

What Shapes the Learning Styles?: In Relation to Learning Contexts and English Proficiency

Nam, Hyun-Jeong
(Dong-A University)

Nam, Hyun-Jeong. "What Shapes the Learning Styles?: In Relation to Learning Contexts and English Proficiency." *Modern Studies in English Language & Literature* 61.1 (2017): 333-35. The study explored learning styles in different learning contexts. A total of 137 English majors in two different learning contexts (70 in a conventional learning context and 67 in a communicative learning context) participated in the study. The participants responded to a survey which was adopted and revised from Willing (1988) and Wong and Nunan (2011). It was a three-page-long questionnaire that included their learning styles, target language exposure, and self-rated oral proficiency. The findings of the study indicate that higher proficiency learners favored the communicative style approach to learning regardless of the learning contexts. However, the effect of learning contexts was evident among lower proficiency learners. Those in the conventional learning context favored the authority style while the concrete style was favored by those in the communicative learning context. In addition, there was a positive correlation between the L2 exposure in class and oral proficiency. As such, these findings should serve as catalyst for English education reform in Korea. (Dong-A University)

Key Words: learning style, learning context, L2 exposure, English proficiency, EMI

I. Introduction

A great amount of empirical research has been carried out on a wide array of approaches to learning a second/foreign language more effectively. Among the many pedagogical, psychological, and cognitive approaches that attempt to seek answers to the significant attributes that the more

successful L2 learners have over the less successful counterparts, learning styles have attracted the attention of many researchers.

Research has shown that a particular type of learning style is preferred by more or less successful language learners. For example, Wong and Nunan (2011) found that the learning style most favored by the more successful learners was the communicative style and the one most preferred by the less successful learners was the authority-oriented. Concerning the L2 learners in Korea, Kyung-Ja Kim (2007) found positive correlations between learning styles and their English achievement.

It should be noted however that, some studies using even the same questionnaire have not yielded consistent results (e.g., Kyung-Ja Kim, 2007 vs. Reid, 1987). Given that the learning contexts the language learners were in those studies may be different, it would be necessary to see the extent to which the learning context affects learning styles.

Therefore the primary focus of the present study is on the comparison of the learning styles of L2 learners in different learning contexts. The present study hopes to explore how learning contexts may affect learners' learning styles. It further investigates whether particular learning styles are favored by the higher and the lower proficiency learners. In addition, it will include the learners' own perception of their success or failure of language learning corollary to their learning contexts. This will suggest an more effective pedagogical approach to successful learning.

II. Literature Review

2.1 Learning Styles and Learning Contexts

Reid (1995: viii) defines learning styles as “natural, habitual, and

preferred way(s) of absorbing, processing, and retaining new information and skills". Yet, some researchers seem to draw a fuzzy line between the term 'learning style' and 'learning strategy'. Sternberg and Grigorenko (2001) clarify this confusion in terms of consciousness. That is, learning strategies reflect the learner's conscious decision while learning styles reveal the state "between ability and strategy" (ibid.: 3). Dörnyei (2005) further claims that although learning styles cannot be considered entirely separable from learning strategies, they may reveal the learner's preference and personality.

According to Dunn and Dunn (1978), there are five types of stimuli that determine learning styles; environmental, emotional, sociological, physical, and psychological stimuli. Willing (1988) insists that learning styles not only mirror the learner's inner state but also reflect his/her physical and affective phenomena. Kinsella and Sherak (1998) also suggest that learning styles can be formed based on the cultural milieu in class where the learner is exposed to. Norton and Toohey (2001: 318) further state that "understanding good language learning requires attention to social practices in the contexts in which individuals learn the L2". Thus, it may be reasonable not to exclude the possibility of the influence of learning context on learning styles. As Sternberg (1994) claims, the learner may develop and prefer a certain learning style that is most fulfilling. Thus, it can be assumed that obtaining good grades or exam scores rather than successful communication as rewards to Korean English learners for instance, certain learning styles that facilitate the coveted rewards would be favored.

