

A Comparative Study on Speaking Strategy Use of EFL College Students in Japan and Bangladesh

Tadashi NISHIDA (Hiroshima University)
Mst. Moriam QUADIR (Hiroshima University)

要旨 本論は日本とバングラデシュの大学生 EFL 学習者が使用するスピーキング方略を比較考察したものである。両国の大学生 165 人に Cohen and Chi (2004) のスピーキング方略に関する質問紙と Oxford (1990) の SILL の一部を実施して得たデータに、大学生のスピーキング能力の自己評価を加えて、両国の英語学習者間に見られるスピーキング方略の使用頻度の相違と自己評価によるスピーキング能力との関連を調査した。

1. Introduction

In recent years research investigating the impact of culture on the preferences of language learning strategies has become increasingly important. Learners' tendency in using EFL learning strategies in Asian regions has been brought into focus by language scholars and researchers (e.g., Kim, 1995; Oh, 1996; Park, 1997; Takeuchi & Wakamoto, 2001). Speaking skill being a foreign language learning skill, speaking strategy is a crucial part of overall language learning strategy. Speaking strategies are assumed to be used by foreign and second language learners to improve their oral performance in the target language. In Japan and Bangladesh, a large number of students are majoring in English at the university level every year. The EFL learners of these countries use speaking strategies to enhance their speaking proficiency in English.

Little research has been done on the use of English-speaking strategies of EFL-major college students in Bangladesh or in Japan. This study aims to provide information about EFL-major college students' tendency to use English speaking strategies in these two different cultures.

The major purposes of this study are 1) to investigate the frequency differences in the speaking strategies used by the EFL-major university students in Japan and Bangladesh, and 2) to identify the relationship of nationality, gender, and self-evaluated speaking level with the preferences of speaking strategy use.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

A total number of 165 EFL-major university students from Japan and Bangladesh participated in this study. 102 Japanese (70 females and 32 males) and 63 Bangladeshi (26 females and 37 males) students were native speakers of the nationality they belong to. The Japanese participants were students of the Department of English, Faculty of Education, Hiroshima University and the Bangladeshi participants were students of the Department of English, Arts Faculty, University of Dhaka. Their academic grades ranged from undergraduate to graduate levels.

2.2 Instruments

The instrument used for the study was a combination of adapted and simplified items selected from 'Language Strategy Use Survey' (Cohen & Chi, obtained from the internet on July 17, 2004) and 'The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning' (SILL) version 7.0 (Oxford, 1990). The speaking strategies had been exclusively selected from the above sets in order to compose the questionnaire for this study. The 14 item instrument required the respondents to report the frequency with which they use each EFL speaking strategy using a five-point scale ranging from 'almost never' to 'always' (see Appendix 1). The numerical rating scales were 'almost never=1', 'rarely sometimes=2', 'sometimes=3', 'usually=4', and 'always=5'. The questionnaire supplied among the Bangladeshi students was in simple English and the Japanese translated version was used for Japanese students. The internal consistency reliability on Cronbach's alpha is .79 based on a 165 university student sample (in the current study).

The taxonomy was based on the following five categories classified by Stern (1992):

1. Management & planning (Question items No. 2 and No. 8, Appendix 1)
2. Cognitive (Question items No. 7, No. 9, No. 11, and No. 14)
3. Communicative-experiential (Question items No. 5 and No. 10)
4. Interpersonal (Question items No.1, No. 12, and No. 13)
5. Affective (Question items No. 3, No. 4, and No. 6)

According to Stern (1992), management & planning strategies express the learners' intention to direct their own learning, as they decide what commitment to make to language learning, set themselves reasonable goals, decide appropriate methodology and resources and monitor progress. Cognitive strategies are defined as steps and operations used in learning and problem solving, for example, practice, clarification, verification, memorization, monitoring, guessing, and inductive inferencing. Communicative-experiential strategies include circumlocution, gesturing, paraphrase, and asking for repetition used by the learners

so as to keep the conversation going. Interpersonal strategies help the learners to monitor their own development in using the language in real life situations and to become familiar with the target language culture. Affective strategies are those that help the learners to regulate their emotions or attitude and to remove the feelings of strangeness and anxiety to communicate in a new language.

A self-evaluation format attached to the questionnaire asked the participants to report their own levels of English speaking skill on a four-point scales as “poor”, “fair”, “good” and “excellent” and 10, 20, 30, 40 points were given to the levels respectively. A note was provided within the format in order to help the participants’ self-rating.

