

A Review Paper on Gender Difference in SLA: Sociolinguistic Perspective and Implications

Jongbum Ha

Kumoh National Institute of Technology

Ha, Jongbum. (2008). A review paper on gender difference in SLA: Sociolinguistic perspective and implications. *Modern English Education*, 9(2), 21-41.

Through literature review, the current study explored on gender roles for human language acquisition and learning, particularly second language acquisition, and on the formation of gender-specific language behaviors throughout human history. For this purpose, children's first language (L1) development and afterward adults' second language (L2) learning were investigated from the perspective of sociolinguistics. In the light of both anthropological and second language acquisition (SLA) studies, research suggested that cognitive differences between males and females may not stem exclusively from inherently natural and static neurolinguistic preferential networks, but the socialization process undergone by L2 male and female learners may play a much stronger role in the shaping of cognitive networks than what has been previously admitted. Some pedagogical implications, regarding the use of learning strategy and the management of classroom interaction, were taken based on the current review paper.

[gender and language/second language acquisition/sociolinguistic perspective
/성과 언어/제2언어습득/사회언어학적 관점]

I. INTRODUCTION

Many people have a native interest in sex differences. Research showed the differences in general social behavior, verbal ability, use of language, and language learning behaviors (Blair, 2000, Ehrman & Oxford, 1989; Kobayashi, 2002; Lakoff, 1975; Oxford, 1993). "Sex" is a biological category that serves as a fundamental basis for the differentiation of roles, norms, and expectations in all societies, whereas "gender" is the term used to describe socially constructed categories based on sex (Coates, 1986; Eckert, 1989). Accordingly, gender may

be the more appropriate term for sociolinguistic discussion than sex, and the current review study considers gender, rather than sex, the main variable for discussion.

One of the primary functions language has is to enable man to describe the world or communicate with other people. In this sense, language is a neutral tool for man to communicate with each other. On the other hand, language reflects, if it does not determine, the thoughts, attitudes, and culture of the people who make and use it. In this sense, language needs to be viewed as a social practice, and many parts of the different language behaviors by women and men will possibly be explained in terms of socialization as well as biological criteria.

Language acquisition research (particularly second language acquisition) (e.g. Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Skehan, 1989) has often attended to this gender variable as independent with their primary focus on language behavior or acquisition of each gender. However, from the sociolinguistic perspective, gender also needs to be treated as a dependent variable given that men and women have differently been affected by many other variables, such as education (particularly in the past), career, social class, etc. Based on literature review, the current study explores how gender-specific language behaviors have been formed throughout human history, while discussing gender-specific roles on human language acquisition and learning. For this purpose, gender-specific language behaviors, shown in children's first language (L1) development and adults' second language (L2) learning, are investigated from the perspective of sociolinguistics.

II. GENDER DIFFERENCES IN FIRST LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND USE

1. Gender Differences in Acquisition and Use

In children's L1 acquisition, girls usually say their first words and learn to speak in sentences earlier than boys. Later on, women often speak in longer, more complex sentences than men and score higher on tests of spelling, grammar, and perceptual speed. On the other hand, boys have a far greater

frequency of disabilities in learning, reading, and speaking than girls. In addition, females on the average surpass males, particularly from age eleven, on verbal ability tests and reading tests (Slavin, 1988).

For such gender differences in social tendencies and cognitive development, research suggested that socialization is one of the main causes (Block, 1973; Slavin, 1988). Block (1973) suggested, "the development of sex role identity is influenced by both biological and historical-cultural factors in complex interaction and with changing degrees of ascendancy at different critical periods" (p. 513). Indeed, it is hard to side with one of the biological and sociological factors in explaining such gender differences, and it is reasonable to investigate how these two seemingly different explanations interact with each other in human development or, more broadly, throughout human history.

Research showed that, in generalizing about sex differences, all cultures set up social norms for the sexes, which go beyond the biological differences, although societies differ in the way traits are assigned to men and women (Mead, 1949). It is a usual practice that boys are not supposed to act or talk like girls by their parents. However, it is the social norm among the peer group that more pushed us to be like a boy than any other verbal advice (or instruction) from people. Particularly, few would deny that Korean culture has been imposing different roles for each of the men and women while they are growing.

