

**DOKUZ EYLÜL UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT
M.A. THESIS**

**AN EXPLORATORY STUDY ON THE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE AMBIGUITY
TOLERANCE AND PARTICIPATION OF THE
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS**

Sinem COŞKUN

**İzmir
2017**

**DOKUZ EYLÜL UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT
M.A. THESIS**

**AN EXPLORATORY STUDY ON THE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE AMBIGUITY
TOLERANCE AND PARTICIPATION OF THE
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS**

Sinem COŞKUN

**Supervisor
Prof. Dr. Feryal ÇUBUKÇU**

**İzmir
2017**

YEMİN METNİ

Yüksek lisans teziolarak sunduğum “An Exploratory Study on the Relationship Between the Ambiguity Tolerance and Participation of the English Language Learners” başlıklı araştırmanın, tarafımdan bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçada gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, bunlara atıf yapılarak yararlanılmış olduğunu belirtir ve bunu onurumla doğrularım.



09/08/2017

Sinem COŞKUN

Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürlüğüne

İşbu çalışma, jürimiz tarafından Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngilizce Öğretmenliği Programında YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Başkan : Prof. Dr. Feryal ÇUBUKÇU

Üye : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ayfer ONAN

Üye : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sinem BEZİRCİLIOĞLU

Onay

Yukarıdaki imzaların, adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylarım.

09/08/2017

Prof. Dr. Ali Günay BALIM
Enstitü Müdürü V.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I wish to express my earnest gratitude to my thesis supervisor Prof. Dr. Feryal Çubukçu for providing me with her profound knowledge, assisting me whenever I need help and encouraging me during the accomplishment of my thesis.

I owe my thanks to all of my sincere friends both in and out of İzmir as I always felt their warmth. Their valuable opinions and advice helped me a lot during the tough times.

I'm also thankful to all of my students who became a part of my study and contributed to my study with great interest.

Lastly, I give my special thanks to my husband Yener Coşkun who supported me patiently, insightfully and whole-heartedly throughout this process. It would be much more difficult for me to accomplish without him. I also want to thank my parents Gülizar and Hasan İnay, and my beloved sister Sibel Kartoğlu for always giving me the sympathy, compassion, motivation and support I needed.

09.08.2017
Sinem Coşkun

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
ÖZET.....	ix
CHAPTER I.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1.The Problem Statement	1
1.2.The Purpose of the Study.....	4
1.3.Research Questions	4
1.4. The Significance of the Study	4
1.5. The Assumptions of the Study.....	6
1.6. The Limitations of the Study	7
CHAPTER II.....	8
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
2.1.Effective Teaching	8
2.1.1. Characteristics of Effective Teachers	9

2.1.2. Effective Language Teaching.....	13
2.2.Learning	15
2.2.1.Definitions of Learning.....	15
2.2.2.Effective Learning.....	17
2.2.3. Learning Styles and Strategies	18
2.2.4. Studies on Learning Styles and Strategies.....	26
2.3.Ambiguity Tolerance.....	29
2.3.1. Definions and Characteristics of Ambiguity Tolerance	29
2.3.2. Effects of Ambiguity Tolerance on Language Learning	33
2.3.3. Studies on Ambiguity Tolerance	36
CHAPTER III	42
METHODOLOGY.....	42
3.1. Introduction	42
3.2. Model of the Study	42
3.3. Study Group.....	42
3.4. Data Collection Instrument	43
3.5. Procedure	44
3.6. Data Analysis	45

CHAPTER IV	46
RESULTS AND FINDINGS	46
4.1. Introduction	46
4.2. Ambiguity Tolerance Levels of the Sixth Graders	46
4.3. Students' Ambiguity Tolerance Levels and Gender Differences	48
4.4. Frequency of Participation of the Sixth Graders	49
4.5. Students' Frequency of Participation and Gender Differences	51
4.6. Students' Ambiguity Tolerance Levels and Their Frequency of Participation.....	52
CHAPTER V	54
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	54
5.1. Introduction	54
5.2. Discussion	54
5.2.1. Ambiguity Tolerance Levels of the Sixth Graders	55
5.2.2. Participation Frequency of the Sixth Graders	56
5.2.3. The Relationship Between the Students' Ambiguity Tolerance Levels and Their Frequency of Participation	57
5.2.4. Ambiguity Tolerance and Gender Differences	58
5.3. Conclusion	59
5.4. Pedagogical Implications and Suggestions.....	62

REFERENCES.....	64
APPENDICES	75
Appendix-1	75
Appendix-2 Translated Version of SLTAS	76
Appendix-3 Official Permission of Provincial Directorate for National Education of İzmir	77
Appendix-4 Orijinallik Raporu.....	78

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Ambiguity Tolerance Scores of SLTAS	47
Table 2 Ambiguity Tolerance by Gender	48
Table 3 Independent Samples Test of Ambiguity Tolerance	49
Table 4 Frequency of Participation of the Sixth Graders.....	50
Table 5 Statistics of Frequency of Participation.....	50
Table 6 Frequency of Participation by Gender.....	51
Table 7 Independent Samples Test of Participation Frequency	51
Table 8 Correlations	52

ABSTRACT

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE AMBIGUITY TOLERANCE AND PARTICIPATION OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

Ambiguity tolerance is considered as a disposition that influences the individual in terms of his perspectives, his choices and his perception of the world. It could be defined as the embracement of the obscure and uncertain situations that we encountered in life. A certain level of tolerance is preferred as it helps to overcome these situations. Ambiguity tolerance also has an effect on language learning on the assumption that language learning is a complicated process that has several components.

Ambiguity tolerance is manifested in language learning environments when learners are faced with the differences between their mother tongue and the target language. These differences may occur in various learning areas that are necessary for the progress of language skills and achievement. Language learning is an observable process which requires active participation of the learners. Participation during the activities is believed to be one of the best ways of learning a language as active involvement improves language learning abilities. It is significant to encourage participation in the classrooms and increase the participation frequency of the students to provide an effective learning environment.

The purpose of this study is to reveal the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and participation frequency of English language learners. The possible relationship between ambiguity tolerance and gender differences is also aimed to be found out. The study was conducted with 62 sixth grade students who were studying at Menemen Emiralem Atatürk Secondary School during the education year of 2016-2017. Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale was applied to determine

ambiguity tolerance levels of the participants individually. After the implementation of the scale, the students' participation frequency was identified through the observation rubric and was transformed into a 5-Likert Scale. The correlation results indicated that there is a weak correlation between ambiguity tolerance and participation frequency of the learners which means that ambiguity tolerance is insufficient in predicting the students' participation frequency. Participation may be influenced by various factors such as classroom environment or the teacher rather than ambiguity tolerance. In addition, the results of independent samples t-test demonstrated that there is no meaningful difference between ambiguity tolerance levels of males and females.

Key words: Ambiguity tolerance, classroom participation, secondary school students

ÖZET

İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN BELİRSİZLİK TOLERANSLARI İLE DERSE KATILIMLARI ARASINDA İLİŞKİ ÜZERİNE BİR ÇALIŞMA

Belirsizlik toleransı bireyi bakış açısı, seçimleri ve dünya algısı bakımından etkileyen bir eğilim olarak düşünülür. Bu kavram hayatta karşılaştığımız karışık ve belirsiz durumları benimseme olarak tanımlanabilir. Belirli bir seviyedeki belirsizlik toleransı bu gibi durumların üstesinden gelmeye yardımcı olacağı için tercih edilir. Dil öğreniminin pek çok farklı unsuru olan karmaşık bir süreç olduğunu varsayarsak, belirsizlik toleransının dil öğrenimine etkisi olduğu da söylenebilir.

Belirsizlik toleransı dil öğrenme ortamlarında öğrenciler ana dilleri ve hedef dil arasındaki farklılıklarla karşı karşıya kaldıklarında açığa çıkar. Bu farklılıklar dil becerilerinin gelişimi ve başarı için gerekli olan çeşitli öğrenme alanlarında ortaya çıkabilir. Öğrenme süreci öğrencilerin aktif katılımını gerektiren gözlemlenebilir bir süreçtir. Aktif katılım dil öğrenme becerilerini geliştirdiği için sınıf etkinliklerine katılımın dil öğrenmenin en iyi yollarından biri olduğuna inanılır. Etkili bir öğrenme ortamı sağlamak için derste katılımı teşvik etmek ve öğrencilerin derse katılım sıklıklarını artırmak önemlidir.

Bu çalışmanın amacı İngilizce öğrenen öğrencilerin belirsizlik toleransları ve derse katılım sıklıkları arasındaki ilişkiyi ortaya çıkarmaktır. Belirsizlik toleransı ile cinsiyet farklılıkları arasındaki olası ilişkinin bulunması da amaçlanmıştır. Çalışma Menemen Emiralem Atatürk Ortaokulu'nda okuyan 62 altıncı sınıf öğrencisi ile 2016-2017 eğitim-öğretim yılında yürütülmüştür. Yabancı Dil Belirsizlik Toleransı Ölçeği katılımcıların belirsizlik toleransı seviyelerini belirlemek amacıyla uygulanmıştır. Ölçeğin uygulanmasından sonra, öğrencilerin derse katılım sıklıkları

gözlem rubriğine yazılmış ve sonrasında rubrik 5’li likert ölçeğe dönüştürülmüştür. Korelasyon sonuçları belirsizlik toleransı ile derse katılım sıklığı arasında zayıf bir korelasyon olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu sonuç, belirsizlik toleransının öğrencilerin derse katılım sıklıklarını yordamada yetersiz kaldığı, derse katılımın sınıf ortamı veya öğretmen gibi çeşitli faktörlerden etkilenebileceği anlamına gelmektedir. Bununla beraber, bağımsız grup t-testi sonuçları da erkek ve kızların belirsizlik toleransı seviyeleri arasında anlamlı farklılık olmadığını göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Belirsizlik toleransı, derse katılım, ortaokul öğrencileri



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1.The Problem Statement

Learning a new language is a tough process in which learners are expected to learn a number of items which are generally considered as unknown, indefinite, vague and obscure by the learners (Kamran & Maftoon, 2012). In this generalization, the learners' psychological states and characteristic traits have great importance and influence.

Students, while trying to overcome the troubles of the learning period, often have difficulty in understanding the input given by the teacher which is not in their mother tongue. Brown (2000: 120) explains the issue as follows "In second language learning, a great amount of apparently contradictory information is encountered: words that differ from the native language, rules that not only differ but are internally inconsistent because of certain 'exceptions' , and sometimes a whole cultural system that is distant from that of the native culture". These differences between the mother tongue and the target language are one of the most important reasons for learners' having difficulties. Chapelle (1983: 19) also states that "Learning a second language is considered "novel" by the learner because the grammatical, lexical, phonological, and cultural cues are unfamiliar and therefore insufficient to construct an interpretation that is meaningful to him". Besides understanding these unfamiliar items, learners are expected to speak, read, write, listen and communicate in the target language.

In an English language class where students are expected to learn a number of skills and rules, ambiguity tolerance is necessary to make it real. Chapelle (1983)

points out that some characteristics of learners lead them to success, and he examines “the relationship between a personality characteristic, ambiguity tolerance, and success in acquiring English as a Second Language” by stating that “An individual who has little ambiguity tolerance, then, may become nervous in unclear situations and try to avoid them” (iii).

Ambiguity tolerance was first accepted as a personality variable by Frenkel-Brunswik (1948) and Budner (1962). Their definitions of intolerance and tolerance of ambiguity are valued by many researchers. Budner identifies them respectively as “the tendency to perceive ambiguous situations as sources of threat” and “the tendency to perceive ambiguous situations as desirable” (29). He also states that “ambiguous situations were identified as those characterized by novelty, complexity, or insolubility” (49). The differences in tolerance/intolerance of ambiguity degrees of the students have a crucial influence on their learning. Brown (2000) states that ambiguity tolerance was claimed to be a predictive factor affecting the students’ success levels and learners with high tolerance of ambiguity are likely to be more productive in some language tasks.

Intolerance of ambiguity may bring out negative feelings of the learner and increase the level of stress. According to Chapelle (1983),

A person with a lot of ambiguity tolerance will seek out, enjoy and excel in ambiguity, while a person with little ambiguity tolerance will become uncomfortable, causing him to structure information any way he can in novel, complex, insoluble, unstructured situations or to avoid them altogether (14).

Learners with low levels of ambiguity tolerance are discouraged by the uncertain situations, lose their hope for success, cannot concentrate on the lesson and become distracted by the pieces of information. Contrary to this, learners with high levels of ambiguity tolerance perceive uncertain situations as an opportunity to learn and welcome them positively (Lee, 1992). Ambiguity tolerance helps the learner by enhancing his curiosity towards the language and encouraging him to participate in

the learning activity. Ideas of Tayebinik and Puteh (2013) about the subject are as follows:

Ely (1989) explained precisely the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and language learning. According to him, ambiguity in second language (L2) learning is due to the differences between two languages. These differences may relate to the meaning of the words, grammatical elements such as verb forms and tenses, and pronunciation (207).

In this respect, determining the common grounds between two languages and ignoring the differences which facilitate the learning process is of great importance.

Participation is usually considered as a need by the teachers of English to enable the learners' improvement. What lies behind this is that language learning is an observable process, it is difficult to acquire a language without active participation (Leger, 2009). Participation in the lesson can be described as the learners's being active and getting involved in the lesson through communication by asking and answering questions (Tayebinik & Puteh, 2013). As Zulkepli (2012) suggests, "through participation in oral activities, learners gain linguistic knowledge and other aspects of the target language that are necessary to develop their abilities" (67). There are many different ways to participate in the lesson such as using the dictionary, reading, listening, responding orally and working on tasks (Zulkepli, 2012). Rocca (2010) states that students' personality traits have a great influence on their participation. One of these characteristics is ambiguity tolerance. Chapelle (1983) explains the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and performance, and indicates that "Like high levels of anxiety, low levels of Ambiguity Tolerance are believed to produce avoidance strategies in the learner" (4). These avoidance strategies and low levels of ambiguity tolerance affect learners' performance and participation in the classroom.

1.2.The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between the ambiguity tolerance and participation frequency of the sixth grade English language learners. The frequency of their participation in the classroom depending on ambiguity tolerance and its relationship between their gender differences are also aimed to be studied.

