

İREMİNUR ORUÇ

LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES OF FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS
IN
AN ENGLISH MEDIUM HIGHER EDUCATION CONTEXT

İREMİNUR ORUÇ

A THESIS SUBMITTED
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

JANUARY 2024

2024

Çok sevdiğim aileme ...



Language Learning Strategies of First-Year Students
in
an English Medium Higher Education Context

The Graduate School of Education
of
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by
İremnur Oruç

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

in
Teaching English as a Foreign Language

The Department of English Language Teaching
Ankara

January 2024

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BILKENT UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Language Learning Strategies of First-Year Students in
an English Medium Higher Education Context

İremnur Oruç

January 2024

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Necmi Akşit (Advisor)

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Prof.Dr. İsmail Hakkı Mirici, Hacettepe University (Examining Committee Member)

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Doç.Dr. Dilara Demirbulak, Yeditepe University (Examining Committee Member)

Approval of the Graduate School of Education

Prof. Dr. Orhan Arıkan (Director)

ABSTRACT**LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES OF FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS IN
AN ENGLISH MEDIUM HIGHER EDUCATION CONTEXT**

İremnur Oruç

MA in Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Advisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Necmi Akşit

January 2024

The purpose of this study is to investigate the language learning strategies of first-year students at a foundation university in Türkiye where the medium of instruction is English. More specifically, the study aimed to explain what direct and indirect strategies, and accompanying strategy sets, were used by the students. It also examined any potential differences in the strategy used based on gender. This study used a single-case design, shifting attention to a particular and less-explored context, incorporating cross-sectional survey, and causal-comparative designs. The researcher collected the data through a survey within the framework of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL, Version 7.0) tool and 82 first-year students voluntarily participated in the study. The findings indicated that the direct strategies were preferred more than the indirect strategies. More specifically, within *Direct strategies*, *Compensatory strategies* are highly favored; in contrast, *Metacognitive strategies* are moderately favored across *Indirect strategies*. As for the least used strategies, *Memory strategies* as one of the groups in the Direct strategies, and *Affective strategies* within the Indirect strategies are favored the least. Additionally, female first-year students preferred to use direct strategies more than male first-year students although the observed difference is not statistically significant. More specifically, when *Direct strategies* are considered, *Compensatory strategies* are highly favored by both female and male first-year students, but female students use them more frequently. Similarly, among *Indirect strategies*, male participants highly favor *Social strategies*, while female participants moderately favor *Metacognitive strategies* the most. Finally, in relation to two strategies under the *Cognitive strategies*, statistically significant results favoring female students were observed.

Keywords: Language learning strategies, Strategy inventory for language learning, English medium instruction, English as a foreign language, gender.

ÖZET

Eğitim Dili İngilizce Olan Bir Yükseköğretim Kurumunda Birinci Sınıf

Öğrencilerinin Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri

İremnur Oruç

Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Yüksek Lisans Programı

Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Necmi Akşit

Ocak 2024

Bu araştırmanın amacı Türkiye’de bir vakıf üniversitesindeki birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin dil öğrenme stratejilerini incelemektir. Çalışma ilk etapta, öğrencilerin *Doğrudan* ve *Dolaylı stratejileri* kullandıkları stratejileri belirleyerek, bu stratejilere bağlı alt strateji setlerini belirlemeyi amaçlamıştır. Ayrıca, strateji kullanımını cinsiyet odaklı olarak incelemiştir. Bu vaka çalışması, kesitsel anket ve nedensel-karşılaştırmalı araştırma desenleri içermektedir. Araştırmacı, Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanterini kullanmıştır (DÖSE, Sürüm 7.0) ve çalışmaya gönüllü olarak 82 birinci sınıf öğrencisi katılmıştır. Bulgular, *Doğrudan stratejilerin*, *Dolaylı stratejilere* göre daha fazla tercih edildiğini göstermiştir. Detaylara indikçe, *Doğrudan stratejiler* açısından, *Telaflı* edici stratejilerin belirgin bir tercih gördüğü, buna karşın *Üst Bilişsel* stratejilerin nispeten biraz az tercih edildiği görülmüştür. En az kullanılan stratejiler arasında, *Doğrudan stratejiler* içinde *Telaflı* edici stratejiler, *Dolaylı stratejiler* içinde *Duyuşsal stratejiler* bulunmaktadır. vardır. Ek olarak, *Doğrudan stratejilerin*, kız öğrenciler tarafında daha fazla kullandığı gözlemlenmiş, ancak bu fark istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bulunmamıştır. Biraz daha detaylı inceleme yapıldığında, *Doğrudan stratejiler* arasında, *Telaflı stratejilerinin* hem kız ve hem erkek öğrenci grupları tarafından oldukça yüksek oranda tercih edildiği görülmekte, ancak kız öğrencilerin bu stratejileri biraz daha sık kullanma eğilimindedirler. *Dolaylı stratejiler* açısından, Erkek öğrenci grubunun *Sosyal stratejileri* eğilim gösterdiği, kız öğrencilerin *Bilişsel stratejilere* daha fazla ilgi gösterdiği gözlenmiştir. Son olarak, Bilişsel stratejiler altındaki iki strateji ile ilgili olarak istatistiksel olarak anlamlı sonuçlar gözlenmiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Dil öğrenme stratejileri, dil öğrenme stratejileri envanteri, Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce, cinsiyet ve English-medium instruction

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my dearest Asst. Prof. Dr. Necmi Akşit for his inspirational guidance both in my teaching and thesis journey. Thanks to him, I learned everything about teaching, and I had the chance to look at this profession from many different dimensions. I learned how to become a life-long learner, life-long survivor, life-long teacher and a life-long student.

I would like to dedicate my thesis...

to my understanding, full-time encouraging family.

My dearest father Kadir Oruç, my lovely mother Meral Oruç, my beloved siblings Sinem Oruç and Yusuf Kerem Oruç. I am so lucky to have you.

Thank you so much for your endless support and prayers, I love you all!

&

to my dear fiancé, my love and now my husband Doğucan Sezgin who kept on supporting me during this long journey. You gave me the inspiration that I needed, you made me smile and motivated me during the dark days.

&

to my dearest and eternal supporter, my best friend Leo who had paws on my hands and on my heart during the hardest and the good times.

&

to all the faculty members of Bilkent University Graduate School of Education, who are very special to me as I had started with them on my teaching journey.

Last but not least, I would like to dedicate my thesis to all EFL instructors from all around the world who are wholeheartedly dedicated to teaching. I hope that the inspiration that we are having from each other will never come to an end.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	1
Problem.....	2
Purpose.....	3
Research Questions.....	3
Significance.....	4
Definition of Key Terms.....	5
Ç: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	6
Introduction.....	6
Earlier Studies on Language Learning Strategies.....	6
Oxford's Classification of Language Learning Strategies and SILL.....	8
Direct Strategies.....	9
Indirect Strategies.....	12
Language Learning Strategies, Individual Differences and Gender.....	14
Range of Studies in Relation to Oxford's SILL and Gender.....	15
Related Studies Conducted in Türkiye in relation to Oxford's SILL and Gender...	15
Related Studies in Similar Contexts across the World.....	20
CHAPTER 3: METHOD.....	25

Introduction.....	25
Research Design.....	25
Context.....	26
Participants.....	26
Instrumentation.....	28
Method of Data Collection & Analysis.....	29
Ethical Considerations.....	31
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	32
Introduction.....	32
Language Learning Strategies in Descriptive terms.....	32
Overall direct and indirect strategies.....	32
Memory Strategies.....	33
Cognitive Strategies.....	35
Compensation Strategies.....	37
Metacognitive Strategies.....	39
Affective Strategies.....	41
Social Strategies.....	43
Differences in Language Strategy Use in Descriptive and Inferential Terms.....	44
Overall Direct and Indirect Strategies.....	44
Direct and Indirect Strategies: Group by Group.....	45
Direct Strategies: Memory.....	47
Direct Strategies: Cognitive.....	49
Direct Strategies: Compensatory.....	52
Indirect Strategies: Metacognitive.....	53
Indirect Strategies: Affective.....	55

Indirect Strategies: Social.....	57
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	60
Introduction.....	60
Overview of the Study.....	60
Discussion of Major Findings.....	60
Strategy use.....	60
Strategy use and gender.....	61
Implications for Further Practice & Research.....	63
Limitations.....	64
REFERENCES.....	65
Appendix A The Consent Form.....	72
Appendix B SILL.....	73
Appendix D The Ethical Approval Form.....	75
Appendix E The Coding Book.....	76

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Demographic Characteristics of Participants	27
2	Summary of Research Questions & Data Analysis Techniques	30
3	Overall Direct and Indirect strategies: Descriptive.....	32
4	Frequencies: Memory Strategies.....	33
5	Central Tendency & Dispersion: Memory Strategies.....	34
6	Frequencies: Cognitive Strategies	35
7	Central Tendency & Dispersion: Cognitive Strategies.....	36
8	Frequencies: Compensation Strategies	37
9	Central Tendency & Dispersion: Compensation Strategies...	38
10	Frequencies: Metacognitive Strategies	39
11	Central Tendency & Dispersion: Metacognitive Strategies.....	40
12	Frequencies: Affective Strategies	41
13	Central Tendency & Dispersion: Affective Strategies	42
14	Frequencies: Social Strategies.....	43
15	Central Tendency & Dispersion: Social Strategies	43
16	Overall Direct and Indirect Strategies.....	44
17	Independent Sample t-tests for Direct and Indirect strategies.....	45
18	Direct and Indirect Strategies: Group by Group.....	46

19	Independent Sample t-tests for Direct and Indirect Strategies: Group by Group	47
20	Direct Strategies: Memory	47
21	Independent Sample t-test for Memory Strategies.....	48
22	Direct Strategies: Cognitive.....	49
23	Independent Sample t-test for Cognitive Strategies.....	51
24	Direct Strategies: Compensatory.....	52
25	Independent Sample t-test for Compensatory Strategies.....	53
26	Indirect Strategies: Metacognitive.....	53
27	Independent Sample t-test for Metacognitive Strategies.....	55
28	Indirect Strategies: Affective.....	56
29	Independent Sample t-test for Affective Strategies.....	57
30	Indirect Strategies: Social.....	57
31	Mann Whitney-U test for Social strategies.....	58
32	Test Statistics.....	59

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The study explored the learning strategies that first-year students use in the English Medium Instruction (EMI) context. The research population included first-year students from a foundation university in Ankara, Türkiye. This chapter outlined the learning strategies that the first-year students use and ascertains if there is a difference in language learning strategies in relation to their gender. This chapter summarized the background of the study, problem statement, purpose of the study, the research questions, significance of the study and lastly the definition of the key words.

Background

The language learning strategies is a concept that dates back to the past. Firstly, based on her observations Rubin (1975) referred to language learning strategies as "...techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge." (p.43). In relation this definition, Rubin identified a number of strategies used by good language learners. With the investigations about language learning strategies, a new learner profile was questioned and identified by researchers that benefit from LLSs. Rubin (1975) identified good language learners as "wiling and accurate guessers" who has "a strong drive to communicate, not inhibited and learners" who actively looks for clues to infer meaning. Additionally, Stern (1975) defined ten strategies of good language learners. Oxford (1981) further explored the concept of language learning strategies, introducing a 'scheme' classifying them as those affecting learning directly and indirectly. These were

expanded into learning strategies composed of cognitive and metacognitive, communication strategies, and social strategies (1987). Similarly, O'Malley and Chamot (1990) grouped them into three categories: metacognitive, cognitive and social/affective.

Oxford (1990) developed a new strategy system, which is “more comprehensive and detailed; it is more systematic in linking individual strategies, as well as strategy groups, with each of the four language skills ...” (p.14), based on which she developed an instrument named *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning* (SILL). Her system categorizes strategies into two major ‘classes’: direct and indirect. The direct one comprises three groups: memory, cognitive and compensation; the indirect one is composed consists of three groups: metacognitive, social and affective. Additionally, each group is further subdivided into a total of 19 strategy sets, with each group and strategy set mutually supporting one another.

Following the widespread adoption of Oxford's SILL, researchers across various educational sectors from primary to higher education, and in various EMI contexts around the world, conducted studies focusing on the use of language learning strategies, and their effect on various individual differences, including gender (Alhaisoni, 2012; Al Khatib, 2013; Alrashidi, 2022; Andini & Prastiyowati, 2021; Green & Oxford, 1995; Kumar, 2018; Nahavandi & Mukundan, 2014; Oxford, 1990; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Rahman, 2020).

Problem

There are about 54 graduate studies conducted in Türkiye focusing on Oxford's conception of language learning strategies in terms of strategy use and individual differences across various educational sectors and contexts. Out of these, 39 studies conducted in the higher-education context, with only 12 of them

specifically concentrating on language learning strategies and gender (Akmençe, 2019; Aslan, 2009; Çetin, 2019; Kaymaz, 2023; Özgür, 2003; Özkara, 2019; Padem, 2012; Razi, 2012; Yalçın, 2006; Yayla et al., 2016; Yeşilçınar, 2014; Yılmaz, 1997).

The majority of tertiary educational institutions in Türkiye are publicly funded, while the remaining ones are privately established foundation universities. Moreover, many of these foundation universities offer programs in EMI. To enhance students' language skills, pre-sessional and in-sessional programs are implemented foundation universities (Eurydice, 2022; TEPAV, 2015).

The existing body of research offers a reasonably solid foundation concerning the use of language learning strategies and their effect on individual differences, with gender being a major variable. However, at the tertiary level, research has primarily centered on public universities, indicating a notable gap in studies conducted within privately established foundation universities that provide programs through EMI. Additionally, there has been limited attention given to investigating the use of language learning strategies, and individual differences, in Türkiye's top-tier foundation universities.

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to explore the language learning strategies employed by the first-year students at a top-tier foundation university where the medium of instruction is English. More specifically, the study aimed to explain what direct and indirect strategies, and accompanying strategy sets, were used by the students. It also examined potential differences in the strategy use based on gender.