2.3 Procedures

The data were collected in Bangladesh in September, 2004 and in Japan in January, 2005. The participants were assured that the results would not influence their academic reports and were encouraged to resolve any confusion by asking questions. Most of the participants had no difficulty in understanding the questionnaire. Full confidentiality was confirmed in both settings. The questionnaire administration took 15 to 25 minutes. The analysis of the data was carried out using ANOVA4 on the Web: Copyright (c) 2002 Kiriki Kenshi and the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 13.0. The participants were divided into four groups: Japanese females (Group 1), Japanese males (Group 2), Bangladeshi females (Group 3), and Bangladeshi males (Group 4). A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with repeated-measures was performed with group and strategy as the independent variables and scores on the questionnaire as the dependent variable.

3. Results

3.1 Group and strategy uses

The means and standard deviations of strategy use scores of the four groups are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Means and standard deviations of different category strategy use (N=165)

Categories		MP	C	CE	IP	A
Groups	<i>n</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Group 1	70	3.43 (.58)	3.27 (.66)	3.78 (.69)	3.11 (.59)	2.95 (.67)
Group 2	32	3.30 (.63)	2.76 (.69)	3.48 (.93)	3.11 (.70)	2.89 (.79)
Group 3	26	3.40 (.68)	3.90 (.46)	3.92 (.76)	3.91 (.39)	2.86 (.82)
Group 4	37	3.73 (.72)	3.99 (.74)	3.84 (.88)	3.68 (.66)	3.03 (.84)

MP: Management & planning, C: Cognitive, CE: Communicative-experiential, IP: Interpersonal, A: Affective

Group1: Japanese females, Group2: Japanese males, Group3: Bangladeshi females, Group4: Bangladeshi males

Table 2: Analysis of variance

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Groups	35.45	3	11.82	10.79	.000****
Error	176.34	161	1.10		
Strategy category	51.58	4	12.90	38.47	.000****
Group x Strategy category	26.77	12	2.23	6.66	.000****
Error	215.87	644	.34		

****p<.001

The results in Table 2 reveal that the main effects of the group and strategy category were significant and the interaction between them was also significant.

Table 3: Analysis of variance with repeated-measures (N=165)

Effect	SS	df	MS	F	P
Group (MP)	3.73	3	1.24	2.55	.054 +
Group (C)	36.07	3	12.02	24.68	.000 ****
Group (CE)	3.92	3	1.31	2.68	.046 *
Group (IP)	17.83	3	5.94	12.20	.000 ****
Group (A)	.66	3	.22	.46	.713
Error		805	.48		
Category (Group 1)	14.60	4	3.65	10.88	.000****
Category (Group 2)	12.59	4	3.14	9.40	.000****
Category (Group 3)	31.82	4	7.96	23.73	.000****
Category (Group 4)	19.34	4	4.84	14.43	.000****
Error		644	.34		

MP: Management & planning, C: Cognitive, CE: Communicative-experiential, IP: Interpersonal, A: Affective

*p<.05 ****p<.001

Table 3 shows that there were statistically significant frequency differences among the groups in cognitive [$F(3,805) = 24.68, p < .001$], communicative-experiential [$F(3,805) = 2.68, p = .046$] and interpersonal [$F(3,805) = 12.20, p < .001$] strategies. The multiple comparison

test with repeated measures was then performed to find out how the groups differed in using these two categories at $p < .001$ (see Table 4 & 5).

Table 4: Multiple comparison test (N=165) (Cognitive strategy use)

Pair (group)	<i>r</i>	nominal level	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> level	Significance
4-2	4	.008	7.292	.000	<i>s.</i>
4-1	3	.012	5.040	.000	<i>s.</i>
3-2	3	.012	6.218	.000	<i>s.</i>
4-3	2	.025	.463	.643	<i>n.s.</i>
3-1	2	.025	3.945	.000	<i>s.</i>
1-2	2	.025	3.448	.000	<i>s.</i>

Group1: Japanese females, Group2: Japanese males, Group3: Bangladeshi females, Group4: Bangladeshi males

Group 4, Group 3 > Group 1 > Group 2

For cognitive strategy use there was a statistically significant difference ($t=3.448$, $p < .001$) between the Japanese females and males. Here the females showed higher score ($M=3.27$) than their male ($M=2.76$) peers. The difference between the genders was not found significant ($t=0.463$, $p=.64$) in the Bangladeshi learners. In this category a significant difference was revealed between the Japanese and the Bangladeshi learners [Group 1-3 ($t=3.945$, $p < .001$), Group 2-3 ($t=6.218$, $p < .001$), Group 1-4 ($t=5.040$, $p < .001$), Group 2-4 ($t=7.292$, $p < .001$)]. The Bangladeshi learners (female: $M=3.90$, male: $M=3.99$) reported more frequent cognitive strategy use than the Japanese learners (female: $M=3.27$, male: $M=2.76$).