1.3.Research Questions

- 1.What are the ambiguity tolerance levels of the sixth graders?
- 2.What are the frequency of the participation of the sixth graders?
- 3.Is there a relationship between the students' ambiguity tolerance and their participation frequency?
- 4.Do gender differences of the students affect their ambiguity tolerance levels and participation in the classroom?

1.4. The Significance of the Study

Although various studies (Chapelle, 1983; Lee, 1992; Gonzalez, 1996) have been carried out about the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and second language learning, its effects on participation of the English language learners have not been included. This study will contribute to the field concerning ambiguity tolerance and its influences on the learners' participation.

Budner (1962) and Norton (1975) identify ambiguity tolerance as a personality trait and a cognitive style variable. Thus, it has a psychological basis and

will be affecting the students in their education life as well as in other areas. In other words, it is pivotal for learners that have low levels of tolerance to reduce the effects of ambiguity and balance it for the ones who have high levels of tolerance (Brown, 2000). It is reported that students who have high levels of tolerance of ambiguity “tend not to relate the target language to the elements of their native languages. They are more patient and willing to deal with target language on its own terms, and concentrate on the overall meaning instead of on small pieces of information” (Lee, 1992: 17). Without feeling the threat coming from the ambiguous situations that are thought to “block the way to retrieval of knowledge” (Kamran & Maftoon, 2012: 189), it will be easier for both the learner and the teacher to improve the effectiveness of the lesson.

Norton (1973) discusses the ambiguity tolerance in verbal behavior and suggested that “ambiguity tolerance affects cognitive processes from the earliest years of development which, in turn, influences a person’s reasoning ability, his language, his logic, and his norms” (40). He also adds that “a person who is intolerant of ambiguity tends to be prejudiced and ineffective in his reasoning ability. The premise rests upon the belief that a person who is intolerant of ambiguity perceives less” (Norton, 1973: 40). However, “The person who is tolerant of ambiguity is free to entertain a number of innovative and creative possibilities and not to be cognitively or affectively disturbed by ambiguity and uncertainty” (Brown, 2000: 120). So, it is crucial for a learner to be tolerant of ambiguity to a certain degree, as it eases the learning process. A research made by Gonzalez (1996) puts emphasis on the increasing levels of second language acquisition and its influences on “student’s ability to tolerate ambiguity” (105). Erten and Topkaya (2009) discuss the effect of ambiguity tolerance on EFL learners and suggest that EFL learners have a low level of ambiguity tolerance in general.

There have been a number of studies about the reasons that affect participation in the language classrooms. A study conducted by Robson (1994) points out the relationship between individual learner differences and classroom

participation. The study indicates that students that are extroverted and non-anxious participate more. Fritschner (2000) discovers the relationship between course levels and participation frequencies of the students which reveal different styles of learners belonging to different levels. Additionally, a study made by Fassinger (2000) reveals that with active participation of the students, a more favorable evaluation rises and students become less concerned about their personality characteristics such as their abilities. According to Lee (2005), personality types and attitudes of the students have a great influence on the participation. He concludes that being introvert or extrovert and gender differences of the learners are important factors of participation. A similar study made by Delaney (2012) verifies the positive impact of frequent participation on learning English.

Students' involvement in the class has been discussed by many researchers. "The impact of student age, student gender, instructor gender, and course level on student participation" was clarified by Howard and Henney (1998: 385) who claim that all of these are significant factors. Additionally, the positive effect of participation on learners' critical thinking skills is stated by Tsui (1998). Weaver and Qi (2005) name various factors that affect students' active participation in learning such as age, gender, class size, students' fears, comments of peer groups, preparation and confidence. According to Dallimore, Hertenstein and Platt (2013), instructors worry that non-participants will not learn as good as the participants. Loftin, Davis and Hartin (2012) divide the effects that influence participation and underline the importance of intrapersonal as well as environmental influences and influences of peers. As this study will show the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and participation frequency of the students, gender differences will also be studied as a factor that has a possibility to affect it.

1.5. The Assumptions of the Study

It is assumed that students' primary aim to attend English classes is to learn and use English effectively. Participants' truthfulness and honesty while responding

to the statements in the scale is expected. The researcher, who is the teacher of the lesson as well, is assumed to be objective during both the implementation and the evaluation phases of the study. It is hoped that the study results will present the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and participation frequency of the students.

1.6. The Limitations of the Study

In the study, three classes of secondary school students who learn English at Menemen Emiralem Atatürk Secondary School, Menemen, İzmir, Turkey will be included only and generalizations will be made regarding these participants. The study is limited to sixth graders, so, their levels of competence will be assumed on equal footing. As the scale will be applied only once and last for about 20 minutes, time is also limited.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Effective Teaching

Many scholars tried to define the term *teaching* and they have come up with different definitions. Brown (2000) defines it as “guiding and facilitating learning, enabling the learner to learn, setting the conditions for learning” (7), Brosh (1996) as “a continuous process of communication in which the teacher transmits messages to students who respond to them” (125) and Harmer (2001) questions it by stating “Is teaching about the transmission of knowledge from teacher to student, or is it about creating conditions in which, somehow, students learn for themselves?” (56). However, some of these scholars (Miller, 1987; Brown, 2000; Harmer, 2001; Saha & Dworkin, 2009) agree that teaching is a term that is difficult to define and that needs to be examined with a great deal of components, which will be discussed later.

In his essay *Perceived Characteristics of the Effective Language Teacher*, Brosh (1996) states the following:

Penner (1992) describes effective teaching as ‘the growth and improvement of classroom communication - the ability of the teacher to adequately communicate to the student and the student’s ability and opportunity to respond and demonstrate some competence in reproducing what he has learned by formulating in his own words the facts and concepts that now illuminate his mind’ (125).

With the light of this definition, it is possible to say that effective teaching is, above all, a reciprocal process which needs equal effort of both the teacher and the students. Students need to get through a mental process in order to take the advantage of the teaching profession pre-eminently.

2.1.1. Characteristics of Effective Teachers

Before discussing effective teaching, it would be better to deal with the roles of teachers in the classroom. In all areas of their teaching, teachers are required to be *a facilitator (of learning)*; but, as this is a broad term, it is better to use more definite terms than *facilitator*. Brown (2000) and Weimer (2013) discuss the roles teachers gain in the classroom. As Brown (2000) suggests, two of the most important of these are *controller* and *organizer* which can be used interchangeably. These teachers give students the roles, tell the students about the lesson, put them into pairs or groups, clear the things, prevent the chaos and tell when it is time to do something. Thirdly, teachers as *assessors* give students feedback about their progress (Brown, 2000). Getting informed about their improvement or regression is of great importance for the students in terms of motivation or demotivation. Therefore, it is important to be careful while handing out the grades or telling them about their conduct. Fairness about the grades is another significant issue that need to be paid attention to by the teachers as assessors. The fourth role of the teachers in the classroom may be the teacher as *prompter*. The most important quality prompters must have is being encouraging. While doing the tasks, for instance, students need prompters to trigger and motivate them. The other role of the teacher is *participant* in which the teacher is seen as one of the group members of the activity, not the controller of it. By this way, the learners enjoy seeing their teachers with them. The sixth role a teacher assumes in the classroom is the teacher as *tutor*. This role looks like the prompter but it has a deeper mission, which is more personal. Last but not least, the seventh role teachers embrace is the teacher as *observer*. In almost all of the roles we discussed until now, teacher is apparently the active participant of the lesson. However, teacher as observer has to be away from the activities in some degree in order to observe, correct, and assess the learners. When we examine the roles teachers take in the classroom, a question arises, which one is the best role? Here, shifting the roles is probably the best thing to do. However, being aware of what role we chose and how to perform that role is also crucial (Brown, 2000).

Like Brown (2000), Weimer (2013) sees teacher as a facilitator of learning and supports learner-centered learning. He thinks that facilitator teachers trigger learning and “are focused on what the students are doing, instead of what they themselves are doing” (62). He adds that they try to know their students and shape teaching and learning process according to this information to make it more effective. Weimer (2013) emphasizes that it is important not to intervene with the students more than needed. To provide an effective learning environment, it is important to share power as this will establish a more confident environment in the class. Weimer (2013) asserts four characteristics of a well-designed learning. First of all, the teachers must stimulate their learners before the activities so that they can get ready to absorb the information. Then, they must create suitable environments for the students to do the learning activity on their own and authentically. The third characteristic is to help students build the new information on their existing knowledge in order to compose meaningful input. Finally, teachers must consider the individual learning styles and skills of the students that encourage deep learning. In an essay, Ayers (1986; cited in Weimer, 2013) claims that

Good teachers find ways to activate students, for they know that learning requires active engagement between the subject and ‘object matter’. Learning requires discovery and invention. Good teachers know when to hang back and be silent, when to watch and wonder at what is taking place all around them (50).

Based on the saying that “one who does the work does the learning” (Doyle, 2008), it is fundamental to promote students’ abilities and capacities in guiding them.

With reference to the studies done by some researchers (Weimer, 2013; Zhang, 2013; Moradi & Sabeti, 2014; Xiang & Borg, 2014; Bishop, Caston & King, 2014) on effective teachers and effective teaching, there are a number of characteristics of effective teachers. In every study, similar characteristics of teachers have been found but the frequency of mention levels changes in some of them. Before listing the characteristics of effective teachers, it would be better to make a definition of it. As Brosh (1996) defines, effective teacher is someone “ who comes to know his or her students, who is sensitive to the ways in which students receive

and process information and who establishes a classroom environment that stimulates and supports students' innate motivation" (127). Considering this definition, it is possible to say that the effective teacher is a combination of social and pedagogical skills.

Hill (2014) divides characteristics of effective teachers in terms of teaching competence, relationships with students and teacher attitudes, and he evaluates the effective teacher in all of these three categories separately:

Teaching Competence	Relationships with Students	Teacher Attitudes
Being experienced Making connections Teaching practice as well as theory Being knowledgeable and prepared Providing examples Presenting knowledge-based information	Being approachable Providing contact information Having adequate office hours Answering e-mail in a timely manner Answering phones	Having enthusiasm Being fun and energetic

Regarding these categories, effective teachers deal well with the students, convey knowledge and help students learn by themselves. They are also accessible and have some time for students apart from the lesson. About attitudes, teachers who are enjoyable and who value their learners are the ones who can provide effective teaching and learning (Hill, 2014).

As Penner (1992) claims, "one who teaches effectively, teaches not only his subject but himself. Personality is that part of the teacher's self which he projects into every classroom activity, thereby affecting and conditioning every learning

situation” (45). Accordingly, while teaching, teachers express their feelings to students visibly or invisibly as a result of which the students learn or adopt some attitudes. Xiang and Borg (2014) agree with Penner (1992) and Hill (2014) about the importance of teacher attitudes and add that knowledge delivery and interest creation are other most important characteristics of the effective teachers.

Miller (1987) discusses the criteria for an effective classroom. These criteria can be separated into four areas:

1) Affective characteristics

Enthusiasm
Encouragement
Humor
Interest and confidence in the student
Patience
Availability
Mental health

2) Skills

Creativity
Challenge

3) Classroom management

Pace
Fairness

4) Academic knowledge

Grammar

Affective characteristics will help the learner feel more confident, motivated and prized while making the learning process easier by the teachers. Although teachers' effectiveness depend on their demonstration of affective characteristics, they are sometimes inborn, as Miller uttered. However, they are also within the grasp of most teachers. Pace provides a positive force on the students and with the help of it, they do not feel distracted through the lesson. The students do not have time to feel distracted as they keep up with the flow of the lesson. Besides, grammar knowledge of the teacher which is the other side of the effective teaching is needed for the informative part of the lesson. Teachers must be completely honest if they do not know the answer to a question. They may promise to search for the answer and tell the student immediately the other day not to lose the students' faith in them.

Miller (1987) gave more importance to affective characteristics of an effective teacher; however, without a good organization of techniques and grammar points, the lesson will be less than effective. Teachers usually try to find ways to take into consideration of all of these characteristics. Most teachers want to be encouraging, humorous, patient and enthusiastic, but they just have to be reminded at times.

2.1.2. Effective Language Teaching

In an attempt to identify the roles and qualities of effective teachers, some definitions and characteristics have been mentioned above. Now, we may touch on the general characteristics and necessities in an effective language class. As many researchers suggest (Brosh, 1996; Bell, 2005; Borg, 2006), language learning is different from any other learning experiences in terms of “the nature of the subject, the content of teaching, the teaching methodology, teacher-learner relationships, and contrasts between native and non-native speakers” (Borg, 2006: 3). Brosh (1996) states that language learning differs from other subjects as it is influenced by social, political, psychological, and practical values which the teachers or the language planners can not control. Language learning is necessarily influenced by these values because the thing language teachers are trying to teach is not only the language but also the culture of that language which makes it different and sometimes more difficult from teaching other subjects. It is a complex and multidimensional process that means different things to different people. But if it is necessary to make a definition of effective teaching, it is:

...clear and enthusiastic teaching that provides learners with grammatical (syntactical and morphological), lexical, phonological, pragmatic, and sociocultural knowledge and interactive practice they need to communicate successfully in the target language (Bell, 2005: 259).

In addition to this definition, Penner (1992) describes effective teaching as the teachers’ ability to communicate with the students and the students’ ability and opportunity to react and show competence in reproducing what they have learned.

As mentioned before, language teaching is a little different from teaching the other subjects. They have some distinctive characteristics. Borg (2006) listed these distinctive characteristics and the reasons that make them distinct. To him, language teachers are separated from the others in the matter of the nature of the subject, the contents of teaching, methodology, teacher-learner relationships, non-native issues, teachers' characteristics, training, status, errors, student body and commercialization. To defend his ideas, Borg (2006) states that the nature of language is more dynamic than the other subjects and he adds that it has something more than teaching just grammar and vocabulary: issues such as culture and communication. In terms of methodology, he claims that it is more diverse and it aims at creating contexts for communication. Teaching a language requires more teacher-learner relationships than teaching any other subjects; it also needs personal relevance. As teaching a language is a national issue, teachers are usually compared to the native speakers of the language and some qualities such as creativeness, enthusiasm and flexibility are seen as essential for a language teacher. Regarding the student age, many more adults study languages than other subjects as they need it in their daily lives more than the other subjects. As the last distinctive characteristics, commercial issues have something more to do with language teaching compared to the other concepts.