Gender-specific language is often called "genderlects." Similar to dialects, according to Kamler (1999), a genderlect has its own set of sociolinguistic rules. Lakoff (1975) distinguished women's language from men's. She suggested that both boys and girls first learn the women's language and use it until about age five, and then, by around ten years of age, boys have unlearned their original form of expression and adopted new forms of expression, while the girls retain their old ways of speech. Tannen (1986, 1990) shows that, compared with men's speech, women's speech in many language practices is accompanied by more empathy, concern, politeness, encouragement of other speakers, negotiation, detail remembering, uncertainty, questioning behavior, and grammaticality, whereas men use more verbal expressions of power and aggression, adversarial argumentative style, interruption, ridicule, analytical critique, and discouragement of other speakers.

The existence of genderlects is supported by empirical research. Blair (2000) observed an eighth-grade youth in Harbourview, and found the active, subtle, and ongoing construction of gender identity, which was constrained by the many practices, conditions, and pressures of home and school life. Her observation showed that the boys often spoke to each other in loud voices, and some of them monopolized a great deal of the classroom talk, accompanying their words with gestures, eye contact, and laughter. For this, Blair interpreted that boy talk in the public forum is a powerful phenomenon that gives a great deal of power and privilege to the boys. On the other hand, she found that the girls mostly talked about their personal lives, and some of them were very private, in which case they whispered. Based on these findings, Blair claims that there exist different languages (i.e. genderlects) between men and women.

These characteristics found in children's genderlects can also be observed in adults' language use, which has been studied in both quantitative and qualitative ways. Research showed that women use a more standard language¹ than men do, regardless of their socioeconomic level, age, or race (Labov, 1966; Trudgill, 1972). These researchers claim that gender difference is the result of early childhood socialization processes. Girls are encouraged and rewarded for using elegant language whereas boys are allowed more flexibility and roughness in language use. In other words, men tend to use a more vernacular style than women. This difference can be interpreted as a sign of females' greater desire to conform to societal norms, as compared to men's attitude to show off their current identity and the solidarity among their community members.

From a historical perspective, the difference in the use of vernacular styles across genders can be explained in a different way. Given that languages have evolved from vernacular forms, currently used non-standard styles are prenatal forms of the next generation's standard language. Men may speak nonstandard language to express their feeling of freedom and creative power, in which, however, females are not allowed to do so (Spender, 1980). As for women's tendency toward standard norms, Eckert (1989) interpreted that girls are more

¹ A standard language is the language that is spoken by the majority of the people, whereas a the vernacular is speech used spontaneously among people who know each other well (Coates, 1993, p. 5).

concerned with category membership than boys, because they must rely more on symbolic manifestations of social membership than boys. She claims “women, deprived of access to real power, needed to get closer to mainstream by using symbols of social membership, that is, standard language (p. 265).

Gender-oriented differences are also found in conversational styles in L1. Zimmerman and West (1975) conducted research on mixed-gender conversations and linguistic inequality in gender-specific styles. The findings showed significant differences between same-gender pairs and mixed-gender pairs regarding the use of overlaps² and interruptions, and, in mixed-gender pairs, male speakers caused all of the overlaps and most of the interruptions, while female speakers hardly did so. Interestingly, men rarely interrupted each other, but they primarily used interruptions when speaking to women. As a result of male interruptions, women tended to be more silent than men. This gender-specific conversational style results from gender-specific linguistic norms, which have been enforced through their L1 development (i.e. early acquisition of genderlects). In other words, a linguistic exchange is the result of the relationship between interlocutors, and males and females have disparate social statuses. Consequently, social inequalities existing between women and men are reflected in terms of conversational patterns between males and females.

2. Two Approaches to Gender Differences in Language Use

Previous research on gender and language showed that there have been two main approaches to gender differences in language: ‘dominance’ and ‘difference’ approaches (e.g. Tannen, 1990; Troemel-Ploetz, 1991). In other words, women’s status as a social group has been reflected in terms of either hierarchical difference or different subculture. Such comparison, though not necessary, will help us to understand how the differences in language behaviors of men and women have existed.

The dominance approach sees women as an oppressed group and interprets linguistic differences in women’s and men’s speech in terms of men’s dominance

² Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) used the term to refer to all instances of simultaneity.

and women's subordination. Researchers using this model are concerned with showing how male dominance is prevalent through linguistic practice. West and Zimmerman (1987) suggests 'doing power' is often a way of 'doing gender' too. Doing gender, according to them, means "creating differences between girls and boys and women and men, differences that are not natural, essential, or biological (p. 137). This approach basically views women as innately inferior or oppressed language users.