Research Questions

This study intended to address the following research questions and sub-questions:

1. What language learning strategies are employed by the first-years students at a top-tier foundation university where the medium of instruction is English?
 - a. What direct strategies, and accompanying strategy sets, do they use?
 - b. What indirect strategies, and accompanying strategy sets, do they use?
2. Is there any difference in the use of language learning strategies on the basis of gender?

Significance

This study holds significance in that it directs focus toward a specific and underexplored context: language learning strategies and gender as an individual difference in Türkiye's top-tier private foundation university, employing EMI. The outcomes of the studies conducted in these areas often display variations across institutions, affirming the perspective that "[t]o attribute causality to any one variable ... without taking time and context into account is misguided" (Ellis & Larsen-Freeman, 2006, p. 563).

In the light of these, the outcomes of this study are anticipated to serve as a crucial point of reference within Türkiye's higher education milieu, particularly in the realm of private foundation universities utilizing EMI. This focused exploration aims to offer nuanced perspectives on the dynamics of language learning strategies and gender within this specific educational context.

Moreover, the study's contributions are expected to extend beyond national boundaries, enriching the global research landscape, especially in diverse EMI institutions. It would also inform curriculum makers, and help tailor and enhance curricula

The study is expected to raise EMI teachers' understanding of language learning strategies with a view to heightening student awareness, and developing their language skills, given the teachable nature of the strategies (Oxford, 1990).

Definition of Key Terms

English for Academic Purposes (EAP): Meaning that teaching non-native English speakers that will need English for their college/university studies (Cambridge Dictionary, Year).

English as a Foreign Language (EFL): The term refers to people who learn English in a non-English speaking country (Iwai, 2011).

English Medium Instruction (EMI): EMI is defined as “the use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English” (Macaro, 2018, p.19).

Language Learning Strategies (LLS): They are the efforts that learners do or techniques that they follow to improve learning's ease, speed, enjoyment, effectiveness, and adaptability to new circumstances (Oxford, 1990).

Strategy Inventory Tool for Language Learning (SILL): It is the tool for assessing the language learning strategy use of the learners and it has two versions. First version is version 5.1 and used to assess native speakers; however, the second version which is called version 7.0 used to evaluate the foreign learners (Russel, 2010). The SILL tool consists of six constructs; memory, cognitive, compensatory, metacognitive, affective and social (see Appendix B & C). These six constructs also have sub-constructs, and the researcher explains them in detail in Chapter 2.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In this chapter, the researcher initially focuses on earlier studies on language learning strategies, and then introduces Oxford's (1990) classification of language learning strategies, and the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning Strategies. Following this, the researcher analyzes studies concerning language learning strategies and gender within the higher education context in Türkiye. The investigation then extends to studies worldwide, conducted in similar contexts.

Earlier Studies on Language Learning Strategies (LLSs)

Firstly, Rubin (1975) defined LLSs as “techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge” (p. 43). Following this definition, Rubin argues that there are three specific strategies that learners employ:4 being a good guesser, being keen to communicate and being open to test their knowledge by trying out new sentences (Rubin, 1975). Additionally, while making observations and research about the language learning strategies Rubin (1975) states “... the good language learner takes and creates opportunities to practice what he has learned and while the poorer learner passively does what is assigned him” (p.44). Building on this finding, Rubin (1975) identified the good language learner and their characteristics.

Based on her observations, Rubin (1975) defines “good language learners” by referring to their seven important characteristics.

The good language learner is “a willing and accurate guesser, ... has a strong drive to communicate, ... is willing to make mistakes in order to learn and to communicate, ... is constantly looking for patterns in the language, ... practices, ...

monitors his own and the speech of others, [and] ... attends to meaning" (Rubin, 1975, pp. 46-47).

Likewise, Stern (1975b, p.304) claimed that "by discovering how good language learners proceed, it should be possible to help problem learners to improve their approach and in this way to become more effective." To this end, he explored strategies used by good language learners, and identified ten strategies:

- 1 Planning strategy: a personal learning style or positive learning
- 2 Active strategy: an active approach to the learning task.
- 3 Empathic strategy: a tolerant and outgoing approach to the target language and its speakers.
- 4 Formal strategy: technical know-how of how to tackle a language.
- 5 Experimental strategy: a methodical but flexible approach, developing the new language into an ordered system and constantly revising it.
- 6 Semantic strategy: constant searching for meaning.
- 7 Practice strategy: willingness to practise.
- 8 Communication Strategy: willingness to use the language in real communication.
- 9 Monitoring strategy: self-monitoring and critical sensitivity to language use.
- 10 Internalization strategy: developing second language more and more as a separate reference system and learning to think in it." (1975a, pp. 414-415; 1975b)

Rubin (1981, as cited in O'Malley & Chamot, 1990, pp 4-5) further explored the concept of language learning strategies, and introduced a "scheme" classifying them under "strategies that directly affect learning", and "processes that contribute indirectly to learning". The former include "*clarification/ verification, monitoring,*

memorization, guessing/inductive inferencing, deductive reasoning, practice. The latter include processes that *create opportunities for practice*, or those that use *production tricks*".

Rubin (1987) further categorized direct and indirect strategies, delineating three major strategy types: learning strategies, communication strategies and social strategies. Learning strategies had two main categories: cognitive and metacognitive strategies. The former include *clarification/verification, guessing/inductive inferencing, deductive reasoning, practice, memorization*, and *monitoring*; the latter include several processes such as *planning, prioritizing, setting goals*, and *self-management* (Rubin, 1987).

O'Malley and Chamot (1990) considered the language learning strategies as "... the special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information ..." (p.1). They (1990) posited that within the context of second language acquisition, strategies could be grouped into three primary categories: *metacognitive* (e.g. selective attention, monitoring evaluating), *cognitive* (e.g. rehearsal, organization, referencing, summarizing), and *social/affective* (cooperation, questioning, self-talk).

Oxford's Classification of Language Learning Strategies and SILL

Expanding upon research conducted by Rubin, and O'Malley and Chamot, Oxford (1989, 1990) developed the *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning* (SILL), introducing a broader range of cognitive and affective strategies (Rubin, 2005). Also, she advocated that "the basic purpose of the SILL is to provide a general picture of the learner's typical strategy use, rather than a specific portrayal of the strategies used by the learner on a particular language task (Oxford, 1999, p. 114, as cited in Oxford, 2011).

Oxford (1990) categorized LLSs into six main categories grouped under direct and indirect strategies. Direct strategies are composed of memory, cognitive and compensation strategies. Indirect strategies consist of metacognitive, affective and social strategies.

Direct Strategies

According to Oxford (1990), “all direct strategies require mental processing of the target language, and the three groups of direct strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation) do this processing differently and for different purposes” (p. 37).

Memory

Memory strategies are categorized into four groups: “Creating mental linkages”, “Applying images and sounds”, “Reviewing well”, and “Employing action” (Oxford, 1990). According to Oxford’s (1990), “Memory strategies reflect very simple principles, such as arranging things in order, making associations, and reviewing...enable[ing] learners to store verbal material and then retrieve it when needed for communication” (p.39).

Creating mental linkages. There are three strategies in this set which form the basis of “Creating mental linkages” (1990): “Grouping”, “Associating/Elaborating”, and “Placing new words into a context” (pp. 40-41). Based on Oxford’s (1990) explanations, “Grouping and Associating/Elaborating” relate to the listening and reading skills; however, “Placing new words into a context” relates to listening, reading, writing and speaking skills.

Applying images and sounds. There are four strategies in this set which form the basis of “Applying images and sounds” (1990): Using “Imagery”, “Semantic mapping”, “Using keywords”, “Representing sounds in memory” (p.59). Based on Oxford’s (1990) explanations, “Using imagery”, “Semantic mapping” and

“Using keywords” relates to the listening and reading skills; however, “Representing sounds in memory” relates to listening, reading and speaking skills.

Reviewing well. There is one strategy in this set which form the basis of “Reviewing well” (1990): “Structured reviewing” (p.59). All strategies from this part relates to listening, reading, writing and speaking skills.

Employing action. There are two strategies in this set which form the basis of “Employing action” (1990): Using physical response or sensation relates to listening and reading, and “Using mechanical techniques” (p.59) relates to listening, reading and writing skills.

Cognitive

Cognitive strategies are categorized into four groups: “Practicing”, “Receiving and sending messages”, “Analyzing and reasoning”, and “Creating structure for input and output” (Oxford, 1990, p.44). “Cognitive strategies are essential in learning a new language. Such strategies are a varied lot, ranging from repeating to analyzing expressions to summarizing” (p.43).

Practicing. There are five strategies in this set which form the basis of “*Practicing*” (1990): “Repeating”, “Formally practicing with sounds and writing systems”, “Recognizing and using formulas and patterns”, “Recombining, and Practicing naturalistically” (p.69). *Repeating* relates to listening, reading, writing and speaking skills. While “*Recognizing and using formulas and patterns*”, as well as “*Practicing naturalistically*” are applicable to all four skills, “*Formally practicing with sounds and writing systems*” focuses on listening, speaking and writing, and “*Recombining*” mainly pertains to speaking and writing (Oxford, 1990).

Receiving and sending messages. There are two strategies in this set which form the basis of “Receiving and sending messages” (1990): “Getting the idea

quickly”, “Using resources for receiving and sending messages” (p.69). “Getting the idea quickly” relates to listening and reading skills. “Using resources for receiving and sending messages” relates to listening, reading, writing and speaking skills.

Analyzing and reasoning. Within this set, there are five strategies: “Reasoning deductively”, “Analyzing expressions”, “Analyzing contrastively”, “Translating”, “Transferring” (p.69). While “Reasoning deductively”, “Translating” and “Transferring” relate to listening, reading, writing and speaking skills. “Analyzing expressions” and “Analyzing contrastively” relate to listening and reading skills.

Creating structure for input and output. At the core of this set are three main strategies: “Taking notes”, “Summarizing” and “Highlighting” (p.69). They all relate to listening, reading and writing skills.

Compensation

Compensation strategies are categorized into two groups: *Guessing intelligently and Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing* (p.91). “*The compensation strategies ... help learners to overcome knowledge limitations in all four skills*” (p.90).

Guessing intelligently. This set rests on two strategies: “Using linguistic clues”, and “Using other clues” (p.91), are related to listening and reading skills.

Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing. There are eight strategies in this set: “Switching to the mother tongue”, “Getting help”, “Using mime or gesture”, “Avoiding communication partially or totally”, “Selecting the topic”, “Adjusting or approximating the message”, “Coining words”, “Using a circumlocution or synonym” (p.91). While “Switching to the mother tongue”, “Getting help”, “Using mime or gesture”, “Avoiding communication partially or

totally” relate to speaking skills, “Selecting the topic”, “Adjusting or approximating the message”, “Coining words, using a circumlocution or synonym” relate to speaking and writing skills.

Indirect Strategies

The indirect strategies are composed of three main categories: metacognitive, affective and social (Oxford, 1990). “All these strategies are called indirect because they support and manage language learning without (in many instances) directly involving the target language” (Oxford, 1990, p.135). These strategies “are applicable to all four language skills: listening, writing, reading and speaking” (p.135).

Metacognitive

Metacognitive strategies are categorized into three groups: “Centering your learning”, “Arranging and planning your learning”, “Evaluating your learning” (p.136). “Metacognitive strategies are actions which go beyond purely cognitive devices, and which provide a way for learners to coordinate their own learning process” (p.136).

Centering your learning. There are three strategies which form the basis of this set. “Paying attention” relates to all four language skills, namely, listening, reading, writing and speaking skills; however, “Delaying speech production to focus on listening “relates to listening and speaking skills.

Arranging and planning your learning. There are six strategies in this set “Finding out about language learning”, “Organizing”, “Setting goals and objectives”, “Identifying the purpose of a language task”, “Planning for a language task”, “Seeking practice opportunities” (p.153). All strategies from this part relate to listening, reading, writing and speaking skills.

Evaluating your learning. There are two strategies in this set: “Self-monitoring and self-evaluating” (p.153). All strategies from this part relate to all four language skills.

Affective

Affective strategies are categorized into three groups: “Lowering your anxiety”, “Encouraging yourself”, “Taking your emotional temperature” (p.136). “It is impossible to overstate the importance of affective factors influencing language learning. Language learners can gain control over these factors through affective strategies” (p.140).

Lowering your anxiety. There are three strategies in this set which form the basis of “Lowering your anxiety” (1990): “Using progressive relaxation”, “Deep breathing or meditation”, “Using music”, “Using laughter” (p.163). All strategies from this part relate to listening, reading, writing and speaking skills.

Encouraging yourself. This is composed of three strategy sets: “Making positive statements”, “Taking risks wisely”, “Rewarding yourself” (p.163). All strategies from this part relate to listening, reading, writing and speaking skills.

Taking your emotional temperature. There are four strategies in this set which form the basis of taking your emotional temperature (1990): “Listening to your body”, “Using a checklist”, “Writing a language learning diary”, “Discussing your feelings with someone else” (p.163). All strategies from this part relate to listening, reading, writing and speaking skills.

Social

Language is regarded as “a form of social behavior ... [l]earning a language thus involves other people, and appropriate social strategies are very important in this process” (p.144). Social strategies are categorized into three groups, and each of

includes two specific strategies: “Asking questions”, “Cooperating with others”, “Empathizing with others” (p.145).

Asking questions. At the core of this set, there two specific strategies: “Asking for clarification” relates to listening and reading skills and “Asking for correction relates” to speaking and writing skills.

Cooperating with others. There are two strategies in this set which form the basis of “Cooperating with others” (1990): “Cooperating with peers and “Cooperating with proficient users of the new language” (p.169). All strategies from this part relate to listening, reading, writing and speaking skills.

Empathizing with others. There are two primary strategies in this set: “Developing cultural understanding”, and “Becoming aware of others’ thoughts and feelings” (p.169). All strategies from this part relate to the four language skills, namely listening, reading, writing and speaking skills.