According to Brown (2002), there must be some principles in second language classrooms:

1. Lower Inhibitions
2. Encourage Risk Taking
3. Build Students' Self-Confidence
4. Help Students Develop Intrinsic Motivation
5. Promote Cooperative Learning
6. Encourage Students To Use Right-Brain Processing
7. Promote Ambiguity Tolerance

8. Help Students Use Their Intuition

9. Get Results to Make Their Mistakes Work for Them

10. Get Students to Set Their Own Goals (16-17)

These rules might be crucial as an effective teacher needs a combination of some characteristics which enable the students learn the planned information in a positive environment.

2.2.Learning

2.2.1.Definitions of Learning

Learning is a complex and broad term which is usually difficult to define and which contains social, emotional and cognitive elements. Bruner (1997) sees learning in the light of discoveries and suggests that “ Emphasis on discovery ... helps the child to learn the varieties of problem solving, of transforming information for better use, helps him to learn how to go about the very task of learning” (87). For him, discovery learning is a process which the child will be rewarded at the end.

Learning is affected by classroom atmosphere and ethos as well as emotional or affective climate (Hewitt, 2008). He defines learning as “achieving a balance of motivation,effort, organization, social ability and confidence to encourage effective learning” (Hewitt, 2008: 87). He also suggests that “Learning is more than just thinking. It is more than just performing certain actions in line with the teacher’s instructions” (Hewitt, 2008: 9).

Learning is a reflective process. It helps the learner shape future actions by evaluating the previos and the present actions and as a result create new knowledge. Through this process, Watkins et al. (2000) claim that it implies “relating new

meaning to existing meaning, involving the accommodation of ideas, skills and thoughts, and making connections between past, present and future.”(91). They also support Gardner’s (1993) view adding that “Learning occurs through multiple channels using multiple intelligences” (Watkins et al. 2000: 92).

Along with these ideas on learning, Brown (2000) makes a list of what learning is:

- 1) Learning is acquisition or “getting”.
- 2) Learning is retention of information of skill.
- 3) Retention implies storage systems, memory, cognitive organization.
- 4) Learning involves active, conscious focus on and acting upon events outside or inside the organism.
- 5) Learning is relatively permanent but subject to forgetting.
- 6) Learning involves some form of practice, perhaps reinforced practice.
- 7) Learning is a change in behaviour (7).

Brown (2000) adds that acquisition processes, memory systems, conscious and unconscious learning styles and strategies are formed by these definitions made above.

Teachers’ advanced knowledge about teaching and learning strategies where they can provide students with mental processes is a requirement of learning according to Jones et al.(1987)’s teaching model. They also have the mission of helping students to use strategies effectively and teaching them how to become autonomous learners. O’Malley and Chamot (1990) discuss the crucial points in language learning and, citing Jones et al. (1987), assert the assumptions of learning according to his Strategic Teaching Model:

1. Learning is goal oriented.
2. In learning, new information is linked to prior knowledge.
3. Learning requires knowledge organization.
4. Learning is strategic.
5. Learning occurs in strategic phases.
6. Learning is influenced by development (Jones et al., 1987, cited in O’Malley & Chamot, 1990: 188).

In a successful learning environment, the learners are both the factors influencing the learning process and the factors that are influenced by it (Weinstein & Mayer, 1983). They mention two kinds of goals which are “goals concerning the products of learning ... and goals concerning the processes of learning...” (Weinstein & Mayer, 1983: 3). For successful learning, both of these goals which focus on what to learn and how to learn must come true efficiently.

2.2.2.Effective Learning

Effective learning is, as Weinstein et al. (1989) suggest, building “meaningful connections between what they[the students] already know and what they are attempting to learn” (17). To them, there are some indicative agents that will help the students remember the information they learned before. However, these are not enough to maintain permanent information. To do this, meaningful connections are of great importance. These meaningful connections are made through elaboration strategies through which the student can form the knowledge in a more organized way.

Effective learning depends on the diversity of strategies a learner uses in his learning. Some strategies are common among successful learners while other similar strategies are used by less successful learners. It is essential to define them and understand why some strategies are important for some learners. Finding the true strategy and applying it to the learning process might be tough and significant for the student. The student must know which strategy is right for him, when to use that strategy and how to use it. Effective learning must be the most important target of the learning environment and learning to learn must be adopted by the learners to prevent the learning process become demoralizing for the learners. Hewitt (2008) prefers to define effective learning as “the ability to function well in the network of interdependencies associated with the learner” (73). By interdependencies, he implies “an interconnected context involving physical, mental and social factors”. It is impossible for learning to be independent which is always in a connection with these

interdependencies for him. Effective learning cannot be just having personally organized strategies, but it is also affected by the physical, mental, and social environments (Hewitt, 2008).

The necessities of effective learning are “to think about the way they [the students] learn and, where necessary to improve their study, revision and examination techniques” for Barrass (1984: xii). To him, there are three phases of effective learning which are accepting responsibility for your learning, student centered learning, and revision and examination techniques.

In order to understand how effective learning occurs, which is the ultimate goal of teachers, it is important to know how learning styles and strategies are defined and what their types are.

2.2.3. Learning Styles and Strategies

In a number of studies, researchers have found that personality traits of a learner play an important role in his learning (Schmeck, 1988; Ehrman & Oxford, 1990; Oxford & Cohen, 1992; Ellis, 1992, 1999; Brown, 2000; Oxford, 2003). Identifying one's style will help the learner find the suitable learning strategy for himself. It will be useful to define what style is and what types of styles we have.

Ehrman and Oxford (1990), in their research about adult language learning styles and strategies, define learning style as the following :

The term ‘learning style’ indicates preferred or habitual patterns of mental functioning and dealing with new information. At least twenty different elements of learning style have been identified. They come from at least three traditions: 1) study of perception and Gestalt psychology; 2) ego psychology; and 3) theories of Carl Jung (311).

The study of perception and Gestalt psychology are the roots of the field independence variable which implies the capacity to separate the most important details from a complicated context. The study of perception shows that this variable helps the learner in detailed tasks. By ego psychology, cognitive styles which have a significant influence on language learning are revealed. It is also an important style dimension which indicates that those with high levels of ambiguity tolerance perform better in language learning when compared to less tolerant learners. The tradition of Carl Jung has two instruments: one is the Kolb Learning Styles Inventory which is applied from Jung's model, the other one is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator which is directly applied from Jung's model of conscious functioning (Ehrman & Oxford, 1990).

Styles affect a person's thinking or feeling which will later help him reveal his own learning strategies. Brown (2000) defines style as "a term that refers to consistent and rather enduring tendencies or preferences within an individual" (113). He suggests that styles are the things that "differentiate you from someone else" (Brown, 2000: 113). He describes cognitive style as the way we behave to solve a problem we encountered as a result of a link between personality and cognition. When cognitive styles are thought in an educational context, involving affective and physiological aspects, they are mostly called as learning styles. People create their own style by personalizing their environment and they reveal their learning styles by putting physical, affective and cognitive factors together. Individuals have a tendency toward a style, however, they may embrace various styles depending on the context (Brown, 2000).

Learning styles are constant and universal; they are usually acquired to be used functionally by the learners in various learning conditions. According to Ellis (1992), learning style means "the totality of psychological functioning evident in the way in which a learner approaches the task of learning the L2. It is considered to be persistent and pervasive and it is reflected in perceptual, cognitive and affective aspects of learning" (13). He states that "learning style refers to the characteristic

ways in which individuals orientate to problem-solving ... [it] is relatively fixed and not readily changed". In Keefe's (1979) words, learning style is "the characteristic, cognitive and physiological behaviours that serve as relatively stable indicators of how learners perceive, interact with and respond to the learning environment. ... Learning style is a consistent way of functioning, that reflects underlying causes of behaviour." (cited in Ellis, 1999: 499). Apparently, learning styles are the ways learners choose which determine the individual differences in their performance.

A style is a tendency a learner owns to use it in the present conditions. By means of this tendency, the learner chooses the right strategies for himself. Schmeck (1988) describes style as "a disposition to adopt one class of learning strategy or one class of teaching strategy in the conversation of a tutorial" (85). His Conversation Theory claims that P-Individuals (psychological individuals or mental organizations) that exist in people's brains and styles appear as a result of this P-Individuals. It is possible that they signify the characteristics of people and that one person has several P-Individuals. According to Schmeck (1983), learning styles are cognitive styles that are used when the individuals are going to learn something. An image is the origin of cognitive style and strategies, and it also indicates the personality of the individual which s/he processes data and performs actions. Cognitive styles are "characterized by greater versatility, flexibility, and adaptation in overall functioning" (Schmeck, 1988: 150). They are defined as "stable, even unchangeable, individual characteristics which partly control and organize more-fluid cognitive strategies" (Schmeck, 1988: 176).

Learning styles are the ways of the learners that are vital for their success in learning. They are defined by Oxford (2003) as "the general approaches – for example, global or analytic, auditory or visual – that students use to acquire a new language or in learning any other subject" (2). There are four aspects of learning style according to Oxford, which are sensory preferences, personality types, desired degree of generality and biological differences. Sensory preferences are divided into four: visual, auditory, kinesthetic (movement oriented) and tactile (touch oriented).

Visual students like to learn in observable and visible environments. They have difficulty in comprehending conversations and oral lessons. Unlike visual learners, auditory learners enjoy lectures and conversations where they can have a chance to interact with the others. However, writing may be a great problem for them. Kinesthetic and tactile students learn best when they are moving around and working with touchable objects and materials (Oxford, 2003).

Personality types can reveal one's perception of the world or his reaction towards learning which will later identify his learning style and as a result learning strategies. They are the main factors influencing the learners' learning style. Being aware of the personality types of the students, the teachers and the students themselves are able to find out their learning styles which will lead to effective learning. Personality types consist of four aspects which are extraverted vs. introverted; intuitive-random vs. sensing-sequential; thinking vs. feeling; closure-oriented/judging vs. open/perceiving.

1. Extraverted vs. Introverted : Extraverted students like to be in the external world where they can be in a connection with the people and friends around them. In contrast, introverted students enjoy being alone, getting their energy from loneliness. Extraverts and introverts can limit each other in the class if they work together which will help them strengthen their weaknesses.
2. Intuitive-Random vs. Sensing-Sequential: Intuitive-Random learners often think in discrete, visionary and nonsuccessive ways. They prefer to be independent in their own learning. On the contrary, sensing-sequential learners like concreteness and cohesion. They need to be directed and individually guided by the teacher. In order to be able to teach both types, it is important to present a diversity of opportunities to make them feel free in their actions and choices.
3. Thinking vs. Feeling: Thinking learners tend to be blunt towards people and they usually want to be seen as proficient and self confident. These characteristics may sometimes make them seem distant. However, feeling learners give importance to the other people's feelings while showing sympathy and kindness. They reveal

their feelings emotionally and value people personally. Thinking and feeling learners can help each other by trying to balance their characteristic behaviours in class.

4. Closure-oriented/Judging vs. Open/Perceiving: Closure-oriented learners are usually successful ones who want to be given written tasks, complete and succeed immediately. In contrast, open learners enjoy learning process and they see it not as a task but as a game that they can have a good time. These contrasting learners can team up and become a unity in the class when the teacher creates heterogeneous groups (Oxford, 2003: 4-6).

The desired degree of generality has two strands which are global or holistic and analytic. Global or holistic learners prefer conversational environments where they can find the main idea, not the small units. They do not pay attention to being given all the information, instead, they enjoy deducing from the context. Analytic learners like grammatical details and they escape conversational activities. They dislike guessing from the context and do not take risks. In L2 learning environments, a combination of global and analytic students will create a useful learning for students (Oxford, 2003). The desired degree of generality is rather important in L2 learning as it reveals how students learn and what they need during the learning process. It is possible for a teacher to pair up these two kinds of learners for useful learning.

Biological factors such as biorhythms, sustenance and location have a great significance in L2 learning. Biorhythms are “the times of day when students feel good and perform their best” as Oxford (2003: 7) suggests. Some learners do their best when they are taught in the morning while the others perform better in the evening. Sustenance is the wish for food and drinks while learning. A great deal of learners prefer eating snacks during their learning, however, some others feel distracted of them. Location refers to the temperature, lighting, sound and comfort of the learning environment all of which must be convenient for an effective learning environment. These factors are extremely important which also affect the learning

style of the learners. The variations in learning styles can have a relationship with these biological factors (Oxford, 2003).

Chen and Hung (2012) claim that the reasons for failure in speaking English after learning it so many years are the individual differences that are style preference and use of learning strategies. They supported Oxford's (2003) view that language learning styles and strategies are the most significant variables in learning a language.

In a study conducted by Willing (1987) in Australia, two major dimensions of learning style were found which are cognitive and affective (Ellis, 1999). Based on these dimensions, he defined four learning styles used by adult ESL learners:

General Learning Style	Main Characteristics
1) Concrete learning style	Direct means of processing information; people orientated; spontaneous; imaginative; emotional; dislikes routinized learning; prefers kinaesthetic modality.
2) Analytical learning style	Focuses on specific problems and proceeds by means of hypothetical-deductive reasoning; object-orientated; independent; dislikes failure; prefers logical, didactic presentation.
3) Communicative learning style	Fairly independent; highly adaptable and flexible; responsive to facts that do not fit; prefers social learning and a

	communicative approach; enjoys taking decisions.
4) Authority-oriented learning style	Reliant on other people; needs teacher's directions and explanations; likes a structured learning environment; intolerant of facts do not fit; prefers a sequential progression; dislikes discovery learning.

(Ellis, 1999: 507)

Language may be used not only in formal situations but also in less formal settings where it is used just for communication. Oxford and Cohen (1992) see many aspects of language learning such as cognitive and metacognitive as well as social and affective. These aspects may arise from learning styles of the learners and have an influence on learning strategies as well. While learning style is defined as innate characteristics, learning strategy is the art of learning more easily and effectively by using the main chunks for

forming concepts and hypotheses, testing hypotheses, personalizing linkages, embedding material in long term memory, understanding one's affective state, managing the learning process and producing language while lacking adequate linguistic knowledge (Oxford & Cohen, 1992: 4).