The difference approach, on the other hand, emphasizes the idea that women and men belong to different subcultures. Wareing (1994) argued that the dominance approach has revealed unequal gender relations of power by examining cross-gender conversations, whereas the difference approach has explored gender-specific communicative norms by examining same-sex interactions. One of the characteristics of a social group is that it has a distinctive subculture. According to Tannen (1990), the discovery of distinct male and female subcultures seems to be a direct result of women's growing resistance to being treated as a minority group. In linguistic terms, the differences in women and men's speech are interpreted as reflecting and maintaining gender-specific subcultures.

Based on Eckert (1989), it seems that the boundary between dominance and difference is not clear. Gender difference is possibly interpreted in terms of either power difference or different socialization according to contexts. In other words, both dominance approach and difference approach need to be incorporated to explain language practice of males and females.

III. GENDER DIFFERENCES IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Given that each gender shows different characteristics in L1 in the shape of genderlects, we can assume that these characteristics may affect people in their L2 learning behaviors. This section explores gender-specific differences in L2 learning behaviors in terms of learning styles and strategies, learning motivation and attitude, and gender variable in conversational interaction respectively.

1. Learning Styles and Learning Strategy Use

Learning strategy is defined as "intentional cognitive or affective actions taken by the learner in order to learn both simple and complex material" (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990, p. 43). On the other hand, learning style refers to "individuals' preferred way of processing information" (Saville-Troike, 2006, p. 87), and is often considered to have more passive (or less active) characteristic than learning strategy. Accordingly, styles are more or less predetermined ('immutable'), whereas strategies are learnable through instruction ('mutable'). Perhaps for this reason, research on styles and strategies in SLA has mostly been conducted separately with little consideration of the interaction between them. However, long time socialization may be the factor that would have affected both of the styles and strategies of people in a certain degree, and, as a result, people's learning styles and strategies may interact with each other.

Gender difference in learning styles has been studied inside and outside the L2 learning area. One dominant explanation by now is brain hemisphericity. According to this explanation, right-hemisphere dominant individuals, those whose right side of the brain typically dominates their thinking processes, tend to be more field dependent (less able to separate the details from a confusing background), global, and emotion-oriented, while left-hemisphere dominant people are more field independent, analytic, and logic-oriented. Springer and Deutsch (1989) reported that in men the left hemisphere is more lateralized for verbal activity and the right hemisphere is more lateralized for abstract or spatial processing. On the other hand, they reported that women use both the left and the right hemispheres for verbal and spatial activity. In women, as compared to men, part of the corpus callosum (the bundle of brain fibers linking the left and the right hemispheres) is bigger in relation to overall brain weight, allowing more information to be exchanged between the two hemispheres, thus lending strength to the possibility that women have more integrated brain function than men.

More recently, Maubach and Morgan (2001) investigated the relationship between gender and language learning with reference to the preferred learning styles of Year 12 and 13 sixth-form students of A level French and German. 72

students (57 girls and 15 boys) participated and completed the questionnaire. Results showed that there appeared to be four main gender-related characteristics³, and, accordingly, confirmed the gender division in language learning. Specifically, male students showed more tendency to take risks; speak spontaneously in the foreign language; a greater male self confidence about asking questions of the teacher for their better understanding; and the female students' interest in reading and presenting well-organised written work. He suggested, however, despite some male or female differences, that there were as much within-group differences as between-group differences.

Few studies have conducted to find out whether learning styles stem from nurture or nature, or whether nurture has any impact on nature, and/or vice versa. Socialization (i.e. nurture) is one of the possible explanations in the sense that long time impact (nurture) installs certain types of preferential cognitive mechanism among people (nature). Considering that impacts (i.e. socialization process) are different for men and women, the development of gender-specific preferential cognitive networks might have caused the brain to shape differently as a result of a gender-specific lateralization process stemming from gender-specific socialization. In other words, women may not be 'born' women, but they may be 'made' women. Unfortunately, however, there has been little research on this issue to support this assumption, maybe because of the difficulty in conducting an experiment.