Table 5: Multiple comparison test (N=165) (Interpersonal strategy use)

Pair(group)	<i>r</i>	nominal level	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> level	Significance
3-1	4	.008	5.005	.000	<i>s.</i>
3-2	3	.012	4.305	.000	<i>s.</i>
4-1	3	.012	4.067	.000	<i>s.</i>
3-4	2	.025	1.261	.207	<i>n.s.</i>
4-2	2	.025	3.372	.000	<i>s.</i>
2-1	2	.025	.060	.952	<i>n.s.</i>

Group1: Japanese females, Group2: Japanese males, Group3: Bangladeshi females, Group4: Bangladeshi males

Group 3, Group 4 > Group 1, Group 2

In interpersonal strategy use there was no significant difference between the genders,

but a statistically significant difference in the strategy use frequency was found between the Japanese and the Bangladeshi learners [Group 1-3 ($t=5.005$, $p<.001$), Group 2-3 ($t=4.305$, $p<.001$), Group 1-4 ($t=4.067$, $p<.001$), Group 2-4 ($t=3.372$, $p<.001$)]. Here also the Bangladeshi learners (female: $M=3.91$, male: $M=3.68$) reported higher use of this strategy than the Japanese learners (female: $M=3.11$, male: $M=3.11$). In the other three categories, management & planning, communicative-experiential and affective strategies no significant difference was revealed among the four groups.

Table 6: Multiple comparison test (Japanese females: $N=70$)

Pair (category)	r	nominal level	t	p level	Significance
3-5	5	.005	8.442	.000	<i>s.</i>
3-4	4	.006	6.887	.000	<i>s.</i>
1-5	4	.006	4.865	.000	<i>s.</i>
3-2	3	.010	5.182	.000	<i>s.</i>
1-4	3	.010	3.311	.000	<i>s.</i>
2-5	3	.010	3.260	.001	<i>s.</i>
1-2	2	.020	1.606	.108	<i>n.s.</i>
3-1	2	.020	3.576	.000	<i>s.</i>
2-4	2	.020	1.705	.088	<i>n.s.</i>
4-5	2	.020	1.555	.120	<i>n.s.</i>

1: Management & planning, 2: Cognitive, 3: Communicative-experiential, 4: Interpersonal 5: Affective

Category 3 > Category 1 & 2 > Category 4 & 5

Table 6 shows that the Japanese female students used communicative-experiential strategy ($M=3.78$) significantly more frequently than the other four categories. The next preferred categories by this group were management & planning ($M=3.43$) and cognitive ($M=3.27$) strategies. The least used strategies of this group were interpersonal ($M=3.10$) and affective ($M=2.95$) strategies. The Japanese male learners showed a slightly different strategy use tendency from their female peers. They reported that they used three categories almost with the same frequency; these are communicative-experiential ($M=3.48$), management & planning ($M=3.30$) and interpersonal ($M=3.11$) strategies. Affective ($M=2.89$) and cognitive ($M=2.76$) strategies were the least frequently used categories by this group (see Table 7).

Table 7: Multiple comparison test (Japanese males: N=32)

Pair (category)	<i>r</i>	nominal level	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> level	Significance
3-2	5	.005	5.020	.000	<i>s.</i>
3-5	4	.006	4.137	.000	<i>s.</i>
1-2	4	.006	3.724	.000	<i>s.</i>
3-4	3	.010	2.563	.010	<i>n.s.</i>
1-5	3	.010	2.841	.004	<i>s.</i>
4-2	3	.010	2.457	.014	<i>n.s.</i>
1-4	2	.020	1.267	.205	<i>n.s.</i>
3-1	2	.020	1.295	.195	<i>n.s.</i>
4-5	2	.020	1.574	.115	<i>n.s.</i>
5-2	2	.020	.883	.377	<i>n.s.</i>

