Fall 2013.

Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language learning strategy use, *System*, 31(3). 367-383.

Hong, J. M. (2012). Research on language learning strategies of women immigrants as KSL learner, *The Studies of Korean Language and Literature* 44, The Society Of Korean Language and Literature, 419-451.

Hong, J. M. (2013). The item analysis of SILL focusing on Chinese immigrants, *The Studies of Korean Language and Literature* 46, The Society Of Korean Language and Literature, 235-264.

Hong, J. M. (2014). The exploratory study on Korean learning strategy of Vietnamese women immigrants, *東南亞研究* 24(2), Center for Southeast Asian Studies at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, 241-268.

Kang, S. H. (1996). 제2 언어로서의 한국어 학습자의 언어학습 전략 유형 및 학습 결과 분석 연구, Doctoral dissertation, Yonsei University.

Kim, S. H. (2000). Learning strategies of learners in Korean class as foreign language in U.S, *Korean Language Education Research*, 11, The Association of Korean Language Education Research, 107-133.

Kim, Y. M. (1995). The effect of gender and learning context on the use of language learning strategies, *English Teaching,* 50(2), 331-345.

Lee, K. A. (2015). An analytic study on learning style and Korean language learning strategy of married female, Ph.D Dissertation, Dongguk University.

Lee, K. O. (2003). The relationship of school year, sex and proficiency on the use of learning strategies in learning English of Korean junior high school students, *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(3), 1-36.

Lee, K. R. & Oxford, R. L. (2008). Understanding EFL learners' strategy use and strategy awareness, *Asian EFL Journal*, 10(1), 7-32.

Little, D (1995). Learner autonomy: Definitions, issues and problems, *Authentic Language Learning Resources Limited*, 1991.

McCurdy, P. (1992). What students do with composition feedback, Paper Presented at the 27th Annual TESOL Convention, Vancouver, BC. Canada.

Murray, B. K. (2010). Students' language learning strategy use and achievement in the Korean as a foreign language classroom, *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(4), 624-634.

O'Malley, J. M. et al. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL student, *Language Learning,* 35(1), 21-46.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Oxford, R. L. (2003). Language learning styles and strategies: Concepts and relationships, *Iral*, 41(4), 271-278.

Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Language Learning Strategies*, Longman: Pearson Education ESL.

Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version with the strategy inventory of language learning (SILL), *System*, 23, 11-23.

Oxford, R. L. & Ehrman, M. E. (1995). Adults' language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *System*, 23(3), 359-386.

Rigney, J. W. (1978). Learning strategies: A theoretical perspective, L*earning strategies*, Academic Press, INC, 165-202.

Shon, S. H. (2011). A study on language learning strategies of Korean language learners, Doctoral dissertation, Yonsei University.

Tavakol, M & Dennick, R (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha, *International journal of medical education*, 2, 53-55.

이인혜(Lee, Inhye)
고려대학교 국어국문학과
136-701 서울시 성북구 안암로 145
전화번호: 1-612-961-6213
전자우편: heyday0817@korea.ac.kr