Research showed that there is gender difference in learning strategies. Three types of strategies are often employed in the study of learning strategies. They are 'metacognitive' (higher order planning, monitoring, and evaluating comprehension), 'cognitive' (the strategies that manipulate information, such as rehearsal, summarizing, and reorganization), and 'social/affective' strategies (involving interaction with another person or self-assurance in order to complete a task) (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). Ehrman and Oxford (1989) reported that females used more social learning strategies than men do, such as requests for clarification, asking questions, circumlocutions, etc. Their findings also show that

³ Some people may not agree that gender-related characteristics in terms of learning styles cover risk-taking and self-confidence, but Mauback and Morgan (2001) included these two items in these characteristics.

females excelled at strategies used to establish and convey meaning, and that language used among women is based on establishing connections. More studies support this finding. Politzer (1983) showed that females use social strategies more than men do, and Gass and Varonis (1985) suggested that females are more likely to use social learning strategies with female partners than with male partners.

Differences are also found in the specific use of strategies. Bacon (1992) showed from the study on students' listening strategies that females use more global strategies⁴ and that males use more local strategies. He reported that women also showed more affective responses than men. Additionally, Zoubir-Shaw and Oxford (1994) showed that women surpass men in the use of several strategy categories and of many strategies that might be viewed as effective for language learning, whereas men choose more often to use less effective strategies. Women use strategies involving visual details, grammar, reviewing, and contextualized learning more frequently than men.

Not all research, however, claims women's superiority in learning strategies. Tran (1988) investigated gender differences in English language acculturation and learning strategies among Vietnamese adults over age 40 in the United States, and found that females had more L2 learning problems and that males were more likely to use a variety of L2 learning strategies to improve their English skills than females. This study, however, admitted other possible variables, such as age and cultural gender-role differences, influenced the results.

There has been research on Korean students' learning styles and strategies. Young-Ye Park (2006) investigated elementary school students who were learning English. The results showed that there were significant gender differences in both strategy use and style preferences. Female students used strategies relatively more frequently than male students. Specifically, the female students preferred visual learning styles, while the male students preferred haptic learning styles. On the

⁴ It is not clear who initiated the use of these terms, "global and local strategies," in SLA. Bacon (1992) used global strategy to refer top-down processing, such as trying to think in the target language, using advance organizers, listening to known words and cognates, inferring meaning from context, while using local strategy to refer to bottom-up processing, such as linear processing, understanding of every word, reliance on their native language.

other hand, her earlier study (Young-Ye Park, 1999) showed the opposite result. At this time, the participants were undergraduate students at KAIST enrolled in an advanced reading course. It was revealed that the students' major, language proficiency, and previous L2 experiences had significant effects on their use of learning strategies, while no significant difference existed regarding gender.

There are different results from other studies. Some studies suggested that there are significant differences in strategy use between males and females (Hyo-Woong Lee, 1996), while others suggested that there are no significant differences between two sexes (Jun-Il Oh, 1996; Jun-Eon Park, 2001). Regarding these different results, Young-Min Kim (1995) claimed that other unidentified variables can determine different results saying, "Asian women may respect traditional value more than western women, who are more open and active. If this is right, they may be restricted to use strategy in learning a foreign language" (p. 46). He cited Hyo-Woong Lee (1994a, 1994b), in which gender difference in strategy use was found to be obvious among Korean middle school students, whereas it was not so among high school and university students. Hyo-Woong Lee (1994a, 1994b) suggested these results may have to do with the Asian propensity of the students.

Additionally, Su-Mi Lee and Chung-Ja Kwon (2007) analyzed students' learning strategies when learning English and investigated the relationship between their learning strategies and learner variables, such as perception toward computer-assisted language learning (CALL). A questionnaire was administered to 71 students and data was collected from 67 students, which was then statistically analyzed. The finding showed that there were no significant relationships between gender and learning strategies although gender difference was observed in the use of cognitive strategies. Lee and Kwon suggested that the use of computer is widespread in both male and female students, so there was no gender difference in their strategy use in CALL environment.