2.2 Learning Styles as an Attribute of Successful Language Learners

Willing (1988) identified learning styles to investigate adult immigrant

English learners in Australia. The learning styles are communicative, authority-oriented, analytical, and concrete styles. Communicative learners are active to learn a language for communicative purposes such as talking, listening, or being involved in conversations. Authority-oriented learners are rather passive and feel the need for the teacher's guidance. Analytical learners can be described as active and like to analyze language structures autonomously. Concrete learners are passive and like a close and unstructured type of interaction rather than conventional class conversations (ibid.: 150-56). This classification of learning styles has long been used as one of the characteristics of successful language learners. Wong and Nunan (2011) using Willing's learning styles provided evidence that the more 'effective' learners tend to be the ones who favor the communicative style while the authority-oriented learning style was found to be most pervasive amongst the less 'effective' learners.

It can be said then that communicative learning style is the most salient characteristic of good language learners. As Willing (1994: 153) suggests, "self-directedness" and "interaction" for communication are critical in language learning. In the same vein, Brown (2007: 145) argues that good language learners have a tendency to "find ways to continue learning the language outside of the classroom". Evidently, this does not appear common among the majority of Korean L2 learners whose learning goal and context are far from being communicative.

A number of research projects have studied the Korean L2 learners' learning styles in Korea. Yoon-Kyoung Kim and Tae-Young Kim (2011) explored Korean secondary school students' perceptual learning styles, and Chang-In Lee and Rashmi (2003) analyzed problems regarding the Korean students' learning styles and strategies. Kyung-Ja Kim (2007) examined the relation between English achievement and learning styles. She compared different majors of Korean college students and found that English majors

preferred the visual learning style most while the auditory style was most favored among the information technology majors.

The difference between the present study and the previous research lies in the comparison of English majors in two distinct learning contexts. It contrasts with most of the previous studies in the limited number of courses in the general English program given to non-English majors in the L2 learning. In particular, to date no similar study has been carried out which directly compares English majors in a conventional learning context with those exposed to various communicative activities through English-medium instruction (EMI).

Research Questions

1. How do different learning contexts bring about diverse learning styles?
2. Do higher (or lower) proficiency learners¹ tend to be more (or less) susceptible to the effect of learning context on learning styles?
3. Are there any relations between L2 exposure in class and oral proficiency?

III. Methodology

3.1 Participants

A total of 137 college students participated in the study. They were 70 and 67 English-related majors respectively at local universities in Korea. The learning environment of the conventional learning context group

¹ The more successful learner is the one in the 'higher proficiency group' in the study whose TOEIC score is higher than the average of the given learning context group.

(hereafter conventional LC group) was mainly based on Korean-medium lecture style of instruction in large class size (over 50 students in a class). The learning context of the other group (hereafter communicative LC group), on the other hand, was far from being conventional. The class size was relatively small since there were only 20-25 students in each year, and classrooms had a layout suitable for group activities and discussions. All the courses provided English-Medium Instruction (EMI) including assignments and exams. Further, the courses required the students to participate in various types of pair and group activities as well as oral presentations in English.

At the initial step of procedures, TOEIC scores of the participants were collected to select the higher or lower proficiency learners. Each learning context group was divided into two sub-groups according to the mean of TOEIC score. In the conventional LC group (mean 765), 34 participants whose TOEIC score of higher than the group mean were assigned to 'higher proficiency group' and 36 participants to 'lower proficiency group'. In the communicative LC group (mean 590), 32 participants were assigned to 'higher proficiency group' and 35 to 'lower proficiency group'.

<Table 1> Participants

	Sub-group	N	TOEIC	Oral Proficiency	Language in class
Conventional LC group	lower	36	680	1.50	Korean
	higher	34	850	2.64	
Communicative LC group	lower	35	440	1.39	English
	higher	32	740	3.63	

3.2 Materials and Procedure

The participants responded to a survey which was adopted and revised from Willing (1988) and Wong and Nunan (2011). It was a three-page-long questionnaire that included their learning styles, target language exposure, and self-rated oral proficiency. Moreover, the participants' perception of the reasons for either their L2 improvement or the stationary state of their English learning was added as an open-ended question² to the study.

3.3 Data Collection and Analysis

First, the responses in each section were collected manually and organized using Microsoft Excel program. Second, the data were fed to the statistics program SPSS 22. Descriptive statistics were initially used for both groups' learning styles. Third, to compare the learning styles in the two learning context groups, independent-samples t-test was used. Fourth, in order to investigate the factors influencing the differing learning styles, Pearson Correlation coefficients were used for relationship between oral proficiency and L2 exposure in class.