Language Learning Strategies, Individual Differences and Gender

To Dörnyei and Ryan (2015), “...*individual differences* are characteristics or traits in which individuals may be shown to differ from each other” (p.2). Interest in individual variables grew rapidly towards the end of the twentieth century, and gender is considered to be among those variables (Griffiths & Soruç, 2020). When investigating language learning strategies across different grouping variables, gender differences have consistently emerged as recurring themes in studies (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). Gender plays a role in influencing the use of language learning strategies, with females commonly indicating a higher level of strategy use in various cultural settings (Oxford, 1996; Kaylani, 1996). The study conducted by Peacock and Ho (2003) found that “[f]emales reported significantly higher use of all six strategy categories ... than did males. They also report a much higher use of nine individual

strategies (78% were from the memory or metacognitive categories) (p. 186).

However, it is important to note that studies vary; while some found female language learners to be more proficient than male students, others reported no significant gender differences (Griffiths & Soruç, 2020). In any case, to Ellis and Larsen-Freeman (2006), “[t]o attribute causality to any one variable ... without taking time and context into account is misguided” (p. 563).

Range of Studies in Relation to Oxford’s SILL and Gender

When *language learning strategies* as a term was searched through the National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education in Türkiye (Ulusal Tez Merkezi, 2023), 88 studies were identified. Among these studies, 54 were conducted in the Turkish higher education context, using Oxford’s SILL framework (1990) either alone or in combination with other variables, with 39 of them including gender as a unit of analysis, and 12 higher education contexts. The researcher primarily analyzed the findings of the studies focusing on language learning strategies in general alongside individual differences in reverse-chronological order.

Related Studies Conducted in Türkiye in relation to Oxford’s SILL and Gender

To start with, Kaymaz (2023) conducted a quantitative study using Oxford’s (1990) SILL tool. The purpose of the study was to investigate the LLSs use of language preparatory school students at a public university. In this study, gender, level and departments of the students were also analyzed vis-à-vis LLSs. 296 randomly selected preparatory school students from the departments of English Language and Literature (ELL), International Relations (IR) and Business Administration (BA) took part in the study. 184 of the students were female and 112 of them were male.

Based on the results, the preparatory school students in the departments of ELL, IR and BA tend to utilize LLSs at a medium level with a notably frequent use of social strategies in the department of ELL and that of compensation strategies in the departments of IR and BA. While the use of social strategies is followed by “compensations strategies, metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, memory strategies, and affective strategies (Kaymaz, 2023 p.55), in the departments of IR and BA, the compensation strategies are followed by social, cognitive, metacognitive and memory strategies.

The study also investigated the use of LLS by female and male students. Firstly, a significant difference in the use of LLSs was observed, favoring female students in the departments of ELL, IR and BA (Kaymaz, 2023). The findings also indicated that, overall, female students in the ELL department used LLSs in general, and direct and indirect strategies in particular, significantly more frequently than male students. However, it was found that while female students in the IR and BA department tended to use direct strategies more frequently, male students employed indirect strategies more often.

The results additionally indicated that “with the exception of compensation strategies, females at the department of ELL used all learning strategies more frequently than males (Kaymaz, 2023, p. 57). In addition, the findings indicated that the female students in the department of ELL utilized both affective and social strategies significantly more than the male ones (Kaymaz, 2023). As for the departments of IR & BA, female students were observed to use cognitive, metacognitive, affective and social strategies more frequently than their male counterparts. In contrast, the male students were found to employ memory and compensation strategies more frequently than the female students in these

departments. Additionally, male students significantly favored compensation strategies significantly more frequently than their female counterparts, while female students significantly employed affective strategies more frequently.

Next, using Oxford's (1990) the conception of language learning strategies, Ozkara (2019) conducted a mixed-method study including 225 participants in EMI settings, and the purpose of the study included investigating the LLSs use the students and gender difference. The finding revealed that the most preferred strategy was *metacognitive*, the least preferred one was *affective*. *Social* and *memory* strategies showed a medium level of use. The study did not find any differences in strategy use between male and female students.

In a similar vein, Soya Çetin (2019) conducted a study, involving 208 preparatory students, using Oxford's (1990) the conception of language learning strategies. The study aimed to examine their use of LLSs, and to explore potential differences based on gender. The results of the study showed that students favored *metacognitive* strategies the most, and *affective* strategies the least. Gender was found to be a factor in overall strategy use, with female students in *metacognitive* and *affective* strategies in particular.

Likewise, Akmençe (2019) used the Turkish version of Oxford's SILL to assess language learning strategy use, with a particular focus on variables like gender. The study involved 200 students at the School of Foreign Languages in Fırat University. The findings of the study indicated that students employed language learning strategies at moderate level. Among these strategies, *metacognitive strategies* were the most frequently used while *affective* strategies were the least utilized. As to gender, the study found that female learners had significantly higher

averages than male students in all sub-dimensions of the six strategies and the entire scale.

Furthermore, Yayla et al., (2016) conducted a study to investigate monolingual and bilingual university students' language learning strategies, with a focus on examining if there is any difference based on some selected categories including gender. A total of 524 students from two state universities participate in the study. The researchers used Oxford's (1990) SILL tool to collect data. It was found that students employed LLSs at a medium level. *Metacognitive strategies* were the most frequently used, followed by *compensation*, *social*, *cognitive*, *memory*, and, finally, *affective strategies*. Additionally, the study revealed significant differences between male and female students' use of LLSs, favoring female students in the overall scale, and in all sub-dimensions except for *cognitive* and *affective* strategies.

Accordingly, Yeşilçınar (2014) conducted a study to investigate the use of LLSs among EFL students in different departments of the Faculty of Education at Muş Alparslan University. The researcher used Oxford's (1990) SILL tool to collect data, and a total of 150 EFL students participated in the study. The study found that students employed LLSs at a medium level, with the most frequently used strategies being *metacognitive* and the least used strategies being *cognitive*. Additionally, the study also revealed that female EFL students used LLSs more than male EFL students, and the results were significant with regard to *memory*, *compensation*, *metacognitive* and *affective* strategies.

Razi (2012) conducted a study investigated the English language teaching department students' language learning strategy preferences. The study also aimed to identify the impact of several categorical variables, including gender. The researcher used Oxford's (1990) SILL. The participants in the study consisted of 189 students

from the ELT Department of the Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University. Descriptive findings indicated that *compensation* and *metacognitive* strategies were the most preferred, while *affective* and *social* strategies were the least preferred. The results did not indicate any significant differences based on gender

Padem (2012) conducted a study to examine the use of language learning strategies of university preparatory school students, the focus of which included gender difference in strategy use. In total, 461 students participated in the study and the researcher used the Turkish version of Oxford's (1990) SILL tool to collect the data. As a result, the study found that students employed LLSs at a medium level. Besides, the least preferred strategy was *affective* strategies, and the most preferred strategy was social strategies (Padem, 2012). Although there was no significant difference in overall strategy use between female and male students, the study identified significant differences in *memory strategies*, favoring female learners, and in *compensation strategies*, favoring male learners.

In a similar context, Aslan (2009) conducted a study to investigate EFL students' use of LLSs as conceptualized by Oxford (1990), which included strategy use with respect to gender. The study was conducted at Atılım University English Preparatory School. 257 students participated in the study, and the sample was composed of 153 male and 104 female students. The study revealed that female preparatory school students employ LLSs more than male learners (Aslan, 2009). Additionally, the study found that female students use more language learning strategies in learning English than their male counterparts. It was also found that more *direct* than *indirect strategies* were used by the students.

Yalçın (2006) conducted a study to investigate the use of LLSs among students at the Preparatory School of Gazi University, with gender as one of the

categories analyzed in inferential terms. A total of 334 students took part in the study, and the researcher used Oxford's (1990) SILL tool to collect the data. The findings indicated that the preparatory school students employed LLSs at a medium level. Overall, the most frequently used strategy was *compensation*, while *cognitive* strategies were the least utilized. The study also revealed that female learners used LLSs more than male learners. The researcher found a statistically significant difference between female and male student of LLSs, favoring females in all categories except for compensation strategies.

Additionally, Özgür (2003) conducted a study to investigate the use of LLSs at Başkent University's Preparatory School, utilizing Oxford's (1990) SILL. A total of 153 students participated in the study. The findings showed that *metacognitive strategies* were the most frequently used, followed by *social*, *compensation*, *memory*, *cognitive* and *affective strategies*. The results also showed that there were statistically significance differences between the use of LLS by male and female students. Similarly, Yılmaz (1997) conducted a study to investigate students' use of LLSs, with a focus on gender, in the Intensive Language Program at the Faculty of Communication Sciences in Anadolu University. A total of 104 student responses were analyzed and it was found that the students used the learning strategies at a medium level. *Compensation* and *metacognitive* strategies were used moderately frequently, followed by *social*, *cognitive*, *affective* and *memory strategies*. The study also indicated that female learners preferred to use *social strategies* more than males.

Related Studies in Similar Contexts across the World

The researcher reviewed the related literature by specifically selecting the studies that focused on the use of language learning strategies in general, and interplay with gender in particular.

In a study conducted by Alrashidi (2022), which included 256 English major students from three different universities in Saudi Arabia, one of the purposes was to investigate the most and the least preferred language learning strategies by English major students. Additionally, the study aimed to investigate the significant differences, if any, in students' use of LLSs in terms of a number of variables including gender. The study used Oxford's (1990) SILL tool to collect data. The results indicated that the students used language learning strategies at a high level. Additionally, the students mostly preferred to employ *metacognitive strategies* followed by *compensation strategies*, then *cognitive strategies*, *social strategies*, *affective strategies*, and last and the least *memory strategies*. Regarding gender-based differences, the study revealed that both male and female employed *metacognitive* and *compensation strategies* the most, while *memory strategies* were used the least. Additionally, the study showed that female learners employed LLSs significantly more than male learners except for the *social strategies*.

A recent study from India indicated that male and female learners differed in terms of LLSs use and female learners use more LLSs (Andini & Prastiyowati, 2021). The study consisted of 37 students in the department of English language education. The findings revealed that female learners used more LLSs than their male counterparts. They showed a preference for *metacognitive* and *social strategies*. In contrast, male students were less inclined to use *affective* and *cognitive strategies* but leaned towards *cognitive*, *metacognitive* and *compensations strategies*. Based on the mean scores, *compensatory strategies* were the most favored strategy for both female and male learners.

Furthermore, Rahman (2020) conducted a quantitative study to investigate the LLSs use of EFL learners in the English Language and translation department

who are studying at the Qassim University. The study's aim included investigating the most common used strategies and categorize them. The study used Oxford's (1990) SILL tool to collect data. The results of the study showed that EFL learners generally used most strategies at a medium level. *Metacognitive and compensation strategies* were the most preferred, while *affective strategies* were the least favored.

Kumar (2018) conducted a quantitative study to identify type of strategies used by ESL learners using Oxford's (1990) SILL, and to explore gender differences in strategy use among ESL learners through interviews. The study involved a total of 172 participants, consisting of 86 males and 86 females at the Malaysia University of Science Technology joined the study. The findings of the study showed that students mostly used *metacognitive* and *social strategies*, while the least preferred strategy was *memory strategies*.

Moreover, Nahavandi and Mukundan (2014) conducted a study to investigate the language learning strategies of Iranian engineering EFL learners. The purpose of the study also included if gender had any effect on the use of language learning strategies. A total of 403 students were randomly selected for the study, and 369 of them completed Oxford's (1990) SILL. The results showed the participants generally used most strategies at a medium level. Among these strategies, *metacognitive strategies* were the most commonly used, while *memory and affective strategies* were the least favored, with their means significantly lower than the average. The study also revealed that the gender did not have a significant effect on the use of strategies.

Al Khatib (2013) conducted a study to investigate the LLSs used by Emirati EFL university learners. The purpose of the study also included if gender had an effect on the use of LLSs. In total, 190 students in the foundation program took part

in the study. The study used Arabic translation of Oxford's (1990) SILL tool to collect data. The results of the study indicated that Emirati students were using LLSs at the medium level. Besides, the results showed that Emirati students mostly used *metacognitive strategies*, while *memory strategies* were the least preferred. Gender was found to have no significant effect on the use of language strategies.

Alhaisoni (2012) conducted a study in the higher-education context involving 701 Saudi EFL students to investigate their use of LLSs, with a particular focus on gender differences. The outcomes of the study revealed that EFL students utilized language learning strategies with low to medium frequency, with a strong preference for *cognitive* and *metacognitive* strategies, while *affective* and *memory* strategies were less favored. In the study it was also found that “[f]emale students ... tend to use overall language learning strategies more often than males” (p.115); however, “... gender did not have a significant effect overall on the use of language learning strategies except in their use of social strategies, where females reported using social strategies significantly more than males” (p.122).

In Oxford's earlier studies, Green and Oxford (1995) conducted a study to investigate the LLSs use of 374 students from the University of Puerto Rico. The researchers also examined the participants' use of LLSs in relation to their gender. They found higher levels of strategy use by women than men, and “... variation ... by gender was significant...”, p. 273).

Besides, Oxford et al., (1990), conducted a case study to investigate the impact of LLSs training and its effects on language learning. Oxford et al. (1990) concluded that if the strategy training is carefully organized and successfully implemented into classroom, the results could be positive and that may lead the learners to become self-directed learners. Oxford et al., (1990) also suggested that

students should feel that they are responsible for making decisions for their learning and so the teacher can change the role from controller to facilitator.

In one of Oxford's earlier studies with Nyikos (1989), the researchers conducted a study with 1200 university students with approximately equal distribution of men and women. The study found that female learners utilized LLSs more than male learners. "...compared with males, females reported significantly more frequent use of conversational input elicitation strategies, reflecting social interaction" (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989, p.296).



CHAPTER 3: METHOD

Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology for exploring the language learning strategies that first-year students use in the English Medium Instruction (EMI) context. The chapter summarizes the research design of the study, context, participants of the study, instrumentation, data collection, the data analysis and finally the ethical considerations.

Research Design

This study used a single-case design incorporating survey, and causal-comparative designs, to answer the research questions. Case studies could be qualitative or quantitative in nature, or adopt a mixed methodology (Gay et al., 2012). Single-case design may focus on a critical or unique case (Yin, 2009). This study shifts attention to a particular and less-explored context. It was conducted in a leading private foundation university in Turkey, where the medium instruction is English.