In sum, it is not clear if one gender is indeed better at language learning strategies than the other. One constant and reliable finding is that women use more social learning strategies than men do, from which women appear to be more sensitive to social interaction than men. Overall, more research claimed that women surpassed men in the use of several strategy categories and of many

strategies that might be viewed as effective for language learning. Research suggested that social learning strategy appears to be the only difference between men and women which can be generalized. Although few studies have been conducted to examine the impact of socialization on learning strategy use, based on the literature in the previous section (e.g. Labov, 1966; Trudgill, 1972), it may be true that women have more desire to conform to mainstream in their life, and this behavior is represented in the form of more social learning strategies by women. Further research is needed to confirm this assumption.

2. Learning Motivation and Attitude

To understand the issues of motivation in SLA, we need to know the terms 'integrative' and 'instrumental' motivations. According to Gardner and Lambert (1972), integrative motivation implies "that success in mastering a second language depends on a particular orientation on the part of the learner, reflecting a willingness or a desire to be like representative members of the other language community, and to become associated, at least vicariously, with that other community" (p. 14). Instrumental motivation, on the other hand, is "more self-oriented in the sense that a person prepares to learn a new code in order to derive benefits of a non-interpersonal sort" (p. 14).

The argument which motivation, integrative or instrumental, is more effective has been discussed by SLA researchers. Research has presented that integrative motivation is crucial for achieving high proficiency of target language (e.g. Spolsky, 1969). Ehrman and Oxford (1989) have challenged the common belief that females tend to reach a higher level of L2 proficiency because they have a greater aspiration for social approval. They hypothesized that women demonstrated a more integrative motivation when learning a foreign language than men based on the finding that their native communicative style was more socially based than the style of men. Men, on the other hand, were hypothesized to demonstrate a more instrumental motivational orientation in that they were learning a foreign language in order to be more competitive professionally. The findings showed that a majority of male students signed up for foreign language classes because they believe them to be useful (instrumental motivation), whereas female students

were more likely to register for foreign language classes because they were interested in the target language culture and planned to travel and live in the target language country (more closely related to integrative motivation).

Although gender was not the focus of their studies, Dörnyei and Clement (2001) reported possible gender differences in motivation. According to them, female students scored significantly higher than male students on the scales of all of the five motivational dimensions in most of the target language, which are direct contact with L2 speakers, instrumentality, integrativeness, vitality of L2 community and cultural interest.

Recently, Mori and Gobel (2006) explored the gender variable for the differences in motivational sub-constructs. 453 second-year non-English major students participated, and a motivational scale was administered to them. Factor analysis was employed for a multidimensional construct comprised of integrativeness, intrinsic value, motivation, and attainment value, and the results revealed 54.4% of the variance. A MANOVA was then performed with gender as the independent variable. The results indicated that there was a significant difference in integrativeness between male and female students, with females scoring significantly higher on those items. Although both females and males have high means on this factor, the results of factor analysis suggested that female participants have a greater interest in the cultures and people of the target language community, a greater desire to make friends with those people, and are more interested in travelling and/or studying overseas than male participants.

However, it is still premature to generalize that women have more integrative motivation and are better language learners than men. Furthermore, the argument which motivation, integrative or instrumental, is more effective has not yet been clearly answered although it has long been discussed by SLA researchers. Particularly, research (Warden & Lin, 2000) suggested that integrative motivation is hard to find among Taiwan university students, and both integrative and instrumental motivations are effective for foreign language learning.

To investigate gender difference in motivation⁵ and attitude in SLA, Powell and Batters (1985) conducted a survey with 459 boys and 494 girls from six

⁵ Motivation is defined as "a construct made up of certain attitudes" (Gardner & Lambert, 1972, p. 181).

mixed comprehensive schools in the UK. The study found that female students perceived studying of foreign languages in a more positive way. They also suggested that female teachers are predominant in language departments, and this is part of wider social sex-stereotyping of roles which is bound to influence a child's view of the world. This was based on their recognition of social influences on pupils' perceptions of foreign language learning. At the same time, they stated that "we recognise the difficulty for researchers in gaining a clear picture of pupils' perceptions of subjects taught in school, especially as regards sex differences" (p. 20).

While there was no clear conclusion on attitude in western studies, research on Korean students' attitude suggested that female students have more positive attitude for language learning. Hyo-Woong Lee and Jun-II Oh (2000) compared 522 Korean middle and high school students' attitudes according to level of school, gender and proficiency in English. The result of the study showed that female students had more positive attitude for overall items, such as English itself and attitude for Americans. This finding was suggested in their earlier studies as well (Hyo-Woong Lee, 1996; Jun-II Oh, 1996).