1: Management & planning, 2: Cognitive, 3: Communicative-experiential, 4: Interpersonal, 5: Affective

Category 3, 1 & 4 > Category 5 & 2

Table 8: Multiple comparison test (Bangladeshi females: N=26)

Pair (category)	<i>r</i>	nominal level	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> level	Significance
3-5	5	.005	6.647	.000	<i>s.</i>
3-1	4	.006	3.234	.001	<i>s.</i>
4-5	4	.006	6.546	.000	<i>s.</i>
3-2	3	.010	.120	.904	<i>n.s.</i>
4-1	3	.010	3.133	.001	<i>s.</i>
2-5	3	.010	6.527	.000	<i>s.</i>
4-2	2	.020	.019	.984	<i>n.s.</i>
3-4	2	.020	.101	.919	<i>n.s.</i>
2-1	2	.020	3.114	.001	<i>s.</i>
1-5	2	.020	3.413	.000	<i>s.</i>

1: Management & planning, 2: Cognitive, 3: Communicative-experiential, 4: Interpersonal, 5: Affective

Category 3, 4 & 2 > Category 1 > Category 5

The Bangladeshi female learners reported that they used three categories, the communicative-experiential ($M=3.92$), interpersonal ($M=3.91$), and cognitive ($M=3.90$) strategies with almost the same frequency. Next came management & planning ($M=3.40$) strategy. The least preferred category of this group was the affective ($M=2.86$) strategy (see Table 8). The strategy use tendency of the Bangladeshi male students was found to use four

categories, cognitive ($M=3.99$), communicative-experiential ($M=3.84$), management & planning ($M=3.73$) and interpersonal ($M=3.68$) strategies with almost the same frequency. The affective ($M=3.03$) strategy was the least preferred by this group (see Table 9).

Table 9: Multiple comparison test (Bangladeshi males: $N=37$)

Pair (category)	r	nominal level	t	p level	Significance
2-5	5	.005	7.086	.000	<i>s.</i>
2-4	4	.006	2.265	.023	<i>n.s.</i>
3-5	4	.006	5.981	.000	<i>s.</i>
2-1	3	.010	1.907	.056	<i>n.s.</i>
3-4	3	.010	1.161	.246	<i>n.s.</i>
1-5	3	.010	5.178	.000	<i>s.</i>
3-1	2	.020	.803	.422	<i>n.s.</i>
2-3	2	.020	1.104	.269	<i>n.s.</i>
1-4	2	.020	.357	.720	<i>n.s.</i>
4-5	2	.020	4.821	.000	<i>s.</i>

1: Management & planning, 2: Cognitive, 3: Communicative-experiential, 4: Interpersonal, 5: Affective

Category 2, 3, 1 & 4 > Category 5

3.2 Correlations among the strategies

How the five categories of strategy were related to each other was tested on a Pearson correlation (2-tailed). Table 10 shows that in the case of the Japanese learners the strongest correlation was found between cognitive and interpersonal strategies ($r=.55$). Next came the correlation between cognitive and affective strategies ($r=.51$), followed by the correlation between affective and interpersonal strategies ($r=.49$). The relationships between cognitive and communicative strategies ($r=.44$) and between affective and communicative-experiential strategies ($r=.43$) came next. Then came the correlation between interpersonal and communication strategies ($r=.38$). The other correlations appeared to be weak according to the test. The weakest correlation was recorded between management & planning and affective strategies ($r=.10$). The inter-category correlations were stronger in the case of the Japanese subjects than the Bangladeshi subjects.

Table 10: Correlations among the strategy categories for the Japanese learners

Category	MP	C	CE	IP	A
MP	1				
C	.24*	1			
CE	.13	.44**	1		

IP	.25*	.55**	.38**	1	
A	.10	.51**	.43**	.49**	1

MP: Management & planning, C: Cognitive, CE: Communicative-experiential, IP: Interpersonal, A: Affective

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 11: Correlations among the strategy categories for the Bangladeshi learners

Category	MP	C	CE	IP	A
MP	1				
C	.13	1			
CE	.05	.37**	1		
IP	.05	.44**	.36**	1	
A	.30**	.31**	.28**	.21	1

MP: Management & planning, C: Cognitive, CE: Communicative-experiential, IP: Interpersonal, A: Affective