The research employed a survey design to characterize the language learning strategies employed by first-year students. “Survey designs provide plans for a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population” (Creswell, 2017, p. 382). To Fraenkel and Wallen (2012), “the major purpose of survey is to describe the characteristics of a population, ... [where] the members distribute themselves on one or more variables (p. 393). To this end, the researcher used a cross-sectional survey collecting data from a predetermined group. “This design has the advantage of measuring current

attitudes or practices. It also provides information in a short amount of time, such as the time required for administering the survey and collecting the information time” (Creswell, 2017, p.377).

The researcher also incorporated causal-comparative design to investigate whether the use of strategies varied based on gender.” One type of nonexperimental quantitative research is causal-comparative research in which the investigator compares two or more groups in terms of a cause (or independent variable) that has already happened” (Creswell, 2017, p.60). As in the causal-comparative research design the researcher has the chance to see the impact on groups; in this study the researcher used causal-comparative design to investigate the differences between male and female learners in terms of their LLSs use.

Context

The study was conducted at a top-tier private foundation university in Ankara, Türkiye, where English used as the Medium of Instruction (EMI). There are then faculties housing thirty-three departments at the university. Only the Faculty of Law conducts courses related to the Turkish legal system in Turkish. To commence academic studies, all students are required to meet a proficiency level of CEFR B2.

Participants

Upon meeting the proficiency requirement, students are required to take two English Composition Courses. The link to the questionnaire was distributed to all students enrolled in these courses, and those who volunteered, about 82 students, took part in the study, and their demographic characteristics are as follows (Table 1).

Table 1*Demographic Characteristics of Participants*

Baseline Characteristics (<i>n</i> =82)		<i>f</i>	%
Faculty			
	Sciences (applied sciences and engineering)	28	34.1
	Art, Design and Architecture	12	14.6
	Social Sciences	21	25.7
	Humanities	21	25.6
Gender			
	Female	48	58.5
	Male	29	35.4
	Prefer not to answer	5	6.1
Age			
	18-19	50	61.0
	20-21	32	39
English Preparatory Program Attendance			
	Yes	37	45.1
	No	45	54.9
Semesters at Preparatory Program			
	One Semester	23	28.0
	Two or more semesters	14	17.1
High School Type			
	Public	29	35.4
	Public (following an international curriculum)	3	3.7
	Private	40	48.8
	Private (following an international curriculum)	10	12.2
Program Type			
	International Baccalaureate	11	13.4
	Oxford IGCSE	1	1.2
	OLevel/ ALevel System	1	1.2
	Baccalaureate François	1	1.2
	Science School	1	1.2
	AP Calculus AB	1	1.2
CGPA Average			
	3.00 +	15	18.3
	2.99 - 2.00	3	15.9
	1.99-0	9	11.0
ENG101 Letter Grade			
	A (+,-), B+	19	23.2
	B & (B-)	15	18.3
	C (+,-)	4	4.9
Current Enrollment to ENG courses			
	ENG101	45	54.9
	ENG102	37	45.1

In terms of the gender distribution of the 82 students, 48 students represented females and 30 students represented males and finally 5 students preferred not to answer the question.

Instrumentation

The study used Oxford's *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning* Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL) tool based on the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) framework. Her classification system divides strategies into two main 'classes': direct and indirect. Additionally, each group is further subdivided into a total of 19 strategy sets wherein each group and strategy set complement and reinforce one another (Oxford, 1990). There are fifty 5-point Likert-scale items spread throughout the inventory (Appendix B).

Direct Strategies (29 items)

According to Oxford's classification, direct strategies consist of three groups:

- Memory strategies: There are 9 items with the following four strategy sets.
 - Creating mental linkages
 - Applying images and sound
 - Reviewing
 - Employing Action
- Cognitive strategies: There are 14 items with the following four strategy sets.
 - Practicing
 - Receiving and sending messages
 - Analyzing and reasoning
 - Creating structure for input and output
- Compensatory strategies: There are 6 items with the following two strategy sets (Oxford, 1990).

- Guessing intelligently
- Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing

Indirect Strategies (21 items)

Indirect strategies are composed of three categories according to Oxford's classification. These categories are as follows;

- Metacognitive strategies: There are 9 items with the following three strategy sets,
 - Centering your learning
 - Arranging and planning your learning
 - Evaluating your learning
- Affective strategies: There are 6 items with the following three strategy sets,
 - Lowering your anxiety
 - Encouraging yourself
 - Taking your emotional temperature
- Social strategies: There are 6 items with the following three strategy sets (Oxford, 1990).
 - Asking questions
 - Cooperating with others
 - Empathizing with others

Method of Data Collection & Analysis

The researcher prepared the online version of the SILL, using Google Forms. The questionnaire was completed by 82 students. To increase the return rate, the link was sent twice in a four-week time frame. After collecting data through Google Forms, the data collected were reviewed for any errors or inconsistencies. Next, they were transferred into a spreadsheet program to ease their import onto the SPSS

(version 25.0). Following this, to facilitate the process of descriptive and inferential data analysis in a systematic way, the researcher determined the data types, classifying them as nominal, ordinal or scale. Before starting the analysis, the researcher assessed the data's reliability using Cronbach's alpha, and found the score of 0.86, which suggests a relatively high level of internal consistency (Cohen et al., 2008).

The study both used descriptive and inferential statistics to identify the range of strategies used, and to examine potential differences in strategy use based on gender. Table 2 below presents the research questions vis-à-vis how data were analyzed.

Table 2

Summary of Research Questions & Data Analysis Techniques

Research Questions	Analysis Techniques
1) What language learning strategies are employed by the freshmen students at a top-tier foundation university where the medium of instruction is English?	Descriptive Analysis for each strategy (frequencies & measures of central tendency and dispersion)
a. What direct strategies, and accompanying strategy sets, do they use?	
b. What indirect strategies, and accompanying strategy sets, do they use?	
2) Is there any difference in the use of language learning strategies on the basis of gender?	Descriptive & Inferential Analysis, strategy by strategy and item by item (frequencies & measures of central tendency and dispersion) Mann-Whitney U test t-test

To address the first research question, the study used frequencies to examine the distribution of a range of language learning strategies. The analysis also focused on central values, and variability, in relation to each strategy. To address the second research question, the study used the Mann-Whitney U test and t-test, selecting

between them based on the extent to which assumptions of normal distribution were met.

Ethical Considerations

The researcher first obtained the ethical approval of Bilkent University Ethics Committee. Following the approval of the committee, the researcher contacted the program concerned to facilitate the distribution of the Google Forms link to the first-years students enrolled in English 101 and 102. In line with the directions provided by the committee, the survey was circulated to the participants, and those who volunteered signed the consent form and completed the survey.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Introduction

In this chapter, the researcher provides the statistical findings and summarizes the discussion of the findings and then refers to the related studies and findings.

Language Learning Strategies in Descriptive Terms

Overall Direct and Indirect Strategies

Frequency and percentage analysis were applied to determine the item marking frequencies and response percentages of the 5-point Likert-Scale. The results of the analysis are given in Table 3.

Table 3 below presents both central tendency and dispersion measures in relation to direct and indirect strategy use of the first-year students who participated in the study.

Table 3

Overall Direct and Indirect strategies: Descriptive

Language Learning Strategies	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Memory Strategies	82	2.84	0.55
Cognitive Strategies	82	3.51	0.55
Compensatory Strategies	82	3.67	0.56
Overall Direct Strategies	82	3.33	0.43
Metacognitive Strategies	82	3.47	0.64
Affective Strategies	82	2.53	0.68
Social Strategies	82	3.28	0.74
Overall Indirect Strategies	82	3.15	0.49

Note. “High-always or almost always used:4.50 to 5.00, High -usually used:3.50 to 4.49, Medium-sometimes used:2.50 to 3.49, Low -generally not used:1.50 to 2.49, Low -never or almost never used:1.00 to 1.49” (Oxford, 1990).

Table 3 indicates that *Compensatory strategies* (M=3.67) within direct strategies, and *Cognitive* (M=3.51) *strategies* within indirect strategies were among

the most frequently used, while *Affective strategies* (M= 2.53) within indirect strategies, and *Memory Strategies* (M=2.84) within direct strategies were reported with the lowest average use, exhibiting a great variability among participants.

Memory Strategies

Table 4 below displays the frequencies and percentages in relation to *memory strategy* use by the first-year students.

Table 4

Frequencies: Memory Strategies

Items		1	2	3	4	5	<i>n</i>
1. "I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English."	<i>f</i>	1	3	20	37	21	82
	%	1.2	3.7	24.4	45.1	25.6	100
2. "I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	4	10	27	28	13	82
	%	4.9	12.2	32.9	34.1	15.9	100
3. "I connect the sound of a new English word and an image of picture of the word to help me remember the word." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	12	29	18	14	9	82
	%	14.6	35.4	22	17.1	11	100
4. "I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of situation in which the word might be used." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	5	14	18	28	17	82
	%	6.1	17.1	22	34.1	20.7	100
5. "I use rhymes to remember new English words." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	29	23	15	11	4	82
	%	35.4	28	18.3	13.4	4.9	100
6. "I use flashcards to remember new English words." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	43	23	9	4	3	82
	%	52.4	28	11	4.9	3.7	100
7. "I physically act out new English words." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	27	21	16	14	4	82
	%	32.9	25.6	19.5	17.1	4.9	100
8. "I review English lessons often." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	19	28	24	11	0	82
	%	23.2	34.1	29.3	13.4	0	100
9. "I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	14	7	21	23	17	82
	%	17.1	8.5	25.6	28	20.7	100

According to Table 4, Item 1 exhibits the highest combined percentage score of 70.7%, suggesting mostly preferred strategy. Conversely, Items 6 and 5 emerged as the least preferred strategies, with a combined percentage scores of 80.4% and 63.4%, respectively.

Table 5 provides data on the central tendency in relation *to memory strategies*, offering insights into the dispersion of memory strategy usage among 82 first-year students.

Table 5

Central Tendency & Dispersion: Memory Strategies

Items	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. "I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.90	0.869
2. "I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.44	1.055
3. "I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word." (Oxford, 1990)	82	2.74	1.225
4. "I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of the situation in which the word might be used." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.46	1.178
5. "I use rhymes to remember new English words." (Oxford, 1990)	82	2.24	1.213
6. "I use flashcards to remember new English words." (Oxford, 1990)	82	1.79	1.063
7. "I physically act out new English words." (Oxford, 1990)	82	2.35	1.241
8. "I review English lessons often." (Oxford, 1990)	82	2.33	0.982
9. "I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.27	1.352

Note. "High-always or almost always used:4.50 to 5.00, High -usually used:3.50 to 4.49, Medium-sometimes used:2.50 to 3.49,

Low -generally not used:1.50 to 2.49, Low -never or almost never used:1.00 to 1.49" (Oxford, 1990).

As Table 5 indicates, the memory strategy with the highest average of 3.90 was *thinking of relationships between what first-years students already know and new things they learn in English*. The associated SD score of 0.869 suggests there was high level of agreement among participants. Among the other memory strategies with average scores falling within the range of 3.50 and 4.49, two additional strategies stood out: *Using new English words in sentences* (M=3.44), and *Creating mental pictures* (M=3.46). Conversely, the memory strategy with the lowest average score was *Using flashcards* (M=1.79).

Cognitive Strategies

Table 6 below displays the frequencies and percentages in relation to *cognitive strategy* use by the first-year students.

Table 6

Frequencies: Cognitive Strategies

Items		1	2	3	4	5	<i>n</i>
10. "I say or write new English words several times." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	16	27	19	11	9	82
	%	19.5	32.9	23.2	13.4	11	100
11. "I try to talk like native English speakers." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	3	11	11	26	30	82
	%	3.7	13.4	13.4	31.7	36.6	100
12. "I practice the sounds of English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	6	11	23	24	17	82
	%	7.3	13.4	28	29.3	20.7	100
13. "I use English words I know in different ways." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	1	9	16	32	24	82
	%	1.2	11	19.5	39	29.3	100
14. "I start conversations in English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	10	9	15	28	20	82
	%	12.2	11	18.3	34.1	24.4	100
15. "I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	0	0	5	15	62	82
	%	0	0	6.1	18.3	75.6	100
16. "I read for pleasure in English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	7	7	15	16	37	82
	%	8.5	8.5	18.3	19.5	45.1	100
17. "I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	2	3	9	28	40	82
	%	2.4	3.7	11	34.1	48.8	100
18. "I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	6	25	16	19	16	82
	%	7.3	30.5	19.5	23.2	19.5	100
19. "I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English" (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	12	18	25	15	11	82
	%	14.6	22	30.5	18.3	13.4	100
20. "I try to find patterns in English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	7	18	27	16	14	82
	%	8.5	22	32.9	19.5	17.1	100
21. "I find the meaning of English word by dividing it into parts that I understand." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	8	18	24	19	13	82
	%	9.8	22	29.3	23.2	15.9	100

Items		1	2	3	4	5	<i>n</i>
22. "I try not to translate word-for-word." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	4	6	18	22	32	82
	%	4.9	7.3	22	26.8	39	100
23. "I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	13	19	18	22	10	82
	%	15.9	23.2	22	26.8	12.2	100

According to Table 6, Item 15 exhibits the highest combined percentage score of 93.9% suggesting mostly preferred strategy. Following this, Item 17 exhibits the highest combined percentage with the score of 82.9%. Conversely, Items 10, 19 and 23 emerged as the least preferred strategies, with a combined percentage scores of 52.4%, 36.6% and 39.1% respectively.

Table 7 provides data on the central tendency in relation to *cognitive strategies*, offering insights into the dispersion of cognitive strategy usage among 82 first-year students.