Learning strategies are different from personal characteristics and styles that can be changed and adapted in different circumstances (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989). Their research reveal that "learning strategies (steps taken to facilitate acquisition, storage, retrieval and use of information) influence the degree of proficiency obtained in a second language" (1). Another research of Ehrman and Oxford (1990) shows that individual learning styles have an impact on the choice of language learning strategies. They define strategies as "the often conscious steps or behaviours used by language learners to enhance acquisition, storage, retention, recall and use of new information" (Ehrman & Oxford, 1990: 312). In another study, Oxford (2003) explains the relationship between styles and strategies as follows : "if there is

harmony between (a) the student (in terms of style and strategy preferences) and (b) the combinations of instructional methodology and materials, then the student is likely to perform well, feel confident and experience low anxiety” (Oxford, 2003: 2-3). If there becomes a conflict between (a) and (b), the student is unable to perform well, feels anxious and afraid.

Rubin (1975) lists some characteristics of good language learners. Firstly, a good language learner is tolerant of ambiguity and often enjoys uncertainty. He states that “The good language learner may be a good guesser, that is, he gathers and stores information in an efficient manner so it can be easily retrieved” (Rubin, 1975: 43). He is able to use the clues to deduce about unknown situations. Good guessers use social relationships of the speakers, the context, and grammatical hints to make guesses on the intent and point of view of a message. Secondly, the good language learner is a good communicator who can get the information and deliver his knowledge easily and perfectly. He is able to paraphrase the sentences or explain the words he does not know by forming sentences. He can also use mimics to express the unknown words. The good language learner is encouraged to communicate which makes him do anything he needs to convey the message. Thirdly, the good language learner is usually outgoing. He is not afraid to make mistakes and he does not care about seeming irrational with the aim of communicating and learning. He is mostly tolerant for ambiguous situations. Another characteristic of the good language learner is that, in Rubin (1975)’s words “He attends to the form in a particular way, constantly analyzing, categorizing, synthesizing” (47). He tries to find hints of the form of the language to make him understand it better. Speech is another important quality of the good language learner. He often checks and considers his speech which is one of the significant elements of learning a language. By monitoring his speech, he is able to see his own mistakes and take lessons from them. The good language learner knows that there are many functions of a language and he tries to find ways to transfer these functions (Rubin, 1975).

In this study, the relationship between the ambiguity tolerance levels and participation frequency of the students is planned to be evaluated in accordance with Oxford's (2003) aspects of learning styles which are sensory preferences, personality types, desired degree of generality and biological differences. It is assumed that these characteristics of learning styles will reflect the factors affecting their ambiguity tolerance levels and its consequences well.

2.2.4. Studies on Learning Styles and Strategies

In language learning, learning styles and strategies of learners are crucial elements affecting their learning process from beginning to end. Learning styles of the students lead them to the best strategy according to their learning characteristics and learning needs. A true strategy type assists, motivates and shows the learner the right way in the learning process. Studies on learning styles and strategies mostly agree on the impact of strategies on effective learning.

A study conducted by Kamboj and Singh (2015) shows the effectiveness of selected teaching strategies such as group discussion, real objects, audio-visual aids, whiteboard, lecture, brainstorming, etc. in relation to the learning styles of secondary school students in India. A descriptive method was used in the study where 800 students from different secondary and senior secondary schools of some districts in Haryana state were chosen by random sampling technique. The differences between non-experimental group that the teacher used traditional method and experimental group that the teacher used all the selected teaching strategies were analyzed and a significant difference was seen between the scores of the groups. As scores in relation to learning styles indicated, secondary school students are inclined to learn from demonstrations, drawing images and making new ideas. They are also productive and visionary and they have problem solving skills. Gender, medium or area do not affect the choice of learning style of secondary school students according to the statics. Findings related to achievement and motivation proved that if students

are motivated by their teachers, parents or friends, it is highly probable that they can succeed in academics.

Another study was carried out by Sahragard, Khajavi and Abbasian (2014) about the probable relationships between the field of study, learning styles and language learning strategies among Iranian university students who were studying arts and humanities, science, social sciences and EFL. The students were asked to fill in the Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire and the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning. The results indicated no important relationship between the fields of study and the learning styles of the students while there was a strong relationship between language learning strategies and the fields of study. Lastly, the findings brought out significant relationships between learning styles and language learning strategies. Students often preferred the strategies that they determined depending upon their learning styles.

Learning styles and strategies for language use in the context of academic reading tasks was investigated by Uhrig (2015). This longitudinal study lasted for two semesters of the participants' graduate programmes and was conducted with the help of two international participants who had been studying English for many years. The study log was used as a tool for the participants to note their strategies and it contained specific questions about the metacognitive strategies they used during reading assignments. It helped the participants remember the reading assignments and the strategies they adopted throughout the interviews. The results of the research showed that the participants had no difficulty in reading assignments, yet, their grades were quite high in both semesters compared to the previous studies. They continued using their learning strategies that were compatible with their learning styles which might be an indication of the resistance of learning styles in some instances.

In the descriptive study of Farajolahy and Nimvari (2014), they aimed to define learning styles and language learning strategies and the relationship between

them. Among the qualitative and quantitative data collecting tools, questionnaires and think aloud protocols were used to identify the styles and the strategy choices of the learners. One of the questionnaires was Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire which was developed by Reid (1987) to measure six learning styles and the other one was the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning. The data collecting tools were applied on 211 intermediate level students of Azad University of Bandar Abbas in Iran. According to the results of the learning styles questionnaire, maximum scores belonged to kinesthetic, tactile and auditory styles; however, visual, group and individual learning styles had lower scores. Besides, learning styles of the participants correlated with metacognitive, social and cognitive strategies whereas they showed lack of relationship with compensation and memory strategies. As for gender, it was indicated that it had a strong effect on the learners' styles and strategies which indicated that female learners did better than the male ones.

Parnrod, Drasawang and Singhasiri (2014)'s study investigated the relationship among cognitive styles, learning strategies and task with 778 second year engineering students in King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi. To describe the students' cognitive styles, Kolb (2005)'s questionnaire was applied all of the students who were found out to be mostly *divergers* and *assimilators*. Later on, twelve of them were chosen to carry out a task that consists of subtasks such as note-taking, writing a story and oral presentation. The strategies used by the students differed according to the characteristics of these sub-tasks. It was discovered that although the participants' cognitive styles had an impact on their choice of strategies they used while completing the tasks, in some cases, they used the same ways or chose different processes in using the same strategy. In addition, the most proficient student in the group who was seen as the leader was an important factor affecting the others' use of strategies. The participants also showed some social behaviours while working on their tasks such as sharing and helping despite their variation in cognitive styles.

In conclusion, styles are the ways of doing something that a person chooses and that separates him from the others. This way of doing something affects learning as well. The learners's choice of style is a good signal for determining effective learning strategies which also influence the learners' motivational and affective states and helps them interpret the knowledge. Learners whose learning styles are specified are inclined to be successful with the help of true learning strategies and a good combination of materials and techniques. Learning strategies are chosen by the learners themselves and they lead the learner in comprehension of the concepts to be learned. Good language learners are experts in using the strategies effectively such as getting and storing information, and being a part of learning process actively. They also like ambiguous situations which they see as a chance of gathering new information. Studies show that the strategies learners adopt are usually the results of the learners' learning styles. If chosen properly, they will take the learners to effective learning in all learning domains.

2.3.Ambiguity Tolerance

Ambiguity tolerance is regarded as a crucial characteristic by many researchers (Frenkel-Brunswik, 1948; Budner, 1962; MacDonald, 1970; Norton, 1975) as it has the power to enable the individuals to cope with the complex situations in their lives. It also affects the learners' ability to react positively to unclear and obscure situations especially in language learning (Chapelle, 1983; Lee, 1992; Ehrman, 1993; Gonzalez, 1996). The definitions and characteristics of ambiguity tolerance, effects of it on language learning and studies on ambiguity tolerance will be represented in the following sections.

2.3.1. Definions and Characteristics of Ambiguity Tolerance

Ambiguity tolerance was first studied by Frenkel-Brunswik (1948) as a variable influencing the individual's perception, personality and emotion. She

discussed ambiguity tolerance in consideration of perception-centered and personality-centered approaches affecting emotional, cognitive and social attitudes of the individual. Her definitions and explanations about ambiguity and intolerance of ambiguity were used by the researchers in their studies.

Frenkel-Brunswik (1948) states that people who are intolerant of ambiguity have “a tendency to resort to black-white solutions, to arrive at premature closure as evaluative aspects, often at the neglect of reality, and to seek for unqualified and unambiguous over-all acceptance and rejection of other people” (115). These people avoid dealing with uncertain and vague situations, refuse scrutinizing the solutions and jump to conclusions immediately. She also adds that intolerant people suffer from inability to consider probabilities and as a result they try to find obvious and secure ways. Unwillingness to think in the sense of possibilities and therefore seeking safer facts are seen as characteristics of people with low levels of ambiguity tolerance. While making statements about intolerance of ambiguity, Frenkel-Brunswik (1948) comes into contact with rigidity and makes a point that intolerance of ambiguity and rigidity might have something in common. Budner (1962) mentions their relationship as well; however, he emphasizes their differences stating that intolerance of ambiguity is a means of evaluating while rigidity is a coping action. MacDonald (1970) also addresses rigidity and accepts the relationship between them but also makes some distinctions. Rigid people usually find specified solutions to the problems and keep to them whereas intolerant people feel confused about the solution but may change it considering the circumstances. Similar to the ideas on rigidity, Lee (1992: 16) claims that “People seem to be more close-minded if they are intolerant of ambiguity. They are inclined to reject ideas and propositions that cannot be fitted into their existing cognitive systems”. It is clear that perspectives which are dissimilar to a person’s perception might cause discomfort and retreat.

Based on Frenkel-Brunswik’s (1948) perspective and ideas on ambiguity tolerance and intolerance of ambiguity, Budner (1962) did his research on different situations intolerance of ambiguity may affect. He defines intolerance of ambiguity

as “the tendency to perceive (i.e interpret) ambiguous situations as sources of threat” and tolerance of ambiguity as “the tendency to perceive ambiguous situations as desirable” (Budner, 1962: 29). To him, ambiguous situations arise if there are a great number of cues, different kinds of cues or no cues at all which he calls “situations characterized by novelty, complexity or insolubility”(Budner, 1962: 30). If the individual feels threatened and reacts to these situations by humility -when he realizes that the case is inevitable- or rejection, it can be concluded that he is intolerant of ambiguity. Budner (1962: 47) discusses three elements of the individual which are “hierarchy of values and goals”, “nature of his resources” and “conception of reality”. Hierarchy of values and goals guide the individual’s behaviors while the nature of his resources imply his health and personal qualifications. Conception of reality is a crucial element as it leads to high or low levels of ambiguity tolerance. It is regarded as the effect of a person’s evaluation of his environment.

Contrary to people with intolerance of ambiguity, MacDonald (1970:791) expresses that “persons having high tolerance of ambiguity (a) seek out ambiguity, (b) enjoy ambiguity and, (c) excel in the performance of ambiguous tasks”. These people perceive ambiguous events not as threatening or uninviting, but as charming and facilitator. This point of view about ambiguous tasks usually results in success for people who have high levels of ambiguity tolerance.

To carry out the measurement of ambiguity tolerance, Norton (1975) lists a number of terms to explain the word ‘ambiguous’ and uses these terms to characterize intolerance of ambiguity:

Intolerance of ambiguity is a tendency to perceive or interpret information marked by vague, incomplete, fragmented, multiple, probable, unstructured, uncertain, inconsistent, contrary, contradictory, or unclear meanings as actual or potential sources of psychological discomfort or threat (608).

He mentions three properties in terms of ambiguity. Firstly, there are two possibilities of a situation to be understood as ambiguous: if the situation is ambiguous naturally or if the person attributes it ambiguous. Secondly, it is possible

to see a situation as ambiguous even if all of its possible meanings are understood. Sometimes ambiguity in a context is necessary or intentional. Thirdly, in some conditions, although it is obvious that a situation is ambiguous, ambiguity may not be felt by the people experiencing it. Everybody sees a clear part of it in his own way and does not accept that it is ambiguous. It can be concluded that if a person perceives it as a disturbance or danger, it becomes ambiguous.

In her study about the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and acquiring English as a second language, Chapelle (1983: iii) defines ambiguity tolerance as “a person’s ability to function rationally and calmly in a situation in which interpretation of stimuli is not completely clear”. When such a situation occurs, the individuals feel insecure about it and may even oppose the stimulant. They are discouraged by the uncertain situations and become distracted by the pieces of information. Chapelle (1983) suggests Conceptual Level as one of the variables in her study in connection with ambiguity tolerance and adds that both have a key aspect which is “cognitive flexibility”. However, Conceptual Level focuses on the positive side of it whereas ambiguity tolerance focuses on the negative side. It is usually defined with negative words such as “the nervousness in the midst of inconsistencies, avoidance of ambiguities.” (Chapelle, 1983: 21).

The relationship of ambiguity tolerance with language learning is described by Ely (1989: 439) as follows: “Tolerance/intolerance of ambiguity in second language learning as operationalized in this study is the relative degree of discomfort associated with thinking”. This discomfort occurs when the learner does not get the meaning, when he is unable to explain himself clearly or properly, when the language he is learning is very complicated, or when there are many differences between L1 and L2.

Ehrman (1983) investigates tolerance of ambiguity, language ego and cognitive flexibility and explains ambiguity tolerance as “the ability to hold contradictory or incomplete information without either rejecting one of the

contradictory elements or coming to premature closure on an incomplete schema” (333). She clarifies that recognition of indefinite and disorganized components of a unit brings about ambiguity tolerance. It is a fixed property of the individual which is resistant to change and which influences their choices and behaviors in daily life. She considers tolerance of ambiguity as an unchanging feature of personality having control over a great number of events especially learning.