IV. Results

4.1 The Learning Styles between the Two Different Learning Contexts

Learning styles favored among the participants were examined for any differences of learning styles between the two different learning contexts

² The question is "What are the reasons why you improved/ didn't improve English?"

and between the higher proficiency (higher than average) and lower proficiency (lower than average) L2 learners in each group. The study further explored other factors concerning successful L2 learning such as the relationship between L2 exposure in class and oral proficiency, and learners' perception of their success or failure in the advancement of second language acquisition.

<Table 2> Learning Styles of Learners in the Conventional LC Group

Conventional LC group	Ranks	Mean	Std.
communicative	1	17.26	3.40
authority	2	16.21	3.30
concrete	3	15.96	2.85
analytical	4	14.71	3.07

Table 2 shows the learning styles of the learners in the conventional LC group. The communicative style was found to be the most prevalent among the learners, followed by the authority style while the analytical style was the least favored.

<Table 3> Learning Styles of Learners in the Communicative LC Group

Communicative LC group	Ranks	Mean	Std.
communicative	1	18.30	3.04
concrete	2	17.27	3.16
authority	3	14.52	2.68
analytical	4	13.45	3.23

As shown in Table 3, the learners in the communicative LC group favored the communicative style most, followed by the concrete style while the analytical style was the least preferred among the learners.

The most favored learning styles were the same in both learning contexts; however, the difference was found in the second most favored styles (authority and concrete style).

<Table 4> Difference of the Authority Style between the Two Learning Contexts

	Conventional LC		Communicative LC		t	df	p
	group (N=70)		group (N=67)				
	M	SD	M	SD			
Authority	16.21	3.30	14.52	2.68	3.29	135	.00

In Table 4, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the difference of the authority style between the two learning contexts. There was significant difference in scores for the learners in the conventional LC group (M=16.21, SD=3.30) and learners in the communicative LC group [M=14.52, SD=2.68; t(135)=3.29, p=.00]. The magnitude of the differences in the means was moderate (eta squared³=.07).

<Table 5> Difference of the Concrete Style between the Two Learning Context Groups

	Conventional LC		Communicative LC		t	df	p
	group (N=70)		group (N=67)				
	M	SD	M	SD			
Concrete	15.96	2.85	17.27	3.16	-2.56	135	.012

As shown in Table 5, there was a significant difference in scores for the learners in the conventional LC group (M=15.96, SD=2.85) and learners in the communicative LC group [M=17.27, SD=3.16; t(135)=-2.56, p=.012]. The size of the differences in the means was small (eta squared⁴=.05).

$$^3 \text{ eta squared} = \frac{t^2}{t^2 + (N_1 + N_2 - 2)}$$

$$^4 \text{ eta squared} = \frac{t^2}{t^2 + (N_1 + N_2 - 2)}$$

4.2 Difference between Higher and Lower Proficiency Learners in Different Learning Contexts

To further answer the research question whether different learning contexts bring about diverse learning styles, higher proficiency group as well as lower proficiency group in two different learning contexts were compared respectively.

<Table 6> Learning Style of Higher English Proficiency Learners - Conventional LC Group

Higher proficiency learners	Ranks	Mean	Std.
communicative	1	18.53	3.25
concrete	2	16.32	2.78
authority	3	15.97	3.70
analytical	4	15.12	3.27

Table 6 shows the learning styles of higher English proficiency learners in the conventional LC group. The communicative style was found to be the most favored, followed by the concrete style while the analytical style was the least preferred with a narrow margin to the authority style.

<Table 7> Learning Style of Higher English Proficiency Group - Communicative LC Group

Higher proficiency learners	Ranks	Mean	Std.
communicative	1	19.75	2.85
concrete	2	17.06	3.31
analytical	3	14.75	3.13
authority	4	14.69	2.82

Table 7 shows the learning styles of higher English proficiency learners in the communicative LC group. The communicative style was found to be the most favored, followed by the concrete style, which is consistent with

the results from the conventional LC group. The authority style was the least preferred with a small difference from the analytical style. The learning styles of higher English proficiency learners were not distinctively different between both learning context groups.