Additionally, Hye-Shin Sim (2007) conducted research to determine the factors that affect motivation and attitude and to determine if these factors are gender-biased. 200 high school students participated in the survey. Results showed that boys had more negative attitude towards learning English while female students were far more positive in their motivation and their attitude. According to Sim, the result indicated that there was a tendency for male students to be more independent and solitary learners compared to females who were more socially and interactively oriented.

Gender difference in learning motivation and attitude is possibly related to socialization. One of the few studies on this issue is Sung and Padilla (1998), who revealed that female students were more motivated to study Asian languages than male students. They acknowledged that "we do not know whether the gender difference can be attributed to a type of socialisation ... or the fact that all of the teachers in the various foreign language programs included in this study are female" (p. 215). Many tantalizing questions remain about gender differences in L2 learning motivation and attitude. However, based on their

findings, it seems that female has the advantage in L2 learning motivation, and gender role modeling explains better than any female predisposition to learning languages.

3. Gender Variable in Conversational Interaction

The gender differences in L2 learning process can also be observed in native and nonnative speakers' (NS/NNS) conversation. According to research (Pica, Holliday, Lewis, Berducci, & Newman, 1991; Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler, 1989), male and female NNSs interact with either male or female NSs to have opportunities to request L2 input and modify interlanguage output. These studies originally tried to look at the effect of task types, not gender, so the result of the study was from a complex interaction of both gender and task types. Findings showed that in interaction with male NSs, compared to interaction with female NSs, the opportunities for NNS output were significantly lower and this is the same for female than male NNSs.

Pearson and Lee (1992) investigated the effects of native/nonnative speakers' status and gender and found that interlocutors' gender was a primary factor in that it influenced the structure and content of the discourse. Communication patterns show that the gender of both the direction-seeker and the direction-giver influenced the structure and content of the discourse. Female direction-giver paused to check the comprehension of their interlocutor more often than male direction-givers did. Female direction-seekers, whatever their status is, were given more directives, were addressed with a more complex vocabulary, and received more parenthetical remarks from both male and female direction-givers.

The literature in the previous section (e.g. Zimmerman & West, 1975) suggested that males and females have disparate social statuses, and the relationship between interlocutors results in different linguistic exchanges. Social inequalities may exist between women and men even in an L2 learning environment, and this can be reflected in terms of conversational patterns between males and females. It is generally accepted that males tend to speak in L2 classrooms more than females, and that females tend to listen more and to use shorter statement. Findings in L2 development tend to echo findings in first

language use (i.e. genderlect), and suggest a possible transfer from the students' respective genderlect in the native language to the target language.

IV. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATION

The debate concerning the role of 'nature' versus the role of 'nurture' on the gender issue has been noted for years. The argument on 'system-internal' factors (i.e. nature) and 'system-external' factors (i.e. nurture) is an old one. Instead, we need to look at how they interact with each other. If we have to choose one of them, nature or nurture, to explain many phenomena, such as intelligence, personality, and language (learning) behaviors, we will be having hard time to answer. Difficulties are also related with how to define these terms, because the definitions of these concepts are situation-specific. For example, language aptitude may be considered either mutable or immutable in that it does or does not include other mutable factors, such as learning strategies and motivation. If it includes those mutable factors, aptitude might be improved by improving each of the components. If it is independent from these mutable factors, it is predetermined.

Probably any gender differences in the development of social behavior and cognition arise from multiple causes. Certainly, socialization appears to play a powerful role, as brain hemisphericity has an influence on people's behaviors. In the light of both anthropological and SLA studies, cognitive differences between males and females may not stem exclusively from inherently natural and static neurolinguistic preferential networks. Rather, the socialization process undergone by L2 male and female learners, whether at home or at school, past or present, may play a much stronger role in the shaping of cognitive networks than previously admitted. The relationship between language and gender formed through social practice is dynamic. In this sense, the ways men and women learn and use a language are not determined by their gender but they are constructed, negotiated, and transformed through social practices which are informed by particular social settings, relations of power, and discourses (Kubota, 2003).