Table 7

Central Tendency & Dispersion: Cognitive Strategies

Items	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
10. "I say or write new English words several times." (Oxford, 1990)	82	4.04	0.86
11. "I try to talk like native English speakers." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.70	1.12
12. "I practice the sounds of English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.02	1.65
13. "I use English words I know in different ways." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.73	1.20
14. "I start conversations in English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.51	1.16
15. "I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	4.09	0.97
16. "I read for pleasure in English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.84	1.31
17. "I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	4.23	0.96
18. "I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.17	1.26
19. "I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	2.94	1.24
20. "I try to find patterns in English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.15	1.19
21. "I find the meaning of English word by dividing it into parts that I understand." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.13	1.21
22. "I try not to translate word-for-word." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.88	1.15
23. "I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	2.96	1.28

Note. "High-always or almost always used:4.50 to 5.00, High -usually used:3.50 to 4.49, Medium-sometimes used:2.50 to 3.49,

Low -generally not used:1.50 to 2.49, Low -never or almost never used:1.00 to 1.49" (Oxford, 1990).

As Table 7 suggests, the cognitive strategy with the highest average of 4.23 was *writing notes, messages, letters, or reports in English*. The associated SD score of 0.960 suggests there was high level of agreement among participants. Among the other cognitive strategies with average scores falling within the range of 3.50 and 4.49, seven additional strategies stood out: *watching English language TV shows spoken in English or going to movies spoken in English* (M=4.09) and *saying or writing new English words several times* (M=4.04) and *I try not to translate word-for-word* (M=3.88) and *I read for pleasure in English* (M= 3.84) and *I use English words I know in different ways* (M=3.73) and *I try to talk like native English speakers* (M=3.70) and *I start conversations in English* (M=3.51). Conversely, the cognitive strategy with the lowest average score was *looking for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English* (M=2.94).

Compensation Strategies

Table 8 below displays the frequencies and percentages in relation to *compensation strategy* use by the first-year students.

Table 8

Frequencies: Compensation Strategies

Items		1	2	3	4	5	<i>n</i>
24. "To understand unfamiliar English words. I make guesses." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	1	2	17	35	27	82
	%	1.2	2.4	20.7	42.7	32.9	100
25. "When I can think of a word during a conversation in English. I use gestures." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	2	12	18	25	24	82
	%	2.4	14.6	22	30.5	29.3	100
26. "I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	8	22	20	24	8	82
	%	9.8	26.8	24.4	29.3	9.8	100
27. "I read English without looking up every new word." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	4	13	10	29	26	82
	%	4.9	15.9	12.2	35.4	31.7	100

Items		1	2	3	4	5	<i>n</i>
28. "I try to guess what the other person will say next in English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	4	14	19	26	19	82
	%	4.9	17.1	23.2	31.7	23.2	100
29. "If I can't think of an English word. I use a word or phrase that means the same thing." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	1	6	11	31	33	82
	%	1.2	7.3	13.4	37.8	40.2	100

According to Table 8, Item 29 exhibits the highest combined percentage score of 78% suggesting mostly preferred strategy. Following this, Item 24 exhibits the highest combined percentage with the score of 75.6%. Conversely, Item 26 emerged as the least preferred strategy, with a combined percentage score of 36.6% respectively.

Table 9 provides data on the central tendency in relation to *compensatory strategies*, offering insights into the dispersion of compensation strategy usage among 82 first-year students.

Table 9

Central Tendency & Dispersion: Compensation Strategies

Items	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
24. "To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses." (Oxford, 1990)	82	4.04	0.867
25. "When I can think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.70	1.123
26. "I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.02	1.65
27. "I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of situation in which the word might be used." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.73	1.207
28. "I use rhymes to remember new English words." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.51	1.168
29. "I use flashcards to remember new English words." (Oxford, 1990)	82	4.09	0.971

Note. "High-always or almost always used:4.50 to 5.00, High -usually used:3.50 to 4.49, Medium-sometimes used:2.50 to 3.49,

Low -generally not used:1.50 to 2.49, Low -never or almost never used:1.00 to 1.49" (Oxford, 1990).

As Table 9 suggests, the compensation strategy with the highest average of 4.09 was *using Flashcards to remember new English words*. The associated SD score of 0.971 suggests there was high level of agreement among participants. Among the

other compensation strategies with average scores falling within the range of 3.50 and 4.49, four additional strategies stood out: *to understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses* (M=4.04) and *I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of situation in which the word might be used* (M=3.73) and *when I can think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures* (M=3.70) and *I use rhymes to remember new English words* (M=3.51). Conversely, the compensation strategy with the lowest average score was *I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English* (M=3.02).

Metacognitive Strategies

Table 10 below displays the frequencies and percentages in relation to *metacognitive strategy* use by the first-year students.

Table 10

Frequencies: Metacognitive Strategies

Items		1	2	3	4	5	<i>n</i>
30. "I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	1	10	27	23	21	82
	%	1.2	12.2	32.9	28	25.6	100
31. "I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	0	5	19	36	22	82
	%	0	6.1	23.2	43.9	26.8	100
32. "I pay attention when someone is speaking English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	0	1	12	33	36	82
	%	0	1.2	14.6	40.2	43.9	100
33. "I try to find out how to be a better learner in English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	3	6	24	25	24	82
	%	3.7	7.3	29.3	30.5	29.3	100
34. "I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	26	28	20	5	3	82
	%	31.7	34.1	24.4	6.1	3.7	100
35. "I look for people I can talk to in English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	5	17	29	14	17	82
	%	6.1	20.7	35.4	17.1	20.7	100
36. "I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	2	9	23	25	23	82
	%	2.4	11	28	30.5	28	100
37. "I have clear goals for improving my English skills." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	13	20	18	18	13	82
	%	15.9	24.4	22	22	15.9	100

Items		1	2	3	4	5	<i>n</i>
38. "I think about my progress in learning English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	5	9	22	26	20	82
	%	6.1	11	26.8	31.7	24.4	100

According to Table 10, Item 32 exhibits the highest combined percentage score of 84.1% suggesting mostly preferred strategy. Following this, Item 31 exhibits the highest combined percentage with the score of 70.7%. Conversely, Item 34 emerged as the least preferred strategy, with a combined percentage score of 65.8% respectively.

Table 11 provides data on the central tendency in relation to *metacognitive strategies*, offering insights into the dispersion of metacognitive strategy usage among 82 first-year students.

Table 11

Central Tendency & Dispersion: Metacognitive Strategies

Items	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
30. "I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.65	1.035
31. "I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.91	0.864
32. "I pay attention when someone is speaking English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	4.27	0.754
33. "I try to find out how to be a better learner in English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.74	1.075
34. "I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	2.16	1.060
35. "I look for people I can talk to in English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.26	1.184
36. "I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.71	1.071
37. "I have clear goals for improving my English skills." (Oxford, 1990)	82	2.98	1.324
38. "I think about my progress in learning English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.57	1.155

Note. "High-always or almost always used:4.50 to 5.00, High -usually used:3.50 to 4.49, Medium-sometimes used:2.50 to

3.49, Low -generally not used:1.50 to 2.49, Low -never or almost never used:1.00 to 1.49" (Oxford, 1990).

According to Table 11 findings, the metacognitive strategy with the highest average of 4.27 was *I pay attention when someone is speaking English*. The associated SD score of 0.754 suggests there was high level of agreement among

participants. Among the other metacognitive strategies with average scores falling within the range of 3.50 and 4.49, five additional strategies stood out: *I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better* (M=3.91) and *I try to find out how to be a better learner in English* (M=3.74) and *I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English* (M=3.71) and *I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English* (M=3.65) and *I think about my progress in learning English* (M=3.57). Conversely, the metacognitive strategy with the lowest average score was *I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English* (M=2.16).

Affective Strategies

Table 12 below displays the frequencies and percentages in relation to *affective strategy* use by the first-year students.

Table 12

Frequencies: Affective Strategies

Items		1	2	3	4	5	<i>n</i>
39. "I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	11	13	24	20	13	82
	%	13.4	15.9	29.3	24.4	15.9	100
40. "I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	5	7	16	27	26	82
	%	6.1	8.5	19.5	32.9	31.7	100
41. "I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	40	22	13	3	2	82
	%	48.8	26.8	15.9	3.7	2.4	100
42. "I notice if I am tense or nervous when I'm studying or using English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	22	16	16	10	16	82
	%	26.8	19.5	19.5	12.2	19.5	100
43. "I write down my feelings in a language learning diary." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	55	9	10	5	3	82
	%	67.1	11	12.2	6.1	3.7	100
44. "I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	36	15	14	11	6	82
	%	43.9	18.3	17.1	13.4	7.3	100

According to Table 12, Item 40 exhibits the highest combined percentage score of 64.6% suggesting mostly preferred strategy. Conversely, Items 41 and 43 emerged as the least preferred strategies, with a combined percentage scores of 75.6% and 78.1% respectively.

Table 13 provides data on the central tendency in relation to *affective strategies*, offering insights into the dispersion of affective strategy usage among 82 first-year students.

Table 13

Central Tendency & Dispersion: Affective Strategies

Items	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
39. "I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English." (Oxford, 1990)	81	3.14	1.262
40. "I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake." (Oxford, 1990)	81	3.77	1.175
41. "I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English." (Oxford, 1990)	80	1.81	1.007
42. "I notice if I am tense or nervous when I'm studying or using English." (Oxford, 1990)	80	2.78	1.484
43. "I write down my feelings in a language learning diary." (Oxford, 1990)	82	1.68	1.132
44. "I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	2.22	1.334

Note. "High-always or almost always used:4.50 to 5.00, High -usually used:3.50 to 4.49, Medium-sometimes used:2.50 to

3.49, Low -generally not used:1.50 to 2.49, Low -never or almost never used:1.00 to 1.49" (Oxford, 1990).

Table 13 indicates, the affective strategy with the highest average of 3.77 was *I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake*. The associated SD score of 1.175 suggests there was high level of agreement among participants. Conversely, the affective strategies with the lowest average scores were *I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English* (M=1.81) and *I write down my feelings in a language learning diary* (M=1.68).

Social Strategies

Table 14 below displays the frequencies and percentages in relation to *social strategy* use by the first-year students.

Table 14*Frequencies: Social Strategies*

Items		1	2	3	4	5	<i>n</i>
45. "If I do not understand something as an English word. I ask the other person to slow down or say it again." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	1	7	20	34	20	82
	%	1.2	8.5	24.4	41.5	24.4	100
46. "I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	19	28	17	12	6	82
	%	23.2	34.1	20.7	14.6	7.3	100
47. "I practice English with other students." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	22	12	19	18	11	82
	%	26.8	14.6	23.2	22	13.4	100
48. "I ask for help from English speakers." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	15	23	19	13	11	81
	%	18.3	28	23.2	15.9	13.4	100
49. "I ask questions in English." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	1	4	15	25	37	82
	%	1.2	4.9	18.3	30.5	45.1	100
50. "I try to learn about the culture of English speakers." (Oxford, 1990)	<i>f</i>	4	13	16	17	32	82
	%	4.9	15.9	19.5	20.7	39	100

According to Table 14, Items 45 and 49 exhibit the highest combined percentage scores of 65.9% and 75.6% suggesting mostly preferred strategies. Conversely, Items 46 and 47 emerged as the least preferred strategies, with a combined percentage scores of 57.3% and 41.4% respectively.

Table 15 provides data on the central tendency in relation to *social strategies*, offering insights into the dispersion of social strategy usage among 82 first-year students.

Table 15*Central Tendency & Dispersion: Social Strategies*

Items	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
45. "If I do not understand something as an English word, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.79	0.952
46. "I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk." (Oxford, 1990)	82	2.49	1.209
47. "I practice English with other students." (Oxford, 1990)	82	2.80	1.401

Items	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
48. "I ask for help from English speakers." (Oxford, 1990)	81	2.78	1.304
49. "I ask questions in English." (Oxford, 1990)	82	4.13	0.966
50. "I try to learn about the culture of English speakers." (Oxford, 1990)	82	3.73	1.267

Note. "High-always or almost always used:4.50 to 5.00, High -usually used:3.50 to 4.49, Medium-sometimes used:2.50 to

3.49, Low -generally not used:1.50 to 2.49, Low -never or almost never used:1.00 to 1.49" (Oxford, 1990).

Table 15 indicates the social strategy with the highest average of 4.13 was *I ask questions in English*. The associated SD score of 0.966 suggests there was high level of agreement among participants. Among the other social strategies with average scores falling within the range of 3.50 and 4.49, two additional strategies stood out: *If I do not understand something as an English word, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again* (*M*= 3.79) and *I try to learn about the culture of English speakers* (*M*=3.73). Conversely, the social strategy with the lowest average score was *I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk* (*M*=2.49)

Differences in Language Strategy Use Based on Gender

Overall Direct and Indirect Strategies

The researcher analyzed the first-year student strategy use based on gender. To begin with, Table 16 below indicates direct and indirect strategy use of 29 male and 48 female participants in descriptive terms.

Table 16

Overall Direct and Indirect Strategies

Strategies	Male (<i>n</i> =29)	Female (<i>n</i> =48)
Direct Strategies		
<i>M</i>	3.23	3.38
<i>SD</i>	0.42	0.46
Indirect Strategies		
<i>M</i>	3.17	3.16
<i>SD</i>	0.48	0.52

Note. "High-always or almost always used:4.50 to 5.00, High -usually used:3.50 to 4.49, Medium-sometimes used:2.50

to 3.49, Low -generally not used:1.50 to 2.49, Low -never or almost never used:1.00 to 1.49" (Oxford, 1990).

As for direct strategies, the combined mean score of male participants was 3.23 (SD 0.42), while female participants exhibited a slightly higher mean score of 3.38 (SD 0.46). This indicates that female participants tend to employ direct language learning strategies to a slightly greater extent than male participants.

As regards indirect strategies, the mean scores of 3.17 and 3.16 were found to be close to each other, which suggest similar utilization of indirect strategies.

Overall, there was a relatively balanced distribution, and further analysis provided additional insights. Table 17 demonstrates the results of the independent sample t-tests conducted for direct and indirect language learning strategies based on gender.