<Table 8> Learning Style of Lower English Proficiency Learners -
Conventional LC Group

Lower proficiency learners	Ranks	Mean	Std.
authority	1	16.44	2.91
communicative	2	16.06	3.13
concrete	3	15.61	2.90
analytical	4	14.33	2.85

Table 8 shows that the authority style was found to be the most favored among the lower English proficiency learners in the conventional LC group, followed by the communicative style. The analytical style was the least preferred among the learners.

<Table 9> Learning Style of Lower English Proficiency Learners -
Communicative LC Group

Lower proficiency learners	Ranks	Mean	Std.
concrete	1	17.46	3.042
communicative	2	16.97	2.60
authority	3	14.37	2.57
analytical	4	12.26	2.87

As shown in Table 9, the lower English proficiency learners in the communicative LC group most preferred the concrete style which ranked third by those in the conventional LC group. The authority style, most favored in the conventional LC group, however, ranked third. The differences between the learning context groups lie in the concrete and authority style.

<Table 10> Difference of the Concrete Style between the Lower English Proficiency Learners in the Two Learning Context Groups

	Conventional LC		Communicative LC		t	df	p
	group (N=36)		group (N=35)				
	M	SD	M	SD			
Concrete	15.61	2.90	17.46	3.04	-2.62	69	.01

In Table 10, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the difference of the concrete style between the lower English proficiency learners in the two learning context groups. There was significant difference in scores for the learners in the conventional LC group (M=15.61, SD=2.90) and learners in the communicative LC group [M=17.46, SD=3.04; t(69)=-2.62, p=.01]. The magnitude of the differences in the means was moderate (eta squared⁵=.09).

<Table 11> Difference of the Authority Style between the Lower English Proficiency Learners in the Two Learning Context Groups

	Conventional LC		Communicative LC		t	df	p
	group (N=36)		group (N=35)				
	M	SD	M	SD			
Authority	16.44	2.91	14.37	2.57	3.18	69	.00

As shown in Table 11, there was significant difference in authority style for the lower English proficiency learners in the conventional LC group (M=16.44, SD=2.91) and those in the communicative LC group [M=14.37, SD=2.57; t(69)=3.18, p=.00]. The magnitude of the differences in the means was relatively large (eta squared⁶=.13).

⁵ eta squared= $\frac{t^2}{t^2+(N1+N2-2)}$

So far the research questions regarding learning styles as an attribute of successful language learners and the relation to learning contexts were answered. As supplementary information, target language exposure in class and learners' perception were taken into consideration.

4.3 Additional Findings for Pedagogical Considerations

The survey included supplementary information for pedagogical considerations. First, it concerns the relations between L2 exposure in class and oral proficiency, and second the participants' perception of the reasons for either their L2 improvement or the stationary state of their English learning.

<Table 12> Correlations between L2 Exposure in Class and Oral Proficiency

	L2 exposure in class	Oral Proficiency
Pearson Correlation	1	.22**
Sig. (2-tailed)		.01
N	137	137

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In Table 12, the relationship between L2 exposure in class and oral proficiency was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. There was a small positive correlation, $r=.22$, $n=137$, $p<.01$. That is, the higher amount of L2 exposure in class was provided for the L2 learners, the higher oral proficiency was observed.

$${}^6 \text{ eta squared} = \frac{t^2}{t^2 + (N_1 + N_2 - 2)}$$

<Table 13> Learners' Perception on the Reasons for their Improvement in English

Conventional LC group	Responses	Communicative LC group	Responses
L2 exposure	31	L2 exposure	29
Psychological factors	12	Psychological factors	28
Preparation for TOEIC	2	Others	3
Efforts to think in English	1		

Table 13 shows that L2 Learners in the two learning context groups attributed their success in English learning to L2 exposure most, followed by psychological factors such as confidence, interest, and motivation.

<Table 14> Learners' Perception on the Reasons for their Failure in Advancement of English

Conventional LC group	Responses	Communicative LC group	Responses
Lack of L2 exposure	17	No efforts	11
Teaching methods in Korea	10	Psychological factors	8
Psychological factors	9	Lack of basic grammar and vocabulary	6
Others	2	Others	6

As shown in Table 14, in contrast with the learners' perception of the reasons for the improvement in English found to be similar in both learning context groups, the reasons for their failure in advancement of English were different between both groups. Learners in the conventional LC group attributed the reason to their lack of L2 exposure most, followed by teaching methods in Korea. Those in the communicative LC group perceived that lack of effort was the primary reason.