** $p < .01$

For the Bangladeshi learners the highest correlation was found between cognitive and interpersonal strategies ($r=.44$). Next came the relationship between cognitive and communicative-experiential strategies ($r=.37$), followed by interpersonal and communicative-experiential strategies ($r=.36$). Next correlations came between affective and cognitive strategies ($r=.31$) and then affective and management & planning strategies ($r=.30$). The other correlations were rather weak. The weakest correlations were found between management & planning and both interpersonal and communicative strategies ($r=.05$) (see Table 11). For both the Japanese and the Bangladeshi learners cognitive and affective strategies had the strongest relationship with other categories, indicating that the more the subjects of this study used cognitive and affective strategies, the more often they were inclined to use other categories too.

3.3 Strategy use and learners' self-evaluated speaking level

The relationship between different strategy use frequency and learners' self-evaluated speaking level is tested on a Pearson correlation (2-tailed). Table 12 represents the correlation test results. It appears that the correlations of the Japanese learners' strategy use category and their evaluation of speaking level were stronger than the Bangladeshi learners. It was found that the affective ($r=.65$) and interpersonal ($r=.64$) strategies had the strongest relation to self-evaluation. This implies that the use of these strategies gave the Japanese learners confidence that they possessed higher speaking skill. The Japanese learners who

reported that they often use the two strategies estimated their speaking levels high. Next came cognitive ($r=.57$) strategy, followed by communicative-experiential ($r=.51$) strategy. Management & planning strategy showed the weakest relationship with participants' speaking level evaluation. In the case of Bangladeshi learners the correlations were rather weaker. The highest correlation was found with cognitive strategy ($r=.46$), followed by communicative-experiential ($r=.44$) and interpersonal ($r=.41$) strategies. The other two strategy categories were not found to have significant correlations with subjects' own skill level evaluation. No negative correlation was found in any case.

Table 12: Relationship between strategy use and self-evaluation

Categories	Japan ($N=102$)	Bangladesh ($N=63$)
Management & Planning	.31**	.12
Cognitive	.57**	.46**
Communicative-experiential	.51**	.44**
Interpersonal	.64**	.41**
Affective	.65**	.12

** $p<.01$

3. Discussion

Some discrepancies in EFL learning background between Japan and Bangladesh are assumed to influence learners' tendencies in using EFL-speaking strategies. For a number of reasons the Bangladeshi learners are supposed to be more motivated in learning English and therefore in improving their speaking skill. In Japan, though the motivations to learn English are increasing rapidly, the background reasons are not as same as in Bangladesh.

One of the findings of the present study is that the Bangladeshi EFL-major students showed more frequent use of cognitive and interpersonal strategies than the Japanese students. The reasons behind this tendency are anticipated to be the severe unemployment problem, dependence on foreign investments, attraction to overseas education and employment that motivate the Bangladeshi learners to do active practice to improve their English speaking skill. Rahman (2005) indicates that in Bangladesh the tertiary level English learners have a strong instrumental motivation. Being competent in English is a fundamental qualification for securing a desirable job (Hamamoto, 2002) and for enhancing promotional prospects in the workplace as well. Oxford & Nyikos (1989) argue that the learners who are highly motivated to learn a language are likely to use specific strategies as well as overall strategies in general more frequently than the less motivated learners. Their interpersonal strategy use

tendency may be explained by the same contextual reasons in addition to social cultures in Bangladesh, where speaking English is considered prestigious as well as fashionable in educated society.

Gender difference in strategy use was not found to be significant in this study. Only in the cognitive strategy use did the Japanese females report significantly higher frequency than the males. It is interesting, however, that no other statistically significant difference between the two sexes was found from the two different cultures. These results appear to match other studies in Asian contexts. Kim (1995) found that there is no significant difference on language learning strategy use between males and females in his study on Korean adult ESL learners. In another study Lee (1994, cited in Lee, 2003) reported that there are differences in strategy use between the genders at the middle school level, but less difference or no difference can be observed as learners advance in their level. Again, Oh (1996) in his study on fishery college students in Pusan found no relationship between sexes and strategy use category preferences. He insisted that strategies were used frequently regardless of genders. These results, however, do not match the work by Maccoby & Jacklin (1974) who explain that females are superior to or at least very different from males in many social skills and that females show greater social orientation. In contrast, the Japanese females of this study reported significantly more frequent use of cognitive strategy rather than interpersonal strategy. Considering the results of the present study it could be concluded that strong interest of the university level EFL-major students might weaken or diminish gender differences on strategy use. The Affective strategy category was found to be common as the least preferred category by all the groups of participants. This finding indicates that these subjects made little effort to regulate their emotional anxieties that arise in speaking a foreign language. This tendency, however, corresponds with some recent studies on Asian background learners (Park, 1997; Lee, 2003). They found that Korean EFL students make the least use of affective strategy in learning English. Stern (1992) recommends that learning training can help students to face up to emotional difficulties and to overcome them by drawing attention to the potential frustrations or pointing them out as they arise. The least use of affective strategy by the subjects of this study might be caused by the social cultures both in Japan and Bangladesh, where they are not encouraged to modify the initial difficulties in speaking the foreign language.