Tolerance of ambiguity is explained by González (1996: 7) as “a desirable trait because of its ability to challenge the individual to go beyond known and comfortable situations to exploration of new ideas, new behaviors and new social interaction”. He believes that with the help of this feature, the individuals get ready for a new language. He adds that if there is a redundancy of ambiguity tolerance, it may result in indifference about the situation which is not preferable for learning. The relationship between ambiguity tolerance and social behaviors is also touched upon by Budner (1962). He asserts that people having less tolerance towards ambiguity are inclined to be more conventional than those who have more tolerance of ambiguity considering that the embracement of those conventions eliminates ambiguous situations.

People with ambiguity tolerance are defined as “relatively open-minded in accepting ideologies and events and facts that contradict their own views” by Brown (2000: 119). He states that they are more inclined to accept paradoxical situations, however, others who cannot tolerate ambiguity reject opinions that do not fit into their existing perception style.

2.3.2. Effects of Ambiguity Tolerance on Language Learning

Ambiguity tolerance was originally studied by the reseachers in terms of a personality variable affecting the people’s reactions towards the events taking place

around them. However, it was found out that ambiguity tolerance is also a factor influencing learning to a large extent both positively and negatively.

Learners who show tolerance to ambiguity are mostly considered luckier than those who are intolerant of ambiguity in language learning environments. Chapelle (1983) revealed that there are some learner characteristics concerning second language learning achievement one of which is anxiety. She associates anxiety with ambiguity tolerance and states that high levels of ambiguity may result in either an escape from practising and learning language or a desire to create learning opportunities. Chapelle (1983) lists three reasons for her examining the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and acquiring English as a second language. First of all, ambiguity tolerance is a variable controlling the learners' progress in the learning process. Secondly, learners' ambiguity tolerance level will probably affect their choice of using some strategies such as "willingness to accept vagueness, seeking out opportunities to use L2, inferencing and practicing" (Chapelle, 1983: 5). The last reason is that the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and L2 success was discussed in another study and the results showed that there might be other findings to be shown up regarding the case.

Chapelle (1983) adjusts the characteristics of ambiguous situations in Budner's (1962) definition of ambiguity tolerance to L2 language learning indicating that "It is considered 'novel' by the learner because the grammatical, lexical, phonological and cultural cues are unfamiliar and therefore insufficient to construct an interpretation that is meaningful to him." (Chapelle, 1983: 19). In addition to this, the cues may be high in number, difficult to define or conflicting with each other which arises a "complex" and "insoluble" situation. Likewise, if the language cues are disorganized, they might be regarded as "unstructured" by the learner (Chapelle, 1983).

A good language learner, as Rubin (1975) states, is capable of tolerating uncertainty. Moreover, he might like it and he is usually eager to take a chance.

Chapelle (1983) also speaks of the good language learner and adds that ambiguity tolerance is a characteristic that a good language learner has. She influenced Ehrman and Oxford (1990) about their ideas on ambiguity tolerance. They state that "...those who can more readily tolerate ambiguity often show better language learning performance than those with less such tolerance" (311). In another study, Ehrman (1993) asserts that learners who do not need a very organized world and do not trouble some variance in ideas, that is, who have ambiguity tolerance, will look for new perspectives and appreciate new material easily. As a result, these learners will probably be more enduring and eventually more successful in the learning context.

However, people with little ambiguity tolerance will avoid such situations feeling distressing and insecure. They may even stick to their own language and refuse to learn another language system. It becomes very difficult for them to relate the old and the new which is crucial to be able to interpret the clues in the language system. These clues might cause a threatening fact for the learner who has little ambiguity tolerance instead of encouraging him to learn (Chapelle, 1983).

Learning a new language necessitates some amount of conflicting and unclear words, phrases, and structures that might be totally different from the native language (Ely, 1989; Lee, 1992; Wenden, 1993; Brown, 2000). These variances are welcomed by the successful learners who perceive them as an opportunity to come to a solution. To succeed in language learning, the ambiguities need to be ignored at least for a while as it is impossible to avoid them (Ely, 1989).

Ambiguity tolerance is one of the predominant factors predicting students' progress in language learning (Lee, 1992; Gonzalez, 1996). Learners who do not trouble ambiguous events are likely to be more successful in language learning. Rather than feeling perplexed about the structures and rules of the target language, they accept these rules as they are and focus on the general meaning (Lee, 1992).

While abundance of ambiguity tolerance may cause negative results such as incompetency in explaining the meaning of the language rules or structures and unconditional approval (Gonzalez, 1996; Brown, 2000), a certain level of intolerance of ambiguity prevents this possibility by refusing the conflicting knowledge and concerning only about the explicit ones. It is very difficult to be creative for strict, unflexible and tough-minded people, which will affect their attempts to learn in some way negatively (Brown, 2000). Besides, how learners see some characteristics of learning a language such as facing with complicated rules, not being able to understand and state opinions properly, and dissimilarity between L1 and L2 determines the degree of tolerance and intolerance of ambiguity. The level of ambiguity tolerance also helps establishing some learning strategies of the learner to be used effectively in learning environments (Ely, 1989).

The way a learner perceives ambiguity interactively influences his learning style, learning strategies and achievement in language learning (Morley, 1993; Ehrman, 1993; Ehrman & Oxford, 1990). Each style of the learners reflects at least a small impression of their sensation about ambiguity tolerance. It is important to motivate students to ask questions, make statements and explain every possible unknown item to encourage ambiguity tolerance.

2.3.3. Studies on Ambiguity Tolerance

Ambiguity tolerance was first studied as a personal variable by the researchers (Frenkel-Brunswik, 1948; Budner, 1962; MacDonald, 1970; Norton, 1975). Later, it was confirmed that ambiguity tolerance has a great influence on language learning as it steers learning styles and accordingly language learning strategies (Chapelle, 1983; Ely, 1989; Ehrman & Oxford, 1989; Ehrman & Oxford, 1990; Lee, 1992).

Intolerance of ambiguity was attempted to be measured by Frenkel-Brunswik (1948). In an experiment, subjects were shown successive pictures of a dog which turns into a cat in each picture by degrees. The group that was estimated to have low ambiguity tolerance spent more time thinking about the first picture and showed slower reactions to the upcoming pictures. It was stated that people having clearer ideas tend to accept ambiguities easily and are able to adapt to changing events. In another experiment which was similar to the previous one, subjects were given hues, and as estimated before, the intolerant ones hesitated to answer and chose one-sided classification. The third experiment was also similar to the first one in which subjects were shown numbers instead of dogs and cats. The expected result was a gradual perception of numbers by the less tolerant ones.

Budner (1962) used his 16-item scale of tolerance-intolerance of ambiguity each of which item describes an ambiguous real-life situation. While specifying the items, he asserted that they had to touch on some signals of pressure such as "...phenomenological submission, phenomenological denial, operative submission, and operative denial" (Budner, 1962: 32). It was also necessary to reflect the ambiguous situations: "novelty, complexity and insolubility" (32). The scale was applied and correlated with two other scales measuring conventionality, belief in divine power and dogmatism. Budner (1962) aimed to show that intolerance of ambiguity might be an influential factor in some particular areas such as socially relevant beliefs, personality and medical education. It was accepted that ambiguity is either a target that an individual goes after or escapes, or is uninterested in. Individuals' capacity to adapt to situations is affected by ambiguity tolerance, however, it does not have a straight effect on controlling the environment. Intolerance of ambiguity was also associated with career choices of medical education students and their approval of social and psychological elements.

In his study, MacDonald (1970) used a revised scale whose items consisted of Rydell and Rosen's (1966) ambiguity tolerance scale (the first 16 items), Gough's (1957) California Personality Inventory (items 17 and 18), and Barron's (1953)

Conformity Scale (items 19 and 20). The results of the revised scale showed high ambiguity tolerance. It was asserted that ambiguity tolerance, rigidity and dogmatism are related, and that achievement in ambiguous tasks is also related to ambiguity tolerance. Norton (1975) was influenced by MacDonald (1970) and studied on 20 graduate students using the The Measure of Ambiguity Tolerance-50 (MAT-50) scale. This high validity test was claimed to be a good indicator of ambiguity tolerance. The relationship between rigidity and ambiguity tolerance was measured as well. Norton (1975) revealed that some manifestations of behaviors may be evidence of ambiguity tolerance such as the eagerness to take part in an unknown study voluntarily, aesthetic awareness and conversational performance. While high tolerant people accepted to join an ambiguous activity, interpreted the ambiguous poems as good, compelling and pleasant, and acted out comfortably in a group, low tolerant people tried to stay away from all situations considering them as ambiguous.

In her attempt to prove the relation between ambiguity tolerance and language learning, Chapelle (1983) conducted her research using three measures: Norton's (1975) the MAT-50, Student's Perception of His Ambiguity Tolerance (SAT), and Teacher's Perception of His Ambiguity Tolerance (TAT). It was identified that the influence of ambiguity tolerance on language achievement and especially oral performance is strong and that it is relevant to learner's progress positively. Ambiguity tolerance was determined as an important sign predicting the students' success in tests. Chapelle (1983) precipitated that teachers have the responsibility to drive learners who have low levels of ambiguity tolerance in the manner that they could make better interpretations of the learning process. It is also crucial that various learning styles of different learners are welcomed and considered by the teachers along with their consequences on the learner's success. The learners need to be excited by the teachers in an attempt to use several strategies and techniques their learning styles require.

Use of language learning strategies and ambiguity tolerance was studied by Ely (1989) as well. His ambiguity tolerance scale measured students' views on

various language activities like reading, writing, pronunciation, etc. including different learning and communicative strategies. The results indicated that a small quantity of learning strategies was ineffective on learner's tolerance of ambiguity level such as "looking for similarities between new words and L1 words,..., planning out exactly what to say ahead of time, thinking carefully about grammar when writing,..., asking teacher for the right words when speaking,..., focusing on grammar or vocabulary when listening" (Ely, 1989: 442). However, it was a good predictor of getting the holistic meaning in reading and listening by inferring. They were also less willing to memorize the meanings of the words, instead, they formed their own cognitive representations of the words which they would remember easier. On the subject of language learning, motivation of the learners is a strong determinant in personalizing the language and achieving in multiple learning tasks.

Ehrman and Oxford (1990) also examined language learning styles and strategies and found a significant relationship between language learning styles and ambiguity tolerance. Results showed that judging and sensing learners considered ambiguity as distressing having problems in making interpretations. Some strategies learning a new language requires became a problem for judgers as they have difficulty in having spontaneous conversations and associating new information with the previous knowledge. Unlike judgers, perceivers welcomed the necessities of language learning and used learning strategies effectively with an innate ability. In another study, Ehrman (1993) dealt with the influence of ego boundaries on two learners having different learning styles and concluded that students who do not mind encountering unspecific ideas or confusion in language will be open-minded. They tend to perceive such cases as advantages in learning and have more competence in mastering. Rastegar and Mehrabi Kermani (2015) investigated the relationship among language learning strategies and tolerance of ambiguity of EFL learners. They found no statistically significant connection of ambiguity tolerance to affective and metacognitive strategies while pointing out a substantial relation between social strategies and ambiguity tolerance. This lack of connection between ambiguity tolerance and affective and metacognitive strategies was considered normal because these activities do not embody ambiguity tolerance. However, low

ambiguity tolerance seemed to have a negative effect on social strategies which contain activities such as asking for clarification or asking questions. High level of ambiguity tolerance blocks these kind of strategies which in fact might help learn better.

The relationship between classroom anxiety, motivation and ambiguity tolerance and their effects on foreign language learning were investigated by Lee (1992). It was suggested that anxiety is a negative power lowering the motivation, frequency of class participation, language achievement and ambiguity tolerance levels of the learners. Ambiguity and anxiety have a positive correlation. Unclear and indefinite situations may boost the anxiety level of the learners affecting learning styles and strategies as well. Ambiguity tolerance was seen as an inefficient indicator of oral achievement in the class contrary to the motivation. However, adequate usage of target language during the learning process helps to reduce anxiety and eventually promote ambiguity tolerance.

In most studies, tolerance of ambiguity was considered as a prerequisite for success in language learning. Gonzalez (1996) suggested that second language learning might reinforce the learners' competency to tolerate ambiguity. Because, learning a language necessitates this kind of tolerance for many areas such as culture and religion. Therefore, ambiguity tolerance must be emphasized and promoted during classroom activities. By this way, students' achievement in language learning increases with the help of the diversity of activities in learning process. Başöz (2015) also investigated the positive affect of ambiguity tolerance on learners' progress in language learning. The relationship between ambiguity tolerance and vocabulary knowledge, and self-perceived achievement of learners was studied indicating a majority of moderate ambiguity tolerance level. There was no significant relationship between the ambiguity tolerance levels of the learners and their receptive vocabulary knowledge while there appeared an outstanding relationship between ambiguity tolerance and self-perceived success of the learners in language learning. Self-perception and ambiguity tolerance levels seemed to be positively correlated. That is,

learners having moderate levels of ambiguity tolerance usually considered themselves as more successful in language learning while low ambiguity tolerance levels were indicators of underachievement. As a result, it is essential to minimise ambiguity in learning or enhance the learners' capacity to tolerate ambiguity (Başöz, 2015).

The importance of moderate level of ambiguity tolerance was also emphasized by El-Koumy (2000) in his study about the differences of reading comprehension between various levels of ambiguity tolerance. Results showed that students who adopt moderate level of ambiguity tolerance excel in the reading comprehension tests more than those who have low and high levels. In terms of language learning achievement, it was designated that each group has particular learning strategies which will lead to different performance levels. For this reason, students must be guided in such a way that they could acquire moderate level of ambiguity tolerance.

Ambiguity tolerance and its effects on personality, learning and language learning were attempted to identify by a number of researchers. It is clear that each level of ambiguity tolerance has a particular influence on personality or learning processes of the individuals. When it comes to language learning, its positive effects are a lot more than its negative effects on student achievement.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter aims to explain the methodology of the study by detailing the model of the study, population and sampling, data collection instrument, procedure, and data analysis.

3.2. Model of the Study

As the study intends to show the relationship between the ambiguity tolerance levels and participation frequency of English language learners, quantitative data were used and the relationship was revealed in terms of correlational model. The quantitative data were gathered through Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale (Ely, 1995) to determine ambiguity tolerance levels of the students while the observation rubric was used to grade the participation frequency of each student during six English lessons. The data gathered by this instrument and the observation rubric were analyzed by means of correlation analysis. Besides, independent samples t-test was used in an attempt to analyze the relationship between both ambiguity tolerance levels and gender differences, and participation frequency and gender differences.