The psychological factors as reasons for their improvement in English in Table 13 were similar in the two groups. However, the 'psychological factors' as reasons for their failure in advancement of English in Table 14

were different in both groups. Learners in the conventional LC group identified the psychological reasons for their failure as ‘anxiety of making mistakes’ and ‘lack of confidence in speaking in English’, while those in the communicative LC group attributed their failure to ‘lack of interests in learning English’.

V. Discussion

5.1 Learning Style Preferences

The findings of the study indicate that the higher proficiency learners in both learning contexts favored the communicative style. Similar results can be found in Wong and Nunan (2011) using Willing’s (1994) survey which is most relevant to the present study. Considering that there have been local studies whose findings have found to be inconsistent with research overseas (e.g., Kyung-Ja Kim, 2007 vs. Reid, 1987), it is necessary to take into consideration the possible difference of learning contexts in the studies at this point.

There was sufficient evidence in the present study to suggest that the learning context may have affected the learners’ preference of learning styles. The effect of learning contexts was evident in the results from the lower proficiency learners. These subjects in the conventional LC group favored the authority style, which is consistent with Wong and Nunan (2011). According to their findings, the less successful learners “do better in ‘traditional’ classrooms and look on teachers as authority figures” (152). Considering the conventional Korean-medium lecture style of instruction in the large-sized class that the learners in the conventional LC group were provided, this result does not seem surprising.

In comparison, the concrete style was favored by the lower proficiency learners in the communicative LC group. It is probable that the concrete style (e.g., ‘In class, I like to learn by games’; ‘In class, I like to learn by pictures, films, video’) had been developed or reinforced in the learning context. The majority of the lower proficiency learners in this group inclined to choose elective courses full of games and activities. Even the theory-focused required classes less favored by these learners also promoted various types of group tasks and active discussions, which is distinctively different from any conventional instruction. Even if they were apathetic towards active learning, they may have found the classes in the program less rigid and humdrum than the conventional classes they had taken in their secondary schools. This may have induced their preference to the concrete style. Given that thinking styles may vary cross culturally which may in turn influence the learning styles (Zhang & Sternberg, 2001) and learning styles are “habits rather than intractable biological attributes” (Reid, 1987: 100), it is possible that the learners' learning styles may have changed during their university studies compared to the conventional ones they had experienced in their high schools.

Furthermore, given Kyung-Ja Kim's (2007) findings that different learning styles may be favored by different majors, the course of study that the learners have majored in may also have contributed to the results of the present study. The learners in the communicative LC group may have learned ‘how to learn’ from the required courses such as ‘second language acquisition’, and ‘instructional methodologies⁷’, and the higher proficiency learners may have been able to effectively adopt this knowledge about ‘how to learn’ to their own L2 learning. This explanation seems convincing considering Wenden's (1991: 15) claim that “successful” learners know “how to learn”.

⁷ Those courses were not provided as required courses for the learners in the conventional LC group.

5.2 Further Considerations on Successful L2 Learning

Higher proficiency L2 Learners in both learning context groups attributed their success in English learning primarily to L2 exposure. Nonetheless, L2 exposure was more readily available to the learners in the communicative learning context where English was required for communication in class. Contrary to average TOEIC score (mean 765) which is higher in the conventional LC group than in the communicative LC group (mean 590), self-rated oral proficiency⁸ was relatively higher in communicative LC group (mean 2.51) than in conventional LC group (mean 2.07). The finding that there was a positive correlation ($r=.22$, $n=137$, $p<.01$) between the L2 exposure in class and oral proficiency supports the higher oral proficiency in communicative LC group. That is, those learners who were provided with the higher amount of L2 exposure in class rated themselves higher in oral proficiency. Moreover, lower proficiency learners in the conventional LC group attributed the first reason for their failure in advancement of English to 'lack of L2 exposure', which is distinct from the primary reason in the communicative LC group ('no efforts in English learning'). This implies that counter to the higher proficiency learners with learner autonomy, the lower proficiency learners may be more vulnerable to the lack of L2 exposure in the given learning context.