Table 17

Independent Sample t-tests for Direct and Indirect strategies

Strategies	<i>t</i>	df	<i>p</i>
Direct Strategies	1.420	75	.160
Indirect Strategies	-0.089	75	.929

In both cases, the p-values exceeding 0.05 suggest that there is no statistically significant difference between male and female participants in terms of direct and indirect strategy use.

Direct and Indirect Strategies: Group by Group

The direct category includes three groups—metacognitive, social and affective—while the indirect category consists of metacognitive, social and affective.

Table 18 presents the strategy use in descriptive terms by the three groups in each category for male and female participants.

Table 18*Direct and Indirect Strategies: Group by Group*

Strategies		Male (n=29)	Female (n=48)
Memory Strategies	<i>M</i>	2.68	2.94
	<i>SD</i>	0.51	0.56
Cognitive Strategies	<i>M</i>	3.44	3.54
	<i>SD</i>	0.57	0.56
Compensatory Strategies	<i>M</i>	3.58	3.69
	<i>SD</i>	0.60	0.55
Metacognitive Strategies	<i>M</i>	3.47	3.31
	<i>SD</i>	0.65	0.65
Affective Strategies	<i>M</i>	2.51	2.60
	<i>SD</i>	0.62	0.67
Social Strategies	<i>M</i>	3.73	3.21
	<i>SD</i>	0.74	0.76

Note. "High-always or almost always used:4.50 to 5.00, High -usually used:3.50 to 4.49, Medium-sometimes used:2.50

to 3.49, Low -generally not used:1.50 to 2.49, Low -never or almost never used:1.00 to 1.49" (Oxford, 1990).

It is evident that *social strategies* (indirect) were mostly used by males, as evidenced by the highest mean score of 3.73 (SD=0.74) among all strategy categories. On the other hand, *compensatory strategies* (direct) appeared to be primarily employed by female participants, exhibiting a mean score of 3.69 (SD=0.55). It is worth noting that among all strategy categories, the least used strategy group by male participants was *affective* (indirect), with a mean score of 2.51 (SD=0.62), while females had a slightly higher mean score of 2.60 (SD=0.67), though it remained the least utilized category among female participants.

To provide further insights, the researcher conducted t-test to provide further insights into the data (Table 19).

Table 19*Independent Sample t-tests for Direct and Indirect Strategies: Group by Group*

Strategies	<i>t</i>	df	<i>p</i>
Memory Strategies	1.983	75	.051
Cognitive Strategies	0.733	75	.466
Compensatory Strategies	0.802	75	.425
Metacognitive Strategies	0.178	75	.859
Affective Strategies	0.575	75	.567
Social Strategies	-0.944	75	.348

The *p*-values for all categories exceeded the threshold of 0.05, indicating there was no statistically significant difference between male and female participants for each group.

Direct Strategies: Memory

There are 9 items in this group. Table 20 demonstrates the strategy use in relation to the accompanying strategy sets in descriptive terms for male and female participants.

Table 20*Direct Strategies: Memory*

Strategies		Male (<i>n</i> =29)	Female (<i>n</i> =48)
1. Creating mental linkages: Relationship between old and new (M1)			
	<i>M</i>	3.76	3.96
	<i>SD</i>	0.872	0.874
2. Creating mental linkages: New words in a sentence (M2)			
	<i>M</i>	3.48	3.40
	<i>SD</i>	0.949	1.144
3. Applying images and sounds: Sound and image connection (M3)			
	<i>M</i>	2.38	3.02
	<i>SD</i>	1.115	1.194
4. Applying images and sounds: Mental picture (M4)			
	<i>M</i>	3.31	3.63
	<i>SD</i>	1.339	1.044
5. Applying images and sounds: Rhymes (M5)			
	<i>M</i>	2.03	2.40
	<i>SD</i>	1.017	1.300

Strategies		Male (n=29)	Female (n=48)
6. Applying images and sounds: Flashcards (M6)	<i>M</i>	1.62	1.98
	<i>SD</i>	0.728	1.229
7. Employing action: Physically acting out (M7)	<i>M</i>	2.52	2.32
	<i>SD</i>	1.353	1.153
8. Reviewing well: Review often (M8)	<i>M</i>	2.24	2.42
	<i>SD</i>	0.830	1.048
9. Applying images and sounds: Page, board and street signs	<i>M</i>	2.83	3.46
	<i>SD</i>	1.311	1.352

Note. "High-always or almost always used:4.50 to 5.00, High -usually used:3.50 to 4.49, Medium-sometimes used:2.50 to 3.49, Low -generally not used:1.50 to 2.49, Low -never or almost never used:1.00 to 1.49" (Oxford, 1990).

According to Table 20, the strategy with the highest mean score for both male and female participants was *Creating mental linkages: Relationship between old and new*, with mean scores of 3.76 (SD=0.872) and 3.96 (0.874), respectively. On the other hand, the least favored strategy with the lowest mean score for both male and female participants appeared to be *Applying images and sounds: Flashcards*, with mean scores of 1.62 (SD=0.728) and 1.98 (1.229), respectively.

Table 21 introduces t-test results based on gender in relation to strategy sets in the group of *Memory*.

Table 21

Independent Sample t-test for Memory Strategies

Strategies	<i>t</i>	df	<i>p</i>
Creating mental linkages: Relationship between old and new (M1)	0.973	75	.335
Creating mental linkages: New words in a sentence (M2)	-0.360	75	.720
Applying images and sounds: Sound and image connection (M3)	2.381	75	.20
Applying images and sounds: Mental picture (M4)	1.082	75	.285
Applying images and sounds: Rhymes (M5)	1.357	75	.179
Applying images and sounds: Flashcards (M6)	1.608	75	.112
Employing action: Physically acting out (M7)	-0.956	75	.343
Reviewing well: Review often (M8)	0.811	75	.420

Strategies	<i>t</i>	df	<i>p</i>
Applying images and sounds: Page, board and street signs (M9)	2.021	75	.48

The results indicate that there was no statistically significant evidence to support the claim that there was a difference in the use of strategy sets based on gender.

Direct Strategies: Cognitive

There are 6 items in this group. Table 22 demonstrates the strategy use in relation to the accompanying strategy sets in descriptive terms for male and female participants.

Table 22

Direct Strategies: Cognitive

Strategies		Male (<i>n</i> =29)	Female (<i>n</i> =48)
10. Practicing: Saying or writing new words (C1)	<i>M</i>	2.28	2.89
	<i>SD</i>	1.032	1.286
11. Practicing: Speaking like a native (C2)	<i>M</i>	3.93	3.83
	<i>SD</i>	1.223	1.141
12. Practicing: Practicing the sounds (C3)	<i>M</i>	3.72	3.35
	<i>SD</i>	1.162	1.178
13. Practicing: Using words in different ways (C4)	<i>M</i>	3.83	3.76
	<i>SD</i>	1.071	0.993
14. Receiving and sending messages: Starting conversation (C5)	<i>M</i>	3.55	3.41
	<i>SD</i>	1.83	1.376
15. Receiving and sending messages: English TV shows or movies (C6)	<i>M</i>	4.48	4.80
	<i>SD</i>	0.688	0.500
16. Receiving and sending messages: Reading books (C7)	<i>M</i>	3.52	3.98
	<i>SD</i>	1.503	1.220

Strategies		Male (n=29)	Female (n=48)
17. Creating structure for input and output: Writing in English (C8)			
	<i>M</i>	4.03	4.35
	<i>SD</i>	1.117	0.822
18. Analyzing and reasoning: Skimming then reading carefully			
	<i>M</i>	2.83	3.26
	<i>SD</i>	1.311	1.201
19. Analyzing and reasoning: Looking for similar words (C10)			
	<i>M</i>	2.69	3.11
	<i>SD</i>	1.198	1.286
20. Practicing: Finding patterns (C11)			
	<i>M</i>	3.31	3.09
	<i>SD</i>	1.168	1.208
21. Analyzing and reasoning: Dividing words into parts (C12)			
	<i>M</i>	3.07	3.17
	<i>SD</i>	1.223	1.161
22. Analyzing and reasoning: No word-for-word translation			
	<i>M</i>	4.24	3.65
	<i>SD</i>	0.951	1.197
23. Creating structure for input and output: Making summaries			
	<i>M</i>	2.72	3.11
	<i>SD</i>	1.279	1.251

Note. "High-always or almost always used:4.50 to 5.00, High -usually used:3.50 to 4.49, Medium-sometimes

used:2.50 to 3.49, Low -generally not used:1.50 to 2.49, Low -never or almost never used:1.00 to 1.49" (Oxford, 1990).

According to Table 22, female students usually preferred to use *Receiving and sending messages: English TV shows or movies the most* with an average score of 4.80.

Besides, male students usually preferred to use *Receiving and sending messages: English TV shows or movies the most* with an average score of 4.48 and *Creating structure for input and output: Writing in English* with an average score of 4.03 (Table 22).

On the other hand, from the cognitive strategies category both male and female students least preferred to use were *Practicing: Saying or writing new words strategy* with an average scores of 2.28 and 2.89 (Table 22).

Lastly, from cognitive strategies category female students used all of the strategies mainly at medium-high levels.

Table 23 introduces t-test results based on gender in relation to strategy sets in the group of *Cognitive*.

Table 23

Independent Sample t-test for Cognitive Strategies

Strategies	<i>t</i>	df	<i>p</i>
Practicing: Saying or writing new words (C1)	2.418	75	.018
Practicing: Speaking like a native (C2)	-0.284	74	.777
Practicing: Practicing the sounds (C3)	-1.397	74	.168
Practicing: Using words in different ways (C4)	-0.231	75	.818
Receiving and sending messages: Starting conversation (C5)	-0.316	75	.753
Receiving and sending messages: English TV shows or movies (C6)	2.102	75	.041
Receiving and sending messages: Reading books (C7)	1.342	75	.186
Creating structure for input and output: Writing in English (C8)	1.341	75	.186
Analyzing and reasoning: Skimming then reading carefully (C9)	1.620	75	.111
Analyzing and reasoning: Looking for similar words (C10)	1.276	74	.207
Practicing: Finding patterns (C11)	-0.962	75	.340
Analyzing and reasoning: Dividing words into parts (C12)	0.341	75	.734
Analyzing and reasoning: No word-for-word translation (C13)	-2.332	75	.023
Creating structure for input and output: Making summaries (C14)	1.259	75	.213

The results (Table 23) show that there was a statistically significant difference in the use of one of two of the strategies at the 0.05 significance level:

Practicing: Saying or writing new words ($t(75) = 2.418$); *Analyzing and reasoning: No word-for-word translation* ($t(75) = -2.332$).

Direct Strategies: Compensatory

There are 14 items in this group. Table 24 demonstrates the strategy use in relation to the accompanying strategy sets in descriptive terms for male and female participants.

Table 24

Direct Strategies: Compensatory

Strategies		Male (n=29)	Female (n=48)
24. Guessing intelligently: Guessing unfamiliar words (CP1)			
	<i>M</i>	3.86	4.11
	<i>SD</i>	0.833	0.890
25. Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing: Using gestures (CP2)			
	<i>M</i>	3.48	3.79
	<i>SD</i>	1.090	1.122
26. Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing: Making up new words (CP3)			
	<i>M</i>	2.83	3.15
	<i>SD</i>	1.284	1.103
27. Guessing intelligently: Not looking up every word (CP4)			
	<i>M</i>	3.62	3.72
	<i>SD</i>	1.083	1.314
28. Guessing intelligently: Guessing what is to be said next (CP5)			
	<i>M</i>	3.79	3.34
	<i>SD</i>	1.236	1.069
29. Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing: Using similar words (CP6)			
	<i>M</i>	3.93	4.17
	<i>SD</i>	1.033	0.940

Note. "High-always or almost always used:4.50 to 5.00, High -usually used:3.50 to 4.49, Medium-sometimes used:2.50 to 3.49, Low -generally not used:1.50 to 2.49, Low -never or almost never used:1.00 to 1.49" (Oxford, 1990).

According to Table 24, both male and female students preferred to use *Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing: Using similar words* the most with average scores of 3.93 and 4.17, respectively.

Additionally, both male female students showed the least preference for *Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing: Making up new words* with average scores of 2.83 and 3.15, respectively.

Lastly, both female and male Turkish EFL students preferred to use compensatory strategies at medium-high levels.

Table 25 introduces t-test results based on gender in relation to strategy sets in the group of *Compensatory*.

Table 25

Independent Sample t-test for Compensatory Strategies

Strategies	<i>t</i>	df	<i>p</i>
Guessing intelligently: Guessing unfamiliar words (CP1)	1.209	75	.231
Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing: Using gestures (CP2)	1.170	74	.247
Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing: Making up new words (CP3)	1.114	75	.270
Guessing intelligently: Not looking up every word (CP4)	0.394	75	.695
Guessing intelligently: Guessing what is to be said next (CP5)	-1.668	75	.101
Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing: Using similar words (CP6)	0.913	75	.365

$p > .05$

The results indicate that there was no statistically significant evidence to support the claim that there is a difference in the use of strategy sets based on gender.

Indirect Strategies: Metacognitive

There are 9 items in this group. Table 24 demonstrates the strategy use in relation to the accompanying strategy sets in descriptive terms for male and female participants.

Table 26

Indirect Strategies: Metacognitive

Strategies		Male (<i>n</i> =29)	Female (<i>n</i> =48)
30. Arranging and planning learning: Finding ways to use English (MC1)			
	<i>M</i>	3.72	3.63
	<i>SD</i>	0.960	1.044
31. Evaluating learning: Noticing mistakes (MC2)			

	Strategies	Male (n=29)	Female (n=48)
	<i>M</i>	3.90	3.88
	<i>SD</i>	0.817	0.914
32. Centering learning: Paying attention (MC3)			
	<i>M</i>	4.34	4.25
	<i>SD</i>	0.721	0.758
33. Arranging and planning learning: Finding out to be a better learner (MC4)			
	<i>M</i>	3.69	3.92
	<i>SD</i>	0.967	1.069
34. Arranging and planning learning: Planning schedule to study (MC5)			
	<i>M</i>	2.31	2.13
	<i>SD</i>	1.228	0.959
35. Arranging and planning learning: Looking for people to speak English (MC6)			
	<i>M</i>	3.45	3.13
	<i>SD</i>	1.242	1.196
36. Arranging and planning learning: Looking for opportunities to read (MC7)			
	<i>M</i>	3.52	3.75
	<i>SD</i>	1.222	1.042
37. Arranging and planning learning: Clear goals to improve (MC8)			
	<i>M</i>	2.90	3.13
	<i>SD</i>	1.263	1.378
38. Evaluating learning: Thinking about progress (MC9)			
	<i>M</i>	3.45	3.73
	<i>SD</i>	1.152	1.086

Note. "High-always or almost always used:4.50 to 5.00, High -usually used:3.50 to 4.49, Medium-sometimes used:2.50

to 3.49, Low -generally not used:1.50 to 2.49, Low -never or almost never used:1.00 to 1.49" (Oxford, 1990).