3.3. Study Group

The participants of the study consisted of 62 sixth grade students who are learning English in İzmir Menemen Emiralem Atatürk Secondary School in the second term of the academic year 2016-2017. There were 32 male and 30 female

students who attended the study. They were members of the classes 6/A (20), 6/B (21), and 6/C (21). These students are thought to be at the proper age range of adolescence considering their desire, competency and disposition to learn a foreign language.

Sixth grade students are in the first years of adolescence and their ages vary between 11 and 12. This age range is more suitable for getting information about their characteristics, tendencies and preferences in consideration of both their self-perceiving and their language learning compared to the other age ranges. With the help of the scale the students filled in, it is possible to learn their features about language learning for both the students themselves and for their teachers. The acquired knowledge on this topic can be used as a guide to improve the quality of future programs. Therefore, these students are accepted as participants with regards to the efficiency of the acquisition of data on the subject.

3.4. Data Collection Instrument

In the study, 5-Likert Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale (SLTAS) (Ely, 1995) was used to identify the participants' ambiguity tolerance levels (see Appendix-1). The scale consisted of 12 items and its Alpha reliability coefficient was 0.84. One reason for choosing this scale was that it was specially prepared to measure the ambiguity tolerance levels of students regarding their language learning styles. Another reason was that the scale consisted of 12 clear items about how they feel during the situations identified in the scale. The students had no trouble in interpreting the sentences and it was suitable for their age group and personal characteristics. Besides, the items in the scale might assist the students in realizing their own stance about language learning. It was also beneficial for finding out the impact of the teacher's behaviours or the classroom environment on the students' participation during language learning process. The scale was translated into Turkish (see Appendix-2) by Sinem Coşkun who was the researcher of the study, and it was confirmed by Prof. Dr. Feryal Çubukçu, the supervisor.

Intelligibility and relevance to the objectives of the study were taken in consideration during the translation process. The Alpha reliability coefficient of the translated version of the scale was found to be 0.76. To verify language reliability, the scale was first filled by 57 eighth grade students. When the reliability was ensured, it was carried out with the participants of the study.

To specify the relationship between the ambiguity tolerance levels and participation frequency of the students, an observation rubric was used which would later be transformed into a 5-Likert scale.

3.5. Procedure

The study aimed to reveal the relationship between ambiguity tolerance levels and participation of English language learners. After the official permission had been taken from Provincial Directorate for National Education of İzmir to carry out the study, the implementation process took place in Menemen Emiralem Atatürk Secondary School.

First of all, Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale (Ely, 1995) was translated into Turkish and the comprehensibility was provided. The reliability of the Turkish version of the scale was 0.76. The scale was carried out with 62 sixth grade students in the second term of 2016-2017 education year. They were told to fill in the scale in about 20 minutes considering their perception of the English lesson, the teacher and their willingness to participate in the lesson. The scale aimed to evaluate their ideas about the English lesson, and accordingly their ambiguity tolerance levels. The ambiguity tolerance level of each student was designated individually.

After the implementation of the scale, the students whose ambiguity tolerance levels were determined were observed by the researcher individually during 6 hours. The researcher noted down the number of participation frequency of the students

regarding their active and voluntary participation during the lesson. The results of the observation rubric were transformed into the 5-Likert Scale whose anchors were “Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Usually, Always”. Finally, the results of the instrument and the observation rubric were detected through the statistical analyses which would reveal both the relationship between ambiguity tolerance levels and participation of the English language learners, and the possible effect of gender on this relationship.

3.6. Data Analysis

The data gathered by means of the scale and the observation processes were analysed through IBM SPSS Statistics 23 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). To reveal the relationship between the ambiguity tolerance levels and participation frequency of the students, correlation analysis was used. The significance of correlation was assessed by using two-tailed test. Besides correlation analysis, independent samples t-test put forth if gender differences had an impact on the relationship.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

The study included 62 participants and their levels of ambiguity tolerance was defined personally with the help of Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale (SLTAS) (Ely, 1995). After the students' active participation was observed, the correlation between the ambiguity tolerance levels and the participation frequency of the students was determined through the statistical analysis. This chapter shows the results of the data analysis as well as the research questions which were planned to answer with the help of the study.

4.2. Ambiguity Tolerance Levels of the Sixth Graders

To identify ambiguity tolerance levels of the sixth graders, descriptive statistics were used. SLTAS included five response anchors which were graded between 1-5 as "strongly agree (1), agree (2), undecided (3), disagree (4) and strongly disagree (5)". The items in the scale described negative situations which the students might encounter during the lessons. While agreement with the items would show low levels of ambiguity tolerance, disagreement with the items would indicate the opposite. As the scale consisted of five response anchors, the values between 1-3 indicated low levels of ambiguity tolerance and the values between 3-5 indicated high levels of ambiguity tolerance. The items of the scale and their mean scores are depicted in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Ambiguity Tolerance Scores of SLTAS

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std.</u> <u>Deviation</u>
<u>Valid N (listwise)</u>	62		
1. When I write English compositions, I don't like it when I can't express my ideas exactly.	62	2,2742	1,29525
2. When I'm reading something in English, I feel impatient when I don't totally understand the meaning.	62	2,3226	,78457
3. When I'm writing in English, I don't like the fact that I can't say exactly what I want.	62	2,3548	1,11762
4. It bothers me that even though I study English grammar, some of it is hard to use in speaking and writing.	62	2,5000	1,21129
5. When I'm speaking in English, I feel uncomfortable if I can't communicate my ideas clearly.	62	2,5968	1,22085
6. I don't like the feeling that my English pronunciation is not quite correct.	62	2,6935	1,38598
7. It bothers me that I don't understand everything the teacher says in English.	62	2,7903	1,33229
8. I don't like the fact that sometimes I can't find English words that mean the same as some words in my own language.	62	2,8226	1,23506
9. I don't enjoy reading something in English that takes a while to figure out completely.	62	2,8710	1,38474
10. It is frustrating that sometimes I don't understand completely some English grammar.	62	2,9194	1,25839
11. One thing I don't like about reading in English is having to guess what the meaning is.	62	3,4516	1,11145
12. It bothers me when the teacher uses an English word I don't know.	62	3,5000	1,23806
Mean Scores of All the Items In the Scale		2,7581	,62593

The findings shown in the table suggest that the mean scores for each item differ between 2,27 and 3,50. In the scale, the mean score of the sentence in number-1 (2,27) appears to be the item the students agreed most. It can be concluded that the learners tend to have problems mainly in stating their ideas properly. The item that

the learners are inclined to disagree most is number-12 (3,50) which indicates that the students place less emphasis on the unknown words articulated by their teacher. This might show that either the students are reluctant to learn new vocabulary or they use clues to understand the words that are unfamiliar to them instead of trying to learn every single word. It is also shown that the mean score of all the items in the scale is 2,75 which indicates an ambiguity tolerance level between moderate and low towards language learning. It can be stated that the students consider language learning mostly as an obscure process and they feel uncomfortable because of this.

4.3. Students' Ambiguity Tolerance Levels and Gender Differences

Gender differences are important factors influencing language learning and they might cause a variation in ambiguity tolerance levels of the individuals as well. To identify these possible effects, an independent samples t-test was carried out. Table 2 shows group statistics of gender differences and Table 3 shows the results of independent samples test.

Table 2

Ambiguity Tolerance by Gender

	<u>Gender</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Deviation</u>	<u>Std. Error Mean</u>
Ambiguity	Male	32	2,8021	,64784	,11452
Tolerance	Female	30	2,7111	,60913	,11121

Table 2 manifests that the mean score of both the male and the female students is between agree (2) and undecided (3) which indicates a moderate level of ambiguity. Though there appears a slight difference in terms of tolerance of ambiguity between males and females, female students (2,71) seem to be more tolerant of ambiguity than the male students (2,80) as agreement with the items in the scale indicates low levels of ambiguity tolerance while disagreement shows high levels of ambiguity tolerance.

Table 3

Independent Samples Test of Ambiguity Tolerance

		<u>Levene's</u> <u>Test for</u> <u>Equality of</u> <u>Variances</u>		<u>t-test for Equality of Means</u>				
						<u>Sig. (2-</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std.</u>
		<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>tailed)</u>	<u>Differen</u>	<u>Error</u>
							<u>ce</u>	<u>ce</u>
Ambiguity Tolerance	Equal variances assumed	,554	,460	,569	60	,572	,09097	,15996
	Equal variances not assumed			,570	59,99	,571	,09097	,15964

Table 3 shows the results of independent samples test clearly. As the value of Sig.(2-tailed) is 0,572 which is more than 0,05, it means that there is not a meaningful difference between the ambiguity tolerance levels of male and female students.

4.4. Frequency of Participation of the Sixth Graders

Frequency of participation of the sixth graders was assessed by the observation rubric. The frequency of participation rubric consisted of the names of the students and the number of their participation during the lesson. Each student's number of participation was written on the rubric by the researcher. These numbers were later transformed into a 5-Likert Scale. The anchors of the 5-Likert Scale were "Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Usually, Always". The scale was filled considering the highest and the lowest number of participation. The highest number in the rubric was 15 and the lowest number in the rubric was 0. These numbers of participation frequency were transformed as "Never (0-3), Rarely (4-6), Sometimes (7-9), Usually (10-12) and Always (13-15). The students were observed by the researcher for six hours during their natural classroom environment and their frequency of participation was noted down at the end of every lesson according to their voluntary participation

and contribution to the classroom activities. The results of the 5-Likert Scale were shown below in Table 4 and Table 5 .

Table 4

Frequency of Participation of the Sixth Graders

		<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Valid	Never	11	17,7	17,7	17,7
	Rarely	10	16,1	16,1	33,9
	Sometimes	12	19,4	19,4	53,2
	Usually	15	24,2	24,2	77,4
	Always	14	22,6	22,6	100,0
	Total	62	100,0	100,0	

Table 4 demonstrates the frequency of participation of the sixth graders including the percentages. It is understood that there is not much variety among the participation frequency of the students. However, it is clear that the students who participate in the classroom activities actively outnumber who do not. The total number of students who were graded as “Always” and “Usually” is 29 while the total number of the students who were graded as “Rarely” and “Never” is 21.

Table 5

Statistics of Frequency of Participation

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Deviation</u>
Frequency of Participation	62	3,1774	1,42028
Valid N (listwise)	62		

The mean score of frequency of participation is depicted in Table 5. The grading of frequency of participation was numbered between 1-5 and the mean score of frequency of participation is 3,17 which refers mostly to “Sometimes” in the rubric.

4.5. Students' Frequency of Participation and Gender Differences

As most other factors affecting participation frequency, gender differences might be influential in students' voluntary participation during the classroom activities. Table 6 demonstrates mean scores of gender differences in relation to participation frequency.

Table 6

Frequency of Participation by Gender

	<u>Gender</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Deviation</u>	<u>Std. Error</u>
					<u>Mean</u>
Frequency of Participation	Female	30	3,6000	1,32873	,24259
	Male	32	2,7813	1,40814	,24893

Table 6 clearly manifests that females have a mean score of 3,6 while males have 2,78. Although both female and male students have a moderate level of participation frequency, females seem to be more active than males during the classroom activities.

Table 7

IndependentSamples Test of ParticipationFrequency

		<u>Levene's</u>		<u>Test for</u>		<u>Equality of</u>		<u>Variances</u>		<u>t-test for Equality of Means</u>		
										<u>Sig.</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std.</u>
										<u>(2-</u>	<u>Differen</u>	<u>Error</u>
										<u>tailed</u>	<u>ce</u>	<u>Differen</u>
		<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>1)</u>	<u>ce</u>	<u>ce</u>				
Participation Frequency	Equal variances assumed	,444	,508	,2351	60,022		,81875	,34825				
	Equal variances not assumed			2,356	59,99,022		,81875	,34758				

The participation frequency levels of males and females are manifested in Table 7. It is clear that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is 0,022. As this value is less than 0,05, it is possible to say that there is a meaningful difference between males and females considering their participation frequency.

4.6. Students' Ambiguity Tolerance Levels and Their Frequency of Participation

The Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale (Ely,1995) and frequency of participation rubric demonstrated above the findings of the study. In order to find out and express the relationship between them, correlation analysis was used. Table 8 reveals the correlation between ambiguity tolerance and frequency of participation.

Table 8

Correlations

		<u>Frequency of Participation</u>	<u>Ambiguity Tolerance Levels</u>
Frequency of Participation	Pearson Correlation	1	,333**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,008
	N	62	62
Ambiguity Tolerance Levels	Pearson Correlation	,333**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,008	
	N	62	62

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

Findings of Pearson correlation are depicted in the table. It is clear that the correlation coefficient is 0,33 which shows a weak relationship between the variables. This means that changes in ambiguity tolerance levels of the students will have a 33 percent level of influence on their participation frequency. In other words, students' ambiguity tolerance levels are insufficient in predicting the participation frequency. This weak correlation between these two variables might be a consequence of various factors affecting the students voluntary participation in the

classroom activities such as self-confidence, motivation or positive feelings towards the lesson and the teacher.



CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1. Introduction

This chapter will bring out the discussion of the results and findings of the study considering the common grounds and the differences between this study and earlier studies. The conclusions will also be drawn in the light of the results and their implications.

5.2. Discussion

Ambiguity tolerance was found to be an important variable affecting the individual in many respects (Frenkel-Brunswik, 1948; Budner, 1962; MacDonald, 1970; Norton, 1975; Lee, 1992). It was seen as an unchanging characteristic of the people which influences their perception of language learning as well (Chapelle, 1983; Ehrman, 1983; Ely, 1989; Gonzalez, 1996; Brown, 2000). As Chapelle (1983) stated in his study, learners who have low levels of ambiguity tolerance may become anxious in certain conditions and may display avoidance behaviors. The importance of willingness of the students to participate during the lessons was also emphasized by researchers as it helps them to foster their language learning skills (Leger, 2009; Zulkepli, 2012; Delaney, 2012; Tayebnik & Puteh, 2013).