Another finding of this study is that very similar correlations among the strategy categories were revealed between the Japanese and the Bangladeshi students. Cognitive and affective strategy had the strongest correlations with other strategy categories. Why these two categories had the strongest influence on the learners' strategy use was not clear.

However, considering the crucial role of taking appropriate steps and operations in learning English (cognitive strategy) and the effort to regulate emotional problems (affective strategy) to speak English might lead them to use other categories of strategies. Although affective strategy was found to be the least frequently used category, it had a strong influence on the subjects' whole process of speaking strategy use. This study also found that the Japanese learners who evaluated their speaking skill higher tended to use affective and interpersonal strategies more often than the low self-evaluated learners. This implies that the use of these strategies gave them confidence about their proficiency in speaking English. In contrast, the Bangladeshi subjects showed the strongest correlations with cognitive and communicative-experiential strategies to report high confidence in their speaking skill. It seems that active practice and the use of techniques to continue conversation overcoming a gap in knowledge made the Bangladeshi learners confident in evaluating their speaking skill.

4. Conclusion

This study sought to explore some tendencies of English-speaking strategies used by EFL-major university students in Japan and Bangladesh. In the comparison of strategy use frequency between the Japanese and the Bangladeshi EFL-major students, significant differences were reported in two categories, cognitive and interpersonal strategy. The different cultural, social and economic backgrounds are assumed to cause this difference in strategy use tendency.

According to the findings, no significant difference was found concerning category preference of speaking strategy use between the genders, except that the Japanese females recorded more frequent use of cognitive strategy than the males. Affective strategy was found to be the least preferred strategy by both genders of both cultures. The EFL students might benefit if they are made aware of this tendency. Proper classroom training may also help them in this regard.

In the correlations among the strategy categories, the Japanese learners showed stronger correlations than the Bangladeshi learners. In both cultures, however, cognitive and affective strategies were found to have the strongest correlations with other categories, indicating that the learners who used these two categories were inclined to use other categories too.

The correlations of different category strategy use with learners' self-evaluated speaking skill were found to be stronger for the Japanese subjects than the Bangladeshi subjects. The Japanese subjects showed that the use of affective and interpersonal strategies had the strongest relation to self-evaluation. On the other hand, the Bangladeshi learners indicated the greatest correlations among cognitive strategy, communicative-experiential strategy, and

self-evaluation.

Some limitations of this study need to be acknowledged, and the results should be interpreted with caution. We assumed that the two groups in this study were validly compared in terms of their use of speaking strategies because they were EFL-major university students. More information on their group characteristics, for example, English learning experiences before university, exposure to English in their classrooms, or motivation for studying English is needed. To collect data, a self-report questionnaire was administered at one university in each country. A greater number of students from different universities should participate in a future study. The present study had to depend on the learners' self reporting on their speaking levels since no official evaluation of their skill was available. Future studies need to correct these limitations so that more valid claims can be made about the differences and similarities between Japanese and Bangladeshi university students in their use of speaking strategies.

References

- Cohen, A. D., & Chi, J. C. (obtained from internet on July 17, 2004). *Language Strategy Use Survey*. Center for Advance Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota. USA. [Online] Available at: <http://www.carla.umn.edu/>.
- Hamamoto, S. (2002). A step forward to improve English language education in Bangladesh. *Asian English Studies*, 4, 85-97.
- Kim, Y. M. (1995). The effect of gender and learning context on the use of language learning strategies. *English Teaching*, 50, 331-345.
- 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*, AEF Forum, 5, Article-4. [Online] Available at: <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/>.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). *The physiology of sex differences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Oh, J. I. (1996). The effects of attitude and sex on use of EFL learner strategies. *English Teaching*, 51, 35-53.
- Oxford, R. L., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 291-300.
- Park, G. P. (1997). Language learning strategies and English proficiency in Korean university students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30, 211-221.
- Rahman, A. M. M. H. (1996). Acceptability and English curriculum change in Bangladesh. In R. J. Baumgardner (Ed.), *South Asian English: Structure, use, and users* (pp. 191-206).

Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois.

Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Takeuchi, M., & Wakamoto, N. (2001) Language learning strategies used by college learners of English: A synthesis of four empirical studies. *Language Education & Technology*, 38, 21-43.

Appendix 1

Questionnaire of Speaking Strategy Use for EFL [English as a foreign language] Learners

Hiroshima University, Japan

We would like to ask you to help us by answering the following questions concerning learners' strategy use to improve English speaking performance. This survey is conducted by language researchers of Hiroshima University, Japan, to gather information about your strategy use of English speaking as a foreign language learner. We are just interested in your personal opinion. Please give your answers sincerely as only these will guarantee the success of the investigation. Thank you very much for your help.

[Put a tick by your identity]

Nationality:

Bangladeshi		Japanese		Other	
-------------	--	----------	--	-------	--

Sex:

Male	Female
------	--------

Multiple choice questions will indicate how often you do the following things when speaking in English.

[Put a tick on your selection]

1. Do you try to speak in English in everyday interaction?
 (a) Always (b) Usually (c) Sometimes (d) Rarely sometimes (e) Almost never
2. Do you try to speak in English whenever you get the opportunity?
 (a) Always (b) Usually (c) Sometimes (d) Rarely sometimes (e) Almost never
3. Do you try to take risks even when you don't have enough confidence to speak correct English?
 (a) Always (b) Usually (c) Sometimes (d) Rarely sometimes (e) Almost never
4. Do you try to avoid interference of the mother tongue while speaking in English?
 (a) Always (b) Usually (c) Sometimes (d) Rarely sometimes (e) Almost never
5. When you try to say something but you lack the necessary vocabulary, do you use synonyms or describe the idea or object in other words?
 (a) Always (b) Usually (c) Sometimes (d) Rarely sometimes (e) Almost never

6. When you speak in English, do you worry about your mistakes too much?
 (a) Always (b) Usually (c) Sometimes (d) Rarely sometimes (e) Almost never
7. When you learn a new English vocabulary do you try to use it in speaking?
 (a) Always (b) Usually (c) Sometimes (d) Rarely sometimes (e) Almost never
8. Do you plan out in advance what are you going to say in English?
 (a) Always (b) Usually (c) Sometimes (d) Rarely sometimes (e) Almost never
9. While you watch/listen to some program or music on television/radio in English do you try to pick up some nice sounding phrases or words to use later in your English conversation?
 (a) Always (b) Usually (c) Sometimes (d) Rarely sometimes (e) Almost never
10. Do you use fillers (e.g. well, right, anyway, now let me see, as a matter of fact) to have time in conversation when you face difficulty in thinking of an appropriate reply?
 (a) Always (b) Usually (c) Sometimes (d) Rarely sometimes (e) Almost never
11. Do you try to correct your pronunciation to improve your speaking skill?
 (a) Always (b) Usually (c) Sometimes (d) Rarely sometimes (e) Almost never
12. Do you frequently use expressions that call for cultural knowledge, such as requesting, apologizing, or complaining in English?
 (a) Always (b) Usually (c) Sometimes (d) Rarely sometimes (e) Almost never
13. Do you try to correct your errors in speaking and welcome others' feedback?
 (a) Always (b) Usually (c) Sometimes (d) Rarely sometimes (e) Almost never
14. Do you practice newly learnt grammatical structures in speaking to check your confidence level with the structures?
 (a) Always (b) Usually (c) Sometimes (d) Rarely sometimes (e) Almost never

15. Open ended question

Do you think the above strategies can improve learners' speaking skill in English as a foreign language?

[Put a tick by your choice and give your argument bellow]

Yes		No	
Argument:			

16. Estimate your own EFL speaking skill: [put a tick by your level]

Excellent ()

Good ()

Fair ()

Poor ()

Note: Excellent: You can speak English fluently without problem.

Good: You can speak English with a little problem.

Fair: You can speak English with much problem.

Poor: You cannot speak English without translating from mother tongue.