According to Table 26, both male and female students prefer to use

Arranging and planning learning: Finding out to be a better learner the most with average scores of 4.34 for males and 4.25 for females.

Also, both male and female students prefer to use *Arranging and planning learning: Planning schedule to study* the least with an average scores of 2.31 for males and 2.13 for females (Table 26).

Table 27 introduces t-test results based on gender in relation to strategy sets in the group of *Metacognitive*.

Table 27*Independent Sample t-test for Metacognitive Strategies*

Strategies	<i>t</i>	df	p
Arranging and planning learning: Finding ways to use English (MC1)	-0.425	75	.672
Evaluating learning: Noticing mistakes (MC2)	-0.107	75	.915
Centering learning: Paying attention (MC3)	-0.549	75	.585
Arranging and planning learning: Finding out to be a better learner (MC4)	0.959	75	.341
Arranging and planning learning: Planning schedule to study (MC5)	-0.695	75	.490
Arranging and planning learning: Looking for people to speak English (MC6)	-1.122	75	.266
Arranging and planning learning: Looking for opportunities to read (MC7)	0.906	75	.369
Arranging and planning learning: Clear goals to improve (MC8)	0.743	75	.460
Evaluating learning: Thinking about progress (MC9)	1.059	75	.294

The results indicate that there was no statistically significant evidence to support the claim that there was a difference in the use of strategy sets based on gender.

Indirect Strategies: Affective

There are 6 items in this group. Table 28 demonstrates the strategy use in relation to the accompanying strategy sets in descriptive terms for male and female participants.

Table 28*Indirect Strategies: Affective*

Strategies		Male (n=29)	Female (n=48)
39. Lowering anxiety: Trying to relax (A1)	<i>M</i>	3.21	3.09
	<i>SD</i>	1.264	1.279
40. Encouraging: Encouraging oneself to speak (A2)	<i>M</i>	3.93	3.61
	<i>SD</i>	0.998	1.308
41. Encouraging: Giving a reward or treat (A3)	<i>M</i>	1.66	1.89
	<i>SD</i>	0.814	1.100
42. Taking emotional temperature: Noticing being tense or nervous (A4)	<i>M</i>	2.76	2.76
	<i>SD</i>	1.504	1.493
43. Taking emotional temperature: Keeping diary to write down feelings (A5)	<i>M</i>	1.48	1.72
	<i>SD</i>	0.949	1.186
44. Taking emotional temperature: Talking to someone about feelings (A6)	<i>M</i>	2.03	2.35
	<i>SD</i>	1.180	1.418

Note. "High-always or almost always used:4.50 to 5.00, High -usually used:3.50 to 4.49, Medium-sometimes used:2.50 to 3.49, Low -generally not used:1.50 to 2.49, Low -never or almost never used:1.00 to 1.49" (Oxford, 1990).

As Table 28 indicates, both male and female students preferred to use *Encouraging: Encouraging oneself to speak* the most with an average score of 3.93 for males and 3.61 for female students. On the contrary, both male and female students least preferred to use *Taking emotional temperature: Keeping diary to write down feelings* with an average score of 1.48 for males and 1.72 for female students. Even though male students almost never *Keep a diary to write down their feelings*, female Turkish Freshman students used this strategy at the low level and generally prefer not to use (Table 28).

Table 29 introduces t-test results based on gender in relation to strategy sets in the group of *Affective*.

Table 29*Independent Sample t-test for Affective Strategies*

Strategies	<i>t</i>	df	<i>p</i>
Lowering anxiety: Trying to relax (A1)	-0.346	75	.731
Encouraging: Encouraging oneself to speak (A2)	-1.169	75	.246
Encouraging: Giving a reward or treat (A3)	1.256	74	.213
Taking emotional temperature: Noticing being tense or nervous (A4)	0.140	74	.889
Taking emotional temperature: Keeping diary to write down feelings (A5)	1.308	75	.195
Taking emotional temperature: Talking to someone about feelings (A6)	1.271	75	.208

The results indicate that there was no statistically significant evidence to support the claim that there was a difference in the use of strategy sets based on gender.

Indirect Strategies: Social

There are 6 items in this group. Table 30 demonstrates the strategy use in relation to the accompanying strategy sets in descriptive terms for male and female participants.

Table 30*Indirect Strategies: Social*

Strategies		Male (<i>n</i> =29)	Female (<i>n</i> =48)
45. Asking questions: Asking to slow down or repeat (S1)			
	<i>M</i>	3.83	3.74
	<i>SD</i>	0.889	0.988
46. Asking questions: Asking for correction (S2)			
	<i>M</i>	2.93	2.26
	<i>SD</i>	1.252	1.073
47. Asking questions: Asking for help from natives (S4)			
	<i>M</i>	2.90	2.81
	<i>SD</i>	1.372	1.393

Strategies		Male (n=29)	Female (n=48)
48. Asking questions: Asking questions in English (S5)	<i>M</i>	2.72	2.81
	<i>SD</i>	1.162	1.329
49. Cooperating with others: Practicing with others (S3)	<i>M</i>	4.17	4.04
	<i>SD</i>	0.966	0.999
50. Empathizing with others: Learning about the culture (S6)	<i>M</i>	3.72	3.77
	<i>SD</i>	1.412	1.220

Note. "High-always or almost always used:4.50 to 5.00, High -usually used:3.50 to 4.49, Medium-sometimes used:2.50 to 3.49, Low -generally not used:1.50 to 2.49, Low -never or almost never used:1.00 to 1.49" (Oxford, 1990).

According to the Table 30, both male and female students preferred to use *Cooperating with others: Practicing with others* the most, with an average score of 4.17 for males and 4.04 for female students.

Table 30 demonstrates that male students prefer to use *Asking questions in English* the least with an average score of 2.72. Similarly, female students showed the least preference for *Asking for correction*, with an average score of 2.26 (Table 30).

Indirect Strategies: Social

Table 31 demonstrates the description of the Mean Rank and Sum of Ranks for each group.

Table 31

Mann Whitney-U test for Social Strategies

Strategies		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Social Strategies	Female	48	37.27	1789.00
	Male	29	41.86	1214.00
	Total	77		

To determine whether the difference in terms of ranking is significant, Table 32 needs to be observed.

Table 32

Test Statistics^a

	Social
Mann-Whitney U	613.000
Wilcoxon W	1789.000
Z	-0.876
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.381

a. Grouping Variable: gender

As Table 32 indicates, the *p value of* .381 is greater than the significance level $p < .05$. Therefore, there was no significant difference in terms of social strategy use between male and female students.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Introduction

In this chapter the researcher provides information about the overview of the study, discussion of the major findings, implications for practice and further research and lastly limitations/delimitations.

Overview of the study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the language learning strategies of first-year students at a foundation university in Türkiye where the medium of instruction is English. More specifically, the study aimed to explain what direct and indirect strategies, and accompanying strategy sets, were used by the students. It also examined any potential differences in the strategy used based on gender. This study used a single-case design, incorporating cross-sectional survey, and causal-comparative designs.

Discussion of the Major Findings

Strategy Use

The findings indicated that the direct strategies were preferred more than the indirect strategies. More specifically, within *Direct strategies*, *Compensatory strategies* are highly favored; in contrast, *Metacognitive strategies* are moderately favored across *Indirect strategies*.

There are some other studies in the field that yield similar results and supporting the findings of this study, with *Compensatory strategies* being identified as the most preferred strategy (Rahman, 2020; Razi, 2012; Yalçın, 2006; Yılmaz, 1997). While this study aligns with the outcomes of some research in the field, there

other studies that present different finding. For instance, several related studies indicate the learners mostly prefer *Metacognitive strategies* (Akmençe, 2019; Alhaisoni 2012; Al Khatib, 2013; Alrashidi, 2022; Kumar, 2018; Nahavandi & Mukundan, 2014; Ozkara, 2019; Özgür,2003; Rahman, 2020; Razi, 2012; Yayla et al., 2016; Yeşilçınar, 2014). However, in Soya Çetin's study (2019) students favor *Metacognitive strategies* the most, and *Affective strategies* the least.

As for the least used strategies, *Memory strategies*, a subgroup of *Direct strategies*, and *Affective strategies* within the category of *Indirect strategies* are found to be the least favored. Consistent with findings in related studies that identify *Memory strategies* as the least preferred among *Direct strategies* (Alhaisoni, 2021; Al Khatib, 2013; Alrashidi, 2022; Kumar, 2018; Nahavandi & Mukundan, 2014; Yılmaz, 1997), our study reveals similar results the study revealed similar findings.

Additionally, *Affective strategies* identified as the least preferred among the *Indirect strategies* (Akmençe, 2019; Alhaisoni 2012; Alrashidi, 2022; Nahavandi and Mukundan, 2014; Ozkara, 2019; Özgür,2003; Padem, 2012; Rahman, 2020; Razi, 2012; Soya Çetin, 2019; Yayla et al., 2016) are also found be least preferred in our study.

Strategy Use and Gender

Regarding gender-based strategy use, while there is not statistically significant difference, it is noted that female first-year students exhibit a preference for direct strategies more than over their male first-year counterparts.

More specifically, when examining *Direct strategies*, both female and male first-year students highly favor *Compensatory strategies*, with females demonstrating a slightly higher frequency of use. This contrasts with Kaymaz's (2023) study, which suggest that female students in the department of English Language Literature tend

to use all strategies except *Compensation* more frequently than male students. Furthermore, the findings differ from Padem's (2012) study, which highlights that male students significantly prefer *Compensation strategies* significantly over female students.

As for the least used strategies, both female and male first-year students show a preference for *Affective strategies*. Gender emerges as a significant factor in overall strategy use, particularly with female students emphasizing *metacognitive* and *affective* strategies in particular (Soya Çetin, 2019).

Accordingly, first year students, female ones in particular, predominantly employ *Compensatory strategies*, which shows a difference compared to other studies' findings (Akmençe, 2019; Alrashidi, 2022; Yalçın, 2006).

Similarly, among *Indirect strategies*, male participants exhibit a strong preference for *Social strategies*, while female participants moderately favor *Metacognitive strategies*.

With the exception of *Metacognitive strategies* and *Social strategies*, first-year female students engage more frequently in all other strategies compared to male students, although the observed differences are not statistically significant. The findings indicate that male first-year students have more tendency to collaborate and communicate with English speakers than their female counterparts, aligning with similar observations in another study (Yayla et al., 2016).

In line with the literature review, *Affective strategies* emerge as the least preferred among learners, consistent with other related studies (Akmençe, 2019; Alhaisoni 2012; Al Khatib, 2013; Alrashidi, 2022; Kaymaz, 2023; Nahavandi & Mukundan, 2014; Ozkara, 2019; Özgür, 2003; Padem, 2012; Rahman, 2020; Razi,

2012; Soya Çetin, 2019; Yayla et al., 2016). Both genders in the study share a tendency to employ *Affective strategies* the least.

Finally, two strategies, in the category of *Cognitive strategies*, show a significant difference between male and female first-year students in language learning strategy use: *Practicing: Saying or writing new words* and *Analyzing and reasoning: No word-for-word translation*, indicating there is a significant difference in the use of strategy sets based on gender among first-year students.

Implications for further practice and research

Since direct strategies, particularly compensatory strategies, are highly favored among first-year students, educators and courses for language learning can emphasize these strategies during language instruction. This could include explicit teaching of compensatory strategies such as guessing meaning using such linguistic cues as suffixes, prefixes, and word order (Oxford, 1990).

Educators can design activities that explicitly incorporate metacognitive processes into language learning tasks. This could involve setting aims for language learning, and creating opportunities for practice, and self-monitoring and evaluating (Oxford, 1990).

As regards the strategies preferred less, educators could design targeted interventions and provide additional support in these areas

As for gender preferences, educators could recognize female students tend to use strategies more frequently could lead to more collaborative and interactive learning activities.

In order to enhance the generalizability of the findings, future research could benefit from exploring language learning strategy preference across diverse institutions of a similar nature. Additionally, incorporating qualitative

methodologies alongside quantitative approaches can offer richer insights into some aspects of students' language learning experience. Moreover, experimental studies that focus on the impact of some instructional methods connected to targeted strategies could be conducted. Finally, widening the scope of the individual differences beyond gender to include factors such as department affiliation and language proficiency levels could contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the interplay between variables influencing strategy use.

Limitations

Several limitations should be acknowledged in interpreting the findings of the study. Firstly, the research is constrained by its exclusive focus on a single institution; while the study provides valuable insights into learning strategy preferences for first-year students within the specific context, caution should be exercised when generalizing these findings to other institutions with potentially distinct characteristics. Additionally, the studies relying solely on the survey as the data collection method represents another limitation. Survey instruments, while efficient for gathering quantitative data, may not capture the depth of individual experiences as effectively as qualitative approaches. Furthermore, using gender as the primary demographic variable constraints the study's scope, overlooking potential influences from, for example, departmental influences. Finally, the sample size, while sufficient for analyses, may limit the study's ability to detect patterns or generalize findings to a broader population.