It must also be noted that the category 'teaching methods in Korea' was perceived as the second reason for the failure by the lower proficiency learners in the conventional LC group. The learners claimed that teaching methods in Korea focus on reading and translation, which are less conducive to language production. As Benson and Nunan (2005) stress, the

⁸ Mean '2' can be interpreted as "I can participate in short social and business conversations in English. I can use the past and future to talk about everyday subjects" (Wong & Nunan 2011: 156).

language learning is promoted through communication and the approach should be different from other subjects such as science.

The responses were also different from the two learning context groups despite being in the same category 'psychological factors'. 'Anxiety of making mistakes' and 'lack of confidence in speaking in English' were reported by the learners in the conventional LC group as the reasons for their failure, which is presumably influenced by the teaching environment. In contrast, the lower proficiency learners in the communicative LC group reported the 'lack of interest' as the psychological reason for their failure.

There are pedagogical suggestions based on the findings of the study. As Peacock (2001) points out, it is important to match learning style and teaching style for an effective L2 learning. Given that certain learning styles may be reinforced due to the learning context or class culture, the communicative learning style found to be most effective in the present study as well as in other research studies (e.g., Wong & Nunan, 2011) should therefore be promoted in the English classes in Korea. As Dörnyei (2001) insists, it is the teacher that can change the learners' motivation to 'demotivation' and vice versa. As such, these findings should serve as catalyst for English education reform in Korea.

VI. Conclusion

The study explored learning styles in different learning contexts. The learning context effect was evident among the lower proficiency learners in addition to being susceptible to the teaching methods. As such, the conventional learning context may lead to the authority style approach while a learning context that supports hands-on activities and communication may prompt the communicative learning context group to

prefer the concrete style. This study has some limitations. The findings seem convincing but there may be other factors affecting the learners' learning styles such as personality and gender differences.

Notwithstanding the time and effort most Korean L2 learners expend on their English learning, it would appear reasonable that successful L2 learning should not be left to autonomous learning efforts. It is time to evolve from conventional to communicative teaching methods. More careful considerations should be given to learning style and learning contexts in Korea.

Works Cited

- Benson, Phil, and David Nunan (eds). *Learners' Stories: Difference and Diversity in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.
- Brown, Douglas. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. 5th ed. New York: Pearson Education Inc., 2007. Print.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. Harlow, UK: Longman, 2001. Print.
- _____. *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005. Print.
- Dunn, Rita Stafford, and Kenneth Dunn. *Teaching Students through Their Individual Learning Styles: A Practical Approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: RestonBook, 1978. Print.
- Kamińska, Patrycja Marta. *Learning Styles and Second Language Education*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014. Print.
- Kim, Kyung Ja. "Predicting English Achievement Using Learning Styles of Korean EFL College Students." *English Language & Literature Teaching* 13.1 (2007): 27-46. Web. 8 Aug. 2015.
- Kim, Yoon-Kyoung, and Tae-Young Kim. "The Effect of Korean Secondary School Students' Perceptual Learning Styles and Ideal L2 Self on Motivated L2 Behavior and English Proficiency." *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 11.1 (2011): 21-42. Web. 8 Aug. 2015.
- Kinsella, Kate, and Kathy Sherak. "Designing ESL Classroom Collaboration to

- Accommodate Diverse Work Styles.” *Understanding Learning Styles in Second Language Classroom*. Ed. Reid J. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1998. 85-99. Print.
- Lee, Chang-In, and Dash Rashmi. “Critical Analysis of Problems Associated with the Learning Styles and Strategies of Korean Students.” *The Journal of Studies in Language* 19.1 (2003): 101-21. Web. 8 Aug. 2015.
- Norton, Bonny, and Kelleen Toohey. “Changing Perspectives on Good Language Learners.” *TESOL Quarterly* 35.2 (2001): 307-22. Web. 1 Aug. 2015.
- Peacock, Matthew. “Match or Mismatch? Learning Styles and Teaching Styles in EFL.” *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11.1 (2001): 1-20. Web. 8 Aug. 2015.
- Reid, Joym. “The Learning Style Preferences of ESL Students.” *TESOL Quarterly* 21.1 (1987): 87-111. Web. 8 Aug. 2016.
- _____. *Learning Styles in the ESL/EFL Classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 1995. Print.
- Sternberg, Robert, and Elena Grigorenko. “A Capsule History of Theory and Research on Styles.” *Perspectives on Thinking, Learning, and Cognitive Styles*. Eds. R. J. Sternberg & Li-Fang Zhang. London: Lawrence Earlbaum Publishers, 2001. 1-21. Print.
- Sternberg, Robert. “Allowing for Thinking Styles.” *Educational Leadership* 52.3 (1994): 36-40. Web. 5 Aug. 2015.
- Wenden, Anita. *Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy*. London: Prentice Hall, 1991. Print.
- Willing, Ken. *Learning Strategies in Adult Migrant Education*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, 1994. Web. 8 Aug. 2016.
- _____. *Learning Styles in Adult Migrant Education*. Adelaide, Australia: NCRC research series, 1988. Web. 8 Aug. 2016.
- Wong, Lillian, and David Nunan. “The Learning Styles and Strategies of Effective Language Learners.” *System* 39 (2011): 144-63. Web. 8 Aug. 2015.