This study aimed at finding the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and participation of English language learners. In an attempt to reveal this relationship, the participants' ambiguity tolerance levels and their participation frequency during the English lessons were identified through Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale (SLTAS) (Ely, 1995) and the observation rubric. After the scale was conducted for about 20 minutes during the lesson, the observation process was

carried out. The correlation between these two variables was analyzed and described by means of IBM SPSS Statistics 23. The results and findings of the research will be discussed below regarding the research questions and previous studies.

5.2.1. Ambiguity Tolerance Levels of the Sixth Graders

One of the research questions of the study is the ambiguity tolerance levels of the sixth graders. The results of SLTAS (Ely, 1995) reveal that the mean of all the items in the scale is 2,75 (Table 1) which is an indication of a level of ambiguity tolerance of the students between low and moderate. The items which have the highest level of agreement in the scale are about expressing ideas and understanding the meaning of the sentences exactly and correctly (Item 1, Mean: 2,27; Item 2, Mean: 2,32; Item 3, Mean: 2,35). It can be concluded that students desire to express their opinions properly and feel uncomfortable when they have troubles in getting the meanings. However, the item that the students disagreed with most (Item 12, Mean: 3,5) is about articulation of an unknown word. It is clear that students do not place much emphasis on understanding every single word.

Kazamia (1999), in her study on the ambiguity tolerance levels of the Greek students, found similar results in SLTAS (Ely, 1995). She claimed that the reason for this could be the learners' intention of being understood by the teacher exactly without considering their lack of experience in the language. The items with the highest disagreement level (Item 12, Mean: 3,5) are about the unknown words in a context where the students are expected to guess the meanings. However, the students in this study seem not to be disturbed by this lack of vocabulary knowledge. One reason for this may be their unwillingness or hesitation to learn new vocabulary or their preference to get the overall meaning instead of seeking the meaning of each unknown word. Kazamia's (1999) study has the same result in the scale in terms of the item which the students disagreed with most (Item 12, mean: 3,5). It is about the intolerance of unknown words articulated by the teacher. Considering these results, she deduces that the students accept ambiguity of some lexical items but they feel

uncomfortable when they are unable to understand most of what their teacher says. Similarly, in the study of Erten and Topkaya (2009), the item that the students opposed most (Item 2, Mean: 3,4) is about understanding everything the teacher says in English which is the same as the results of our study. However, the item that has the highest agreement level (Item 12, Mean: 2,9) is about guessing the meaning of the words and it contradicts with the results of our study.

Previous studies about ambiguity tolerance also demonstrate that moderate and low ambiguity tolerance levels are much more common than high ambiguity tolerance levels among students (Kazamia, 1999; DeRoma, Martin & Kessler, 2003; Erten & Topkaya, 2009; Arquero & Tejero, 2009; Pierce, Alvis & Cornick, 2011; Weissenstein, Ligges, Brouwer, Marschall & Friederichs, 2014; Kural, 2014; Chu, Lin, Chen, Tsai & Wang, 2015; Başöz, 2015; Genç, 2016). However, in some studies, it is asserted that ambiguity tolerance levels of the students are related to age or proficiency level. It is suggested that young people usually have low levels of ambiguity tolerance levels compared to the older ones. As they get older, they become more tolerant of ambiguous situations (Kajs & McCollum, 2010; Dewaele & Wei, 2012). Studies support that when they become more experienced in language learning (Thompson & Khawaja, 2015), and accordingly, when their proficiency level increases, their tolerance for ambiguity also improves (Austin, 1999; Erten & Topkaya, 2009; Kural, 2014; Varasteh, Ghanizadeh & Akbari, 2016). The results of this study support the findings of the previous studies in terms of having an ambiguity tolerance level between low and moderate. As the students are sixth graders, they are young learners and they do not have much experience in language learning. As they grow older and their proficiency level improves, it is probable to have higher levels of ambiguity tolerance.

5.2.2. Participation Frequency of the Sixth Graders

Another research question of the study is about determining participation frequency of the sixth graders. The students were observed by the researcher for six

hours and their number of participation during the lessons were written down by the researcher which was later transformed into a 5-Likert Scale. The results show that the values in the rubric have similar number of students ranging from 10 to 15 (Table 4) which means that the level of frequency of participation has a slightly moderate level (3,1; Table 5). While there seems to be no cluster in the values of the observation rubric, those who actively participated in the classroom activities are more than who did not. The effect of gender on frequency of participation is explicit in the results of the rubric where females appear to be more active in the classroom (Female: 3,6; Male: 2,7; Table 6). As mentioned previously, participation during language learning classes is a crucial element as it is considered to be the best way to acquire a language (Leger, 2009; Zulkepli, 2012). The results support the study of Howard and Henney (1998) who identified some factors affecting the level of participation such as class size, age and gender. They found out that though females have a greater percentage of participation frequency, age and class size are better indicators of student participation. The importance of active involvement during the lesson was also emphasized by Nataatmadja, Sixsmith and Dyson (2007). They discovered that the reason which prevented the students from active involvement during the lesson is lack of competence in language and consequently fear of making mistakes.

5.2.3. The Relationship Between the Students' Ambiguity Tolerance Levels and Their Frequency of Participation

This study mainly aimed to find out the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and participation of English language learners. For this purpose, after the identification of the ambiguity tolerance levels and participation frequency of the students, correlation analysis was used to specify the relationship between these variables. The results of Pearson correlation revealed that there is a weak correlation of 0,33 (Table 8) between ambiguity tolerance and participation of the learners. As the correlation is not strong, it may signify that the variables hardly ever influence each other, thus there are other elements that have an impact on the participation of English language learners.

There seems to be a discrepancy between the results of our study and some of the previous studies. Vahedi and Fatemi (2016) did their research on the relationship between the learners' ambiguity tolerance and willingness to communicate and found a positive and strong relationship between them. The link between classroom anxiety and ambiguity tolerance was studied by some researchers who found out that high levels of ambiguity tolerance caused less anxiety and more productivity in English classes (DeRoma, Martin & Kessler, 2003; Dewaele & Ip, 2013; Thompson & Khawaja, 2015). Studies involving online learning classrooms revealed that tolerant learners reported more interest in participating compared to their friends while ambiguous situations in online classes result in a decrease in participation (Tapanes, Smith & White, 2009; Tayebnik & Puteh, 2013). However, our study is supported to a certain extent by the study of Atamanova and Bogomaz (2014) who analyzed the link between ambiguity tolerance and communicative competence of the engineering students. Their findings show that communicative competence is a dynamic fact and there is no significant relationship between communicative competence and ambiguity tolerance of engineering students as some other factors such as hard work, self-confidence, self-respect and determination may be more effectual in the process.

5.2.4. Ambiguity Tolerance and Gender Differences

As the last research question of the study, the effect of gender differences on the ambiguity tolerance levels of the students was determined through independent samples t-test. Findings prove that there appears an insignificant difference between the ambiguity tolerance levels of male and female students (Female: 2,7; Male: 2,8 ; Table 2). Females show a bit more tolerance than males according to the results of SLTAS (Ely, 1995). However, the results of the independent samples t-test revealed that there is no significant relationship between the variables (Table 3).

The findings of our study were in accordance with some other studies which also pointed out scarcely any affect of gender on ambiguity tolerance (Durrheim & Foster, 1997; Austin, 1999; Dewaele & Ip, 2013; Weissenstein, Ligges, Brouwer,

Marschall & Friederichs, 2014; Başöz, 2015; Li & He, 2016). The other studies which disagree with the idea of ‘no relationship’ all claimed that gender has a considerable impact on tolerance of ambiguity and female learners are less tolerant of ambiguity than their male counterparts (Erten & Topkaya, 2009; Marzban, Barati & Moinzadeh, 2012; Kural, 2014; Ezzati & Farahian, 2016).

5.3. Conclusion

This study aimed at revealing the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and participation of English language learners. The effect of ambiguity tolerance on different subjects was studied previously, however, there are no other studies explaining the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and participation of the English language learners. With the aim of revealing this relationship, Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale (SLTAS) (Ely, 1995) was employed to measure ambiguity tolerance levels of the sixth graders. In addition to SLTAS, participation frequency of the students was graded through an observation rubric. Statistical analysis of the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and participation of English language learners was carried out via correlation analysis while independent samples t-test was utilized to reveal the possible relationship of ambiguity tolerance levels and gender differences. The research results yield that there is a weak correlation between ambiguity tolerance and participation of the teenagers which may signify that ambiguity tolerance is not an efficient variable predicting teenagers’ participation frequency in the class. Consequently, participation during the classroom activities is likely to be influenced by other factors.

The importance of active participation in language learning classes is emphasized by researchers as language learning necessitates the observable oral activities (Leger, 2009; Zulkepli, 2012). The findings of the participation frequency of the students in this study (Mean: 3,1) indicate that teenagers have a slightly moderate level of participation frequency as active participation is related to several factors influencing the learners in many different ways such as student’s age,

student's gender, class size, instructor's gender or course level (Howard & Henney, 1998). In addition to these factors, high proficiency in language or classroom anxiety could affect this process as well. While high proficiency leads to frequent participation, classroom anxiety leads to low frequency of participation (Robson, 1994).

Age is believed to be one of the important factors influencing participation frequency of the students. While younger students are more likely to keep silent in the classroom, older students participate more as a result of their higher awareness about education (Howard, Short & Clark, 1996). Students in our study are teenagers whose age range changes between 11-12 which might be the reason for their level of participation frequency. On account of their adolescence, they give importance to the ideas of their peers considering the possibility of leaving a bad impression on them (Howard & Henney, 1998; Fritschner, 2000; Weaver & Qi, 2005). However, older students are more likely to care about the ideas of their teachers instead of their friends (Fritschner, 2000).

Another significant factor that has an impact on participation frequency is students' self-confidence level which leads to more frequent participation in the class. Therefore, it may be important to improve their self-confidence level to increase their eagerness to participate as well (Fassinger, 2000). A negative self-concept might result in retreat and silence of the learners during the activities. Learners' positive relationship between their friends and the instructors may also affect their self-confidence level and consequently their participation frequency. Consideration of others as experts and fear of disfavor by their peers or the instructors may cause avoidance of participation. On the contrary, self-awareness and high level of self-confidence are likely to encourage the learners to join class activities more often (Weaver & Qi, 2005).

Gender is also a significant factor on the voluntary participation of the learners (Howard & Henney, 1998; Fritschner, 2000). It is possible that both

student's gender and instructor's gender have an influence on learners' participation frequency in the class. In some classes with female instructors, students are likely to participate more voluntarily as female instructors support the learners positively and guide the learners to encourage their participation. (Auster & MacRone, 1994; Howard & Henney, 1998; Rocca, 2010; Tatum, Schwartz, Schimmoeller & Perry, 2013). Furthermore, female students seem more voluntary in participation if the class is taught by female instructors and male students are more likely to be active in classes taught by males (Howard & Henney, 1998). Female students are thought to be superior in terms of participation in the classroom (Howard, Short & Clark, 1996; Howard & Henney, 1998; Leger, 2005). They are also more willing to give information about their learning process, their friends and their instructors (Tatum, Schwartz, Schimmoeller & Perry, 2013).

The influence of motivation in the learning process is highly important as effective teaching environments where teaching is considered with all its properties usually give better results in terms of student motivation and as a result intended student behaviors. Among these properties, learners' opinions about the lesson and the teachers might be an important element when considering their willingness to participate more during the class activities (Howard & Henney, 1998; Rocca, 2010). As participation during the class activities is often seen as the most difficult part of the learning process by most of the students, the students need to be highly motivated, self-confident or accomplished to participate actively in the lesson. Their innate characteristics are shaped in the classroom with the help of their interpretation of the learning process in all its aspects. Therefore, the learners and their behaviors in the learning environment must be considered as a whole. Their interpretation of the learning environment depends on many factors such as their friends or their teachers. Teachers' vigorous and wise attitudes encourage the learners in terms of participation (Weisz, 1990; Rocca, 2010). A well-designed learning environment stimulates and encourages to display different learning skills making it more interesting and educatory (Weimer, 2013). Learners' positive perception about the learning process including the lesson and the teacher is likely to be a booster in the language learning

class where observable participatory behaviors are essential (Weisz, 1990; Leger, 2009; Delaney, 2012).

To conclude, student participation in English language learning classrooms might be influenced by many factors such as the characteristics of the learner that separate them from their peers as well as their attitudes towards the factors they faced in the learning environment (Lee, 2005). Ambiguity tolerance levels of the learners help them improve their perspectives at many points but it is possible that it does not have a prevailing effect on class participation.

5.4. Pedagogical Implications and Suggestions

The relationship between ambiguity tolerance and participation of English language learners was examined in this study. Study results showed that though ambiguity tolerance is considered as a fundamental variable that has an impact on human's perception and choices (Budner, 1962), it may not be the best variable predicting participation as student participation in language learning classrooms is also influenced by several factors. These factors influencing student participation in the class other than ambiguity tolerance levels could be students' perception of language learning, their motivation or feelings about their teacher.

Language learning is in fact a complicated process as it contains cultural, cognitive and individual processes as well as motivational components (Dornyei, 1994). Throughout the language learning period, students are exposed to a process which is completely different from their mother tongue and their culture as well. As language is closely related to culture, learners may have difficulty in association of knowledge caused by the complexity of the structure of the new language (Chapelle, 1983). In addition to these cultural elements, learning a new language necessitates the usage of some cognitive processes simultaneously such as grammatical rules, syntax and pronunciation (Cook, 1977). It is possible that learners have problems in

combining all these processes especially when they are expressing themselves orally. Another important element of language learning is individual differences of the learners which differentiate them from each other in terms of learning styles (Brown, 2000; Weimer, 2013). These individual differences could have an impact on the learners' choice of attitude towards the lesson and frequency of participation during the activities.

As suggestions of the study, more importance could be given to the factors influencing participation frequency of the students in the class. First of all, activities promoting active and voluntary involvement of the students should be increased. It is essential for students to realize that language is best learned with active participation in the target language. This awareness will be provided by the effective teachers who create effective learning environments for the learners. It is also highly important for instructors to help students be aware of the complex processes language learning requires. Another solution might be reducing negative feelings and supporting positive behaviors as it will pave the way for effective learning. As participation during the lesson may be affected by negative attitudes, positive language learning environments should be created to promote participation frequency of the learners. Finally, teachers must be aware of the individual characteristics and needs of the learners to be able to guide them as required.