REFERENCES

- Acharya, A. S., Prakash, A., Saxena, P., & Nigam, A. (2013). Sampling: Why and how of it. *Indian Journal of Medical Specialties*, 4(2), 330-333.
- Akmençe, E. (2019). *Üniversite hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin yabancı dil öğrenme strateji kullanımlarının farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* (Publication No. 558932) [Master's thesis, İnönü Üniversitesi]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Al Khatib, A. Z. A. (2013). *Language learning strategies of EFL students in the university general requirements unit in the United Arab Emirates University* (Publication No. 1524578) [Doctoral dissertation, United Arab Emirates University].
- Alhaisoni, E. (2012). Language learning strategy use of Saudi EFL students in an intensive English learning context. *Asian Social Science*, 8(13), 115-127.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n13p115>
- Alrashidi, O. (2022). Assessing language learning strategies employed by university English major students in Saudi Arabia. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2022.2074935>
- Andini, T. M., & Prastiyowati, S. (2021). Gender differences learning strategy at English language education department students University of Muhammadiyah Malang. *JINoP (Jurnal Inovasi Pembelajaran)*, 7(2), 217-226. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jinop.v7i2.10476>
- Aslan, O. (2009). *The role of gender and language learning strategies in learning English* (Publication No. 250767) [Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

- Atlı, I., and Özal, D. (2017). Does English Medium Instruction (EMI) Make a Difference on Student Motivation?, *Journal of Language Research*, 1(1), 25-36.
- Cambridge University Press. (n.d.). EAP. In *Cambridge dictionary | English dictionary, translations & thesaurus*. Retrieved March 10, 2023, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/eap>
- Cohen, A. D. (2014). *Strategies in learning and using a second language* (2nd ed.). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Dearden, J. (2018). The changing roles of EMI academics and English language specialists. *Key issues in English for specific purposes in higher education*, 323-338.
- Dearden, J., & Macaro, E. (2016). Higher education teachers' attitudes towards English medium instruction: A three-country comparison. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(3), 455-486. <https://doi.org/10.14746/sllt.2016.6.3.5>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315779553>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Skehan, P. (2003). Individual differences in second language learning. *The handbook of second language acquisition*, 589-630. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756492.ch18>

- Ellis, N. C., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (2006). Language emergence: Implications for applied linguistics—Introduction to the special issue. *Applied linguistics*, 27(4), 558-589.
- Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E., Airasian, P. (2012). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Green, J., & Oxford, R. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 261–297.
- Griffiths, C., & Soruç, A. (2020). *Individual differences in language learning: A complex systems theory perspective*. Palgrave Macmillan eBooks.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52900-0_3
- Higher education. (n.d.). In *Eurydice*. Retrieved November 18, 2023, from
<https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-education-systems/turkey/higher-education>
- Iwai, Y. (2011). The effects of metacognitive reading strategies: Pedagogical implications for EFL/ESL teachers. *Reading*, 11(2), 150-159.
- Kahraman, E. (2021). *The most preferred language learning strategies of bilingual and monolingual students* (Publication No. 678777) [Master's thesis, Akdeniz Üniversitesi]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Karakas, A. (2016). *Turkish lecturers' and students' perceptions of English in English-medium instruction universities* (Publication No. 402962) [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southampton]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Kaylani, C. (1996). The influence of gender and motivation on EFL learning strategy use in Jordan. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Crosscultural perspectives*. University of Hawaii Press.

- Kaymaz, E. (2023). *Investigation of the preparatory school students' use of language learning strategies* (Publication No. 807276) [Master's thesis, Ufuk Üniversitesi]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Khalil, A. (2005). Assessment of language learning strategies used by Palestinian EFL learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(1), 108-117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2005.tb02458.x>
- Kumar, R. N. C. (2018). *Gender differences in the use of language learning strategies among ESL students* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya] CORE Repository.
- Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, 51(1), 36–76. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000350>
- Murata, K. (Ed.). (2018). *English-Medium Instruction from an English as a Lingua Franca Perspective* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351184335>
- Nahavandi, N., & Mukundan, J. (2014). Language learning strategy use among Iranian Engineering freshman students. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 5(5), 34-45.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Heinle & Heinle.
- Oxford, R. L. (1996). *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii at Mānoa.

- Oxford, R. L. (2003). *Language learning styles and strategies: An overview*. GALA, 1-25. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254446824_Language_learning_styles_and_strategies_An_overview
- Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies*. Routledge
- Oxford, R., Crookall, D., Cohen, A., Lavine, R., Nyikos, M., & Sutter, W. (1990). Strategy training for language learners: Six situational case studies and a training model. *Foreign Language Annals*, 23(3), 197-216.
- Oxford, R., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern Language Journal*, 73(3), 291-300. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1989.tb06367.x>
- Özkara, B. (2019). *Investigating the language learning strategies EMI students use to overcome language barriers and challenges they face* (Publication No. 583192) [Doctoral dissertation, Sakarya Üniversitesi]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Padem, S. (2012). *The examination of the language learning strategies of university preparatory class students with respect to various variables*. (Publication No. 331743) [Master's thesis, Düzce University]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Peacock, M., & Ho, B. (2003), Student language learning strategies across eight disciplines. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 179-200. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00043>
- Rahman, M. (2020). EFL learners' language learning strategies: A case study at Qassim University. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 11(5), 6. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.11n.5p.6>

- Razi, S. (2012). Turkish EFL learners' language learning strategy employment at university level. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 8(1), 94-119.
- Richards, J. C., & Pun, J. (2022). *Teaching and learning in English medium instruction: An introduction*. Routledge.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the "Good Language Learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(1), 41-51. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586011>
- Rubin, J. (1981). The study of cognitive processes in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 2, 117-131.
- Rubin, J. (1987). Learner strategies: Theoretical assumptions, research history and typology. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 15-30). Prentice-Hall.
- Skehan, P. (1989). Language testing part II. *Language Teaching*, 22(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800005346>
- Soya Çetin, İ. (2019). *Language learning strategies of preparatory students at Selçuk University of foreign languages* (Publication No. 560831) [Master's thesis, Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Stern, H. H. (1975b). What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 34, 304-318.
- TEPAV (2015). *The state of English in higher education in Turkey*. Ankara: British Council.
- Tunç (Özgür), S. (2003). *Use of language learning strategies in relation to student characteristics at Başkent University* (Publication No. 140154) [Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Wenden, A L & Rubin, J. (Eds.) (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*.

Prentice Hall

Yalçın, M. (2006). *Differences in the perceptions on language learning strategies of*

English preparatory class students studying at Gazi University (Publication

No.187655) [Master's thesis, Gazi university]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu

Başkanlığı Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Yayla, A., Kozikoglu, I., & Celik, S. N. (2016). A comparative study of language

learning strategies used by monolingual and bilingual learners. *European*

Scientific Journal, 12(26), 278-288.

Yeşilçınar, S. (2014). Identifying learner strategies of university students in an EFL

context. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(2),

225-239.

Yılmaz, V. (1997). *Language learning strategies of Turkish EFL students and the*

effects of proficiency level and gender on strategy use (Publication No.

61328) [Master's thesis, Anadolu university]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu

Başkanlığı Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (Vol. 5). Sage.

APPENDIX A

The Consent Form

Dear Students,

You are invited to participate in a study about **language learning strategies** that I am conducting as a part of a Master's Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language at İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University. Please read the following information, and the criteria to meet, before you agree to participate in this study.

Purpose: The study intends to use Oxford's *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning* with the purpose of examining first the language learning strategies used by the undergraduate students enrolled in ENG 101 and ENG 102, then the relationship between the language learning strategies employed and academic achievement, and finally any difference in their use on the basis of educational background, high school type, gender, age, and department.

Voluntary participation: Participation in this study is voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time for any reason. Your participation will be valuable to increase understanding of language learning strategies used in English-medium higher education institutions.

Confidentiality: If you choose to participate, your answers will be anonymous and your responses, or any other identifying information, including your university, will not be shared. Only the researchers in this study will have access to the information you share, and any data will be kept on a password-protected laptop. Your responses will only be used for conducting and disseminating research.

Duration: It should take about 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Criteria: Check if you meet all of the following criteria, and then read the statement that follows before you decide to tick the box:

1. I am at least 18 years of age.
2. I'm currently enrolled in ENG 101 or ENG 102
3. I give my informed consent to participate in the study

Agreement: I understand the information provided, meet the criteria and agree to participate:

☐

APPENDIX B

SILL

(developed by Rebecca L. Oxford)

Version for Speakers of Other Languages Learning English Version

7.0 (ESL/EFL) © R.L.Oxford, 1990

This form of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) is for students of English as a second or foreign language. You will find statements about learning English. Read each statement and mark the response that tells how true of you the statement is. Answer in terms of how well the statement describes you. Do not answer how you think you should be, or what other people do. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. This usually takes about 20-30 minutes to complete. If you have any questions, let the teacher know immediately.	1= Never or never true of me	2= Usually not true of me	3= Somewhat true of me	4= Usually true of me	5= Always or almost true of me
---	---	--	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

PART A :

*1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image of picture of the word to help me remember the word.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of situation in which the word might be used.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I physically act out new English words.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I review English lessons often.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	1	2	3	4	5

PART B :

10. I say or write new English words several times.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I practice the sounds of English.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I use English words I know in different ways.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I start conversations in English.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I read for pleasure in English.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I try to find patterns in English.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I find the meaning of English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I try not to translate word-for-word.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX C

SILL (cont'd)

PART C :

24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	1	2	3	4	5
25. When I can think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I read English without looking up every new word.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	1	2	3	4	5
29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	1	2	3	4	5

PART D :

30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	1	2	3	4	5
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner in English.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	1	2	3	4	5
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	1	2	3	4	5
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	1	2	3	4	5

PART E :

39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	1	2	3	4	5
40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	1	2	3	4	5
41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	1	2	3	4	5
42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I'm studying or using English.	1	2	3	4	5
43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.	1	2	3	4	5
44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	1	2	3	4	5

PART F :

45. If I do not understand something as an English word, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	1	2	3	4	5
46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	1	2	3	4	5
47. I practice English with other students.	1	2	3	4	5
48. I ask for help from English speakers.	1	2	3	4	5
49. I ask questions in English.	1	2	3	4	5
50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers."	1	2	3	4	5

(Oxford, 1990)

APPENDIX D

The Ethical Approval Form



Bilkent Üniversitesi

Akademik İşler Rektör Yardımcılığı

Tarih : 24 Mayıs 2022

Gönderilen : İremnur Oruç

Tez Danışmanı : Necmi Akşit

Gönderen : H. Altay Güvenir
İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başkanı

Konu : "Language Learning ..." çalışması etik kurul onayı

Üniversitemiz İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu, 24 Mayıs 2022 tarihli görüşme sonucu, "Language Learning Strategies of Undergraduate Students at Bilkent University" isimli çalışmanız kapsamında yapmayı önerdiğiniz etkinlik için etik onay vermiş bulunmaktadır. Onay, ekte verilmiş olan çalışma önerisi, çalışma yürütücüleri ve bilgilendirme formu için geçerlidir.

Bu onay, yapmayı önerdiğiniz çalışmanın genel bilim etiği açısından bir değerlendirmedir. Çalışmanızda, kurulumuzun değerlendirmesi dışında kalabilen özel etik ve yasal sınırlamalara uymakla ayrıca yükümlüsünüz.

Kovid-19 salgını nedeniyle konulmuş olan kısıtlamaların yürürlükte olduğu süre içinde, tüm komite toplantıları elektronik ortamda yapılmaktadır; aşağıda isimleri bulunan Bilkent Üniversitesi Etik Kurulu Üyeleri adına bu yazıyı imzalama yetkisi kurul başkanındadır.

Etik Kurul Üyeleri:

Ünvan / İsim	Bölüm / Uzmanlık	
Prof.Dr. H. Altay Güvenir	Bilgisayar Mühendisliği	Başkan
Prof.Dr. Erdal Onar	Hukuk	Üye
Prof.Dr. Haldun Özaktaş	Elektrik ve Elektronik Müh.	Üye
Doç.Dr. Işık Yuluğ	Moleküler Biyoloji ve Genetik	Üye
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Burcu Ayşen Ürgen	Psikoloji	Üye
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Didem Özkul McGeoch	İletişim ve Tasarımı	Yedek Üye
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi A.Bariş Özbilen	Hukuk	Yedek Üye

Kurul kararı/toplantı No: 2022_05_24_01

APPENDIX E

The Coding Book

Departmental categorization of the students

1	2	3	4
Faculty of Science	Faculty of Art	Faculty of Social Sciences	Faculty of Humanities
Computer information systems (2). Engineering departments (Mechanical, electrical, industrial, computer) (17). Chemistry, mathematics, physics, molecular biology and genetics (9).	Interior architecture, graphics, communication and design, fine arts (11).	Management (3), political science, psychology, international relations (21), law (3).	English language and literature, American studies, translation and philosophy (14).

Gender categorization

1	2
Female (48)	Male (29)

APPENDIX E (cont'd)**The Coding Book***Age group categorization*

1	2
18 to 19 (50)	20 to 22 (32)

Attendance to preparatory school categorization

1	2
Yes (37)	No (45)

Semesters at preparatory school categorization

1	2
1 semester (23)	2 and more semesters (15)

High school type categorization

1	2	3	4
Public (29)	Public (following an international curriculum) (3)	Private (40)	Private (following an international curriculum) (10)

APPENDIX E (cont'd)**The Coding Book***Program type categorization*

1	2	3	4	5	6
IB (International Baccalaureate) (11)	Oxford IGSCE (1)	OLevel/ALevel (1)	Baccalaureate Francais (1)	Science school (1)	AP calculus AB (1)

CGPA Categorization

1	2	3
3.00 + (17)	2.99-2.00 (12)	1.99-0 (8)

ENG101 letter grade categorization

1	2	3
A (+,-) & B+ (18)	B & (B-) (15)	C (+,-) (4)

Current enrollment to ENG courses

1	2
ENG101 (45)	ENG102 (37)

APPENDIX E (cont'd)**The Coding Book***Likert-Scale Categorization*

1	2	3	4	5
Never or never true of me	Usually not true of me	Somewhat true of me	Usually true of me	Always or almost true of me