Some pedagogical implications were taken based on the current review on gender in language acquisition. As for the strategy use, females are more likely to use social learning strategies with female partners than with male partners. Given that this finding is supported by many studies, the teacher will need to help male learners to develop their strategy use, in particular, the use of social strategies. Research also showed that females use more global strategies (i.e. top-down strategies) and that males use more local strategies (i.e. bottom-up strategies). Considering both top-down and bottom-up strategies are necessary for the mastery learning of a foreign language, the teacher will need to help their students to develop the strategies they comparatively lack. At the same time, we should optimize the strategies that males and females use appropriately and well, and we should encourage everyone to develop strategies that go beyond gender boundaries.

Regarding learning motivation and attitude, some research suggested that female students had motivation of more integrativeness (Mori & Gobel, 2006)) and more positive attitude than male students did (Hyo-Woong Lee, 1996; Jun-Il Oh, 1996). However, it is premature to generalize these findings, and the argument which motivation is more effective has not been answered yet. Instead, it is high time to discuss how to develop students' motivation, whether it is integrative or instrumental. Furthermore, considering that it would not be easy to change students' attitude for the target language and its people and culture, teachers will need to be aware of these differences, if any, and respect each student's motivation and attitude.

Finally, it is generally accepted that males tend to speak in classrooms more than females, and that females tend to listen more and to use shorter statement. If foreign language teachers finds their foreign language class in the same way, they needs to keep in mind to reasonably pair them up in classroom activities for the equal opportunity of interaction. The foreign language teacher should be aware of these differences in language learning behaviors between men and women, and should be flexible in managing their classrooms according to these differences.

At the same time, based on the findings from the research on Korean learners of English (Young-Min Kim, 1995; Young-Ye Park, 1999, 2006), more factors,

such as age and students' educational background, should be considered for future research and classroom practice. Additionally, as Maubach and Morgan (2001) suggested that there were significant individual differences in learning styles as well as some male or female differences, EFL teachers need to remember that there may be individual differences even among groups of the same gender, and need to consider such differences, if any, in managing their foreign language class.

REFERENCES

- Bacon, S. M. (1992). The relationship between gender, comprehension, processing strategies, and cognitive and affective response in foreign language listening. *The Modern Language Journal* 76(2), 160-178.
- Blair, H. A. (2000). Genderlects: Girl talk and boy talk in a middle-years classroom. *Language Arts* 77(4), 315-323.
- Block, J. H. (1973). Conception of sex roles: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. *American Psychologist* 28, 512-526.
- Coates, J. (1986). *Women, men and language: A sociolinguistic account of gender differences in language*. Longman: Pearson Education.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Clement, R. (2001). Motivational characteristics of learning different target languages: Results of a nationwide survey. In Z. Dörnyei and R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 399-432). Hawaii: University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, HI. Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Eckert, P. (1989). The whole woman: Sex and gender differences in variation. *Language Variation and Change* 1, 245-267.
- Ehrman, M. E., & Oxford, R. L. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adults' language learning strategies. *Modern Language Journal* 73, 1-13.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- Gass, S., & Varonis, E. M. (1985). Task variation and NNS/NNS negotiation of meaning. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 149-161). Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- Kim, Young-Min. (1995). The effect of gender and learning context on the use of language learning strategies. *English Education*, 50(2), 331-345.

- Kobayashi, Y. (2002). The role of gender in foreign language learning attitudes: Japanese female students' attitudes towards English learning. *Gender and Education* 14(2), 181-197.
- Kubota, R. (2003). New approaches to gender, class, and race in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 12, 31-47.
- Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lee, Hyo-Woong. (1994a). A study on language learning strategies used by Korean students. *English Language Teaching*, 3, 1-38.
- Lee, Hyo-Woong. (1994b). Investigating the factors affecting the use of foreign language learning strategies and comparing the strategy use of EFL and ESL students. *English Teaching*, 48, 51-99.
- Lee, Hyo-Woong. (1996). The effects of attitudes and motivation on learning English in Korean middle and high school students. *English Teaching*, 51, 3-34.
- Lee, Hyo-Woong, & Oh, Jun-Il. (2000). The relationship between attitudes and proficiency in learning English. *English Teaching*, 55(4), 389-409.
- Lee, Su-Mi, & Kwon, Chung-Ja. (2007). The analysis of college students' English learning strategies in a CALL environment. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, 10(3), 155-186.
- Maubach, A-M., & Morgan, C. (2001). The relationship between gender and learning styles amongst A level modern languages students. *Journal of the Association for Language Learning*, 23, 41-47.
- Mead, M. (1949). *Male and female*. New York: William Morrow.
- Mori, S., & Gobel, P. (2006). Motivation and gender in the Japanese EFL classroom. *System* 34, 194-210.
- Oh, Jun-Il. (1996). The effect of attitude and sex on use of EFL learner strategies. *English Teaching*, 51, 35-54.
- O'Malley, M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (1993). Instructional implications of gender differences in second/foreign language (L2) learning styles and strategies. *Applied Language Learning*, 4(1-2), 65-94.
- Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal* 1, 12-28.
- Park, Jun-Eon. (2001). Korean EFL learners' vocabulary learning strategies. *English*