Nam, Hyun-Jeong

Dept. of English language & literature, Dong-A university,

#37 550bun-gil, nakdongdae-ro, saha-gu, Busan, (49315), South Korea

E-mail: hjnam2016@dau.ac.kr

Received: 2016. 12. 27 / Reviewed: 2017. 02. 07 / Accepted: 2017. 02. 09

Appendix

Survey Questions

1. How many hours per week do you use English off campus?
 - a. Less than 1
 - b. 1-5
 - c. 6-10
 - d. more than 10
2. What percent of English-medium classes do you take?
0~20%, 21~40%, 41~60%, 61~80%, 81~100%
3. How important is English?
 - a. Extremely
 - b. Very
 - c. Somewhat
 - d. Not very
 - e. Not at all
4. How do you rate your level of English?
 - a. I know the vocabulary, expressions, and grammar to talk about basic subjects in English. I can talk about the past and the future.
 - b. I can participate in short social and business conversations in English. I can use the past and future to talk about everyday subjects.
 - c. I have the communication strategies to discuss most subjects in English. I know the vocabulary and expressions to use in most situations.
 - d. I can understand long conversations in English on unfamiliar topics. I have a solid understanding of English vocabulary and expressions.
 - e. I can participate fluently in English in most conversations and discussions on a variety of topics.
5. How do you enjoy learning English?
 - a. A great deal
 - b. A lot
 - c. Somewhat
 - d. Not very
 - e. Not at all

- | | | | | |
|---|----|----------|------|------|
| 6. In English class, I like to learn by reading. | no | a little | good | best |
| 7. In class, I like to listen and use cassettes. | no | a little | good | best |
| 8. In class, I like to learn by games. | no | a little | good | best |
| 9. In class, I like to learn by conversation. | no | a little | good | best |
| 10. In class, I like to learn by pictures, films, video. | no | a little | good | best |
| 11. I want to write everything in a notebook. | no | a little | good | best |
| 12. I like to have my own textbook. | no | a little | good | best |
| 13. I like the teacher to explain everything to us. | no | a little | good | best |
| 14. I like the teacher to give us problems to work on. | no | a little | good | best |
| 15. I like the teacher to tell me all my mistakes. | no | a little | good | best |
| 16. I like the teacher to let me find my mistakes. | no | a little | good | best |
| 17. I like to study English by myself. | no | a little | good | best |
| 18. I like to learn English by talking in pairs. | no | a little | good | best |
| 19. I like to go out with the class and practice English. | no | a little | good | best |
| 20. I like to study grammar. | no | a little | good | best |
| 21. I like to learn English words by seeing them. | no | a little | good | best |
| 22. I like to learn English words by hearing them. | no | a little | good | best |

23. At home, I like to learn by reading newspapers, etc.
no a little good best
24. At home, I like to learn by watching TV in English.
no a little good best
25. At home, I like to learn by using cassettes.
no a little good best
26. At home, I like to learn by studying English books.
no a little good best
27. I like to learn by talking to friends in English.
no a little good best
28. I like to learn by watching, listening to native speakers.
no a little good best
29. I like to learn by using English outside class in stores etc.
no a little good best
30. Why do you need to study English?
31. Choose one and explain
A: What are the reasons why you improved English?
B: What are the reasons why you didn't improve English?