- Teaching*, 56(4), 3-30.
- Park, Young-Ye. (1999). An analysis of interrelationship among language learning strategies, learning styles, and learner variables of university students. *English Teaching*, 54(4), 281-308.
- Park, Young-Ye. (2006). An analysis of English learning strategies and learning styles of Korean elementary school students. *Primary English Education*, 12(1), 281-311.
- Pavlenko, A. (2001). Bilingualism, gender, and ideology. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 5, 117-151.
- Powell, R., & Batters, J. (1985). Pupils' perceptions of foreign language learning at 12+: Some gender differences. *Educational Studies* 1, 11-23.
- Pearson, B. A., & Lee, S. K. (1992). Discourse structure of direction giving: Effects of native/nonnative speaker status and gender. *TESOL Quarterly* 26, 113-27.
- Pica, T., Holliday. L., Lewis. N., Berducci. D., & Newman. J. (1991). Language learning through interaction. What role does gender play? *Studies in second language acquisition* 13, 343-376.
- Pica, T., Holliday. L., Lewis. N., & Morgenthaler. L. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 11, 63-90.
- Politzer, R. (1983). Research notes: An exploratory study of self-reported language learning behaviors and their relation to achievement. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 6, 54-68.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Sim, Hye-Shin. (2007). Gender effects on ESL student attitude and motivation. *Injenonchong*, 22(1), 733-775.
- Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second-language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Slavin, R. E. (1988). *Educational psychology: Theory into practice* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Spender, D. (1980). *Man made language*. London: Routledge & Kegan.
- Spolsky, B. (1969). Attitudinal aspects of second language learning. *Language Learning* 19, 270-285.
- Springer, S., & Deutsch, G. (1989). *Left brain, right brain*. New York: Freeman.

- Sung, H., & Padilla, A. (1998). Student motivation, parental motivation, and involvement in the learning of Asian languages in elementary and secondary schools. *Modern Language Journal* 2, 205-216.
- Tannen, D. (1986). *That's not what I meant!* New York: Morrow.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Ballantine.
- Tran, T. V. (1988). Sex differences in English language acculturation and learning strategies among Vietnamese adults age 40 and over in the United States. *Sex Roles* 19(11/12), 747-758.
- Troemel-Ploetz, S. (1991). Review essay: Selling the apolitical. *Discourse and Society*, 2(4), 489-502.
- Trudgill, P. (1972). Sex, covert prestige, and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwick. *Language in Society* 1, 88-104.
- Warden, C. A., & Lin, H. J. (2000). Existence of integrative motivation in an Asian EFL setting. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(5), 535-547.
- Wareing, S. (1994). Gender differences in language use. In J. Sunderland (Ed.), *Exploring gender: Questions and implications for English language education* (pp. 34-38). New York: Prentice Hall.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society* 1(2), June, 125-151.
- Zimmerman, D., & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions, and silences in conversation. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and sex: Difference and dominance* (pp. 105-129). Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- Zoubir-Shaw, S., & Oxford, R. L. (1994). Gender differences in language learning strategy use in university-level introductory French classes: A pilot study employing a strategy questionnaire. In C. A. Klee (Ed.), *Faces in a crowd: The individual learner in multisection courses* (pp. 181-213). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Jong-Bum Ha
School of Humanities and Social Sciences
Kumoh National Institute of Technology
1 Yangho-dong, Gumi, Gyeongbuk 730-701, Korea

Tel: (054) 478-7862

Email: jbha@kumoh.ac.kr

Received in May 31, 2008

Reviewed in June 24, 2008

Revised version received in July 29, 2008