REFERENCES

- Arquero, H. L. & Tejero, C. (2009). Ambiguity tolerance levels in Spanish accounting students: a comparative study. *Science Direct*, 12(1), 95-115.
- Atamanova, I. & Bogomaz, S. (2014). Ambiguity tolerance as a psychological factor of foreign language communicative competence development. *Science Direct*, 154(1), 345-352.
- Auster, C. J. & MacRone, M. (1994). The classroom as a negotiated social setting: an empirical study of the effects of faculty members' behavior on students' participation. *Teaching Sociology*, 22(4), 289-300.
- Austin, J.A. (1999). *Tolerance for ambiguity in accounting and other business majors* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma.
- Barrass, R. (1984). *Study!: a guide to effective learning, revision and examination techniques*. London: Routledge.
- Başöz, T. (2015). Exploring the relationship between tolerance of ambiguity of EFL learners and their vocabulary knowledge. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 11(2), 53-66.
- Bell, T. R. (2005). Behaviors and attitudes of effective foreign language teachers: results of a study questionnaire study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(2), 259-270.
- Bishop, C. F., Caston, M. I. & King, C. A. (2014). Learner-centered environment: creating effective strategies based on student attitudes and faculty reflection. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 14(3), 46-63.

- Borg, S. (2006). The distinctive characteristics of foreign language teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(1), 3-31.
- Brosh, H. (1996). Perceived characteristics of the effective language teacher. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(2), 125-136.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2002). English Language Teaching in the "Post-Method" Era: Toward Better Diagnosis, Treatment, and Assessment. J. Richards & W. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: an anthology of current practice (approaches and methods in language teaching)* (9-18). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruner, J. S. (1997). *On knowing: essays for the left hand*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Budner, S. (1962). Intolerance of ambiguity as a personality variable. *Journal of Personality*, 30(1), 29-50.
- Chapelle, C. A. (1983). *The relationship between ambiguity tolerance and success in acquiring English as a second language in adult learners* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.
- Chapelle, C. A. & Roberts, C. (1986). Ambiguity tolerance and field independence as predictors of proficiency in English as a second language. *Language Learning*, 36(1), 27-45.
- Chen, M. & Hung, L. (2012). Personality type, perceptual style preferences, and strategies for learning English as a foreign language. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 40(9), 1501-1510.

- Chu, W., Lin, D., Chen, T., Tsai, P. & Wang, C. (2015). The relationships between ambiguity tolerance, learning strategies, and learning Chinese as a second language. *Science Direct*, 49(1). 1-16.
- Cook, V. (1977). Cognitive processes in second language learning. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 15(1), 1-20.
- Dallimore, E. J., Hertenstein, J. H. & Platt, M. B. (2013). Impact of cold-calling on student voluntary participation. *Journal of Management Education*, 37(3), 305-341.
- Delaney, T. (2012). Quality and quantity of oral participation and English proficiency gains. *Language Teaching Research*, 16(4), 467-482.
- DeRoma, V. M., Martin, K. M. & Kessler, M. L. (2003). The relationship between tolerance for ambiguity and need for course structure. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 30(2), 104-109.
- Dewaele, J. & Ip, T. S. (2013). The link between foreign language classroom anxiety, second language tolerance of ambiguity and self-rated English proficiency among Chinese learners. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 3(1), 47-66.
- Dornyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 273-284.
- Doyle, T. (2008). *Helping students learn in a learner-centered environment: A guide to facilitating learning in higher education*. Sterling Va.: Stylus.
- Durrheim, K. & Foster, D. (1997). Tolerance of ambiguity as a content specific construct. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 22(5), 741-750.

- Ehrman, M. E. (1993). Ego Boundaries Revisited: Toward a Model of Personality and Learning. James E. Alatis (ed.), *Strategic interaction and language acquisition: theory, practice and research* (330-362). Washington DC: Georgetown University.
- Ehrman, M. & Oxford, R.(1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(1), 1-13.
- Ehrman, M. & Oxford, R. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *The Modern Language Journal*, 74(3), 311-327.
- Ellis, R. (1992). *Second language acquisition and language pedagogy*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R. (1999). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ely, C. (1989). Tolerance of ambiguity and use of second language strategies. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22(1), 437-445.
- Ely, C.M. (1995). Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale. J. Reid (Ed.), *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- El-Koumy, A. S. A. (2000). Differences in FL reading comprehension among high-, middle-, and low ambiguity tolerance students. *Paper presented at the national symposium on English language teaching in Egypt*, March 21-23, 2000, Ain Shams University, Egypt.
- Erten, İ. H. & Zehir Topkaya, E. (2009). Understanding tolerance of ambiguity of EFL learners in reading classes at tertiary level. *Novitas Royal: Research on Youth and Language*, 3(1), 29-44.

- Ezzati, M. & Farahian, M. (2016). Exploring tolerance of ambiguity and grammar achievement of advanced EFL learners. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics*, 4(2), 1-12.
- Farajolahi, S. & Nimvari, A. A. E. (2014). The relationship between student learning styles and their language learning strategies. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 4(1), 157-175.
- Fassinger, P. A. (2000). How classes influence students' participation in college classrooms. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 35(2), 38-47.
- Frenkel-Brunswik, E. (1948). Intolerance of ambiguity as an emotional and perceptual personality variable. *Journal of Personality*, 18(1), 108-123.
- Fritschner, L. M. (2000). Inside the undergraduate college classroom: faculty and students differ on the meaning of student participation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(3), 342-362.
- Genç, G. (2016). Can ambiguity tolerance, success in reading, and gender predict the foreign language reading anxiety?. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 12(2), 135-151.
- Gonzalez, M. P. (1996). *The relationship between selected language learner characteristics and tolerance of ambiguity* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Texas A&M University-Kingsville, Kingsville.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of english language teaching*. United Kingdom: Longman.
- Hewitt, D. (2008). *Understanding effective learning: strategies for the classroom*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

- Hill, L. H. (2014). Graduate students' perspectives on effective teaching. *Adult Learning, 25*(2), 57-65.
- Howard, J. R. & Henney, A. L. (1998). Student participation and instructor gender in the mixed-age college classroom. *The Journal of Higher Education, 69*(4), 384-405.
- Howard, J. R., Short, L. B. & Clark, S. M. (1996). Students' participation in the mixed-age college classroom. *Teaching Sociology, 24*(1), 8-24.
- Kajs, L. T. & McCollum, D. L. (2010). Dealing with ambiguity: assessment of tolerance for ambiguity in the context of school learnership. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 14*(1), 77-91.
- Kamran, S. K. & Maftoon, P. (2012). An analysis of the associations between ambiguity tolerance and EFL reading strategy awareness. *English Language Teaching, 5*(3), 188-196.
- Kamboj, P. & Singh, S. K. (2015). Effectiveness of selected teaching strategies in relation to the learning styles of secondary school students in India. *Interchange: A quarterly Review of Education, 46*(3), 289-312.
- Kazamia, V. (1999). How tolerant are Greek EFL learners of foreign language ambiguities?. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics, 7*(1), 69-78.
- Kural, M. M. (2014). *The relationship between Turkish adult students' ambiguity tolerance levels and metacognitive awareness of L2 reading strategies at different English proficiency levels* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Çukurova University, Adana.
- Lee, H. (1992). *Classroom anxiety, learning motivation, ambiguity tolerance and adult foreign language learning: evidence from Chinese language classroom*

(Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Southern California, California.

Lee, P. (2005). *Students' personality type and attitudes toward classroom participation*. Proceedings of the CATESOL State Conference (2005). Los Angeles, California State University.

Leger, D. (2009). Self-assessment of speaking skills and participation in a foreign language class. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(1), 158-178.

Li, H. & He, Q. (2016). Ambiguity tolerance and perceptual learning styles of Chinese EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 9(6), 213-222.

Loftin, C., Davis, L.A. & Hartin, V. (2010). Classroom participation: a student perspective. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 5(3), 119-124.

MacDonald, A. P. JR. (1970). Revised scale for ambiguity tolerance: reliability and validity. *Psychological Reports*, 26(1), 791-798.

Marzban, A., Barati, H. & Moinszadeh, A. (2012). An investigation into ambiguity tolerance in Iranian senior EFL undergraduates. *English Language Teaching*, 5(1), 76-85.

Miller, P. (1987). Ten characteristics of a good teacher. *English Teaching Forum*, 25(1), 36-38.

Moradi, K. & Sabeti, G. 2014. A comparison of EFL teachers and EFL students' understandings of 'highly effective teaching'. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98(6), 1204-1213.

Morley, J. (1993). Learning Strategies, Tasks, and Activities in Oral Communication Instruction. James E. Alatis (ed.), *Strategic interaction and language*

acquisition: theory, practice and research (116-136). Washington DC: Georgetown University.

Nataatmadja, I., Sixsmith, A. & Dyson, L. E. (2007). Improving class participation by Asian students. *Managing Worldwide Operations and Communications with Information*, 1(1) , 74-77.

Norton, R. W. (1973). *Manifestations of ambiguity tolerance in verbal behavior* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin.

Norton, R. W. (1975). Measurement of ambiguity tolerance. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 39(6), 607-619.

O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. L. (2003). *Language learning styles and strategies: an overview*. Oxford: GALA.

Oxford, R. L. & Cohen, A. D. (1992). Language learning strategies: crucial issues of concept and classification. *Applied Language Learning*, 3(1-2), 1-35.

Parnrod, U., Darasawang, P & Singhasiri, W. (2014). Styles, strategies & tasks: are they related?. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 47(1), 1-21.

Penner, J. G. (1992). *Why many college teachers cannot lecture?*. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Pierce, B., Alvis, A. & Cornick, M. (2011). Toward determining whether accounting students are tolerant or intolerant of ambiguity: a pilot study. *Journal of Academy of Business Education*, 12(1), 113-120.

- Rastegar, M. & Mehrabi Kermani, E. (2015). Emotional intelligence, tolerance of ambiguity, and language learning strategies use of EFL learners: a study of relations. *Cumhuriyet University Faculty of Science Journal*, 36(3), 1961-1971.
- Robson, G. L. (1994). *Relationships between personality, anxiety, proficiency and participation* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Temple University, Philadelphia.
- Rocca, K. A. (2010). Student participation in the college classroom: an extended multidisciplinary literature review. *Communication Education*, 59 (2), 185-213.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the “good language learner” can teach us?. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(1), 41-51.
- Saha, L. J. & Dworkin, A. G. (2009). New Perspectives on Teachers and Teaching. *International handbook of research on teachers and teaching* (3-11). Berlin: Springer Science + Business Media.
- Sahragard, R., Khajavi, Y. & Abbasian, R. (2014). Field of study, learning styles, and language learning strategies of university students: are there any relations?. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(3), 255-271.
- Schmeck, R. R. (1988). An Introduction to Strategies and Styles of Learning. *Learning strategies and learning styles* (3-19). New York: Springer Science + Business Media.
- Tapanes, M. A., Smith, G. G. & White, J. A. (2009). Cultural diversity in online learning: a study of the perceived effects of dissonance in levels of individualism/collectivism and tolerance of ambiguity. *Internet and Higher Education*, 12(1), 26-34.

- Tatum, H. E., Schwartz, B. M., Schimmoeller, P. A. & Perry, N. (2013). Classroom participation and student-faculty interactions: does gender matter?. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 84(6), 745-768.
- Tayebinik, M. & Puteh, M. (2013). The role of ambiguity tolerance in participation in online EFL courses. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 44(6), 207-208.
- Thompson, A. S. & Khawaja, A. J. (2015). Foreign language anxiety in Turkey: the role of multilingualism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 37(2), 115-130.
- Tsui, L. (1998). *A review of research on critical thinking skills*. Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (November 5-8, 1998). Miami, FL.
- Uhrig, K. (2015). Learning styles and strategies for language use in the context of academic reading tasks. *Science Direct*, 50(1), 21-31.
- Vahedi, V. S. & Fatemi, A.H. (2016). The role of emotional intelligence and tolerance of ambiguity in academic Iranian EFL learners' willingness to communicate. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(1), 178-184.
- Varasteh, H., Ghanizadeh A. & Akbari, O. (2016). The role of task value, effort-regulation, and ambiguity tolerance in predicting EFL learners' test anxiety, learning strategies, and language achievement. *Research in Progress*, 61(1), 2-12.
- Watkins, C., E. Carnell, C. Lodge, P. Wagner & C. Whalley, (2000). *Learning about learning*. London: Routledge.
- Weaver, R. & Qi, J. (2005). Classroom Organization and Participation: College Students' Perceptions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 76(5), 570-601.

- Weissenstein, A., Ligges, S., Brouwer, B., Marschall, B. & Friederichs H. (2014). Measuring the ambiguity tolerance of medical students: a cross-sectional study from the first to sixth academic years. *BMC Family Practice*, 15(6), 1-5.
- Weimer, M. (2013). *Learner-centered teaching: five key changes to practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weinstein, C. E. Mayer, R. E. (1983). The teaching of learning strategies. *Innovation Abstracts*, 5(32), 830-845.
- Weinstein, C. E., Ridley D. S., Dahl T. & Weber E. S. (1989). Helping students develop strategies for effective learning. *Educational Leadership*, 46(4), 17-19.
- Weisz, E. (1990). Energizing the classroom. *College Teaching*, 38(2), 74-76.
- Wenden, A. (1993). Strategic Interaction and Task Knowledge. James E. Alatis (ed.), *Strategic interaction and language acquisition: theory, practice and research* (568-686). Washington DC: Georgetown University.
- Xiang, M. & Borg, S. 2014. College English teachers' beliefs about effective language teaching. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 24(24), 97-120.
- Zhang, S. 2013. What makes an excellent teacher? *An analysis from the teaching evaluation*. *Academy of Business Research*, 1(1), 35-47.
- Zulkepli, N. (2012). *An investigation into English as a second language (ESL) learner participation in language learning opportunities: a social view* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Exeter, England.

APPENDICES

Appendix-1

SECOND LANGUAGE TOLERANCE OF AMBIGUITY SCALE

Read each statement on the following pages. Please respond to the statements as they apply to your study of English.

Decide whether you agree or disagree with each statement. For example, if you *strongly agree (SA)*, mark:

Strongly agree (SA)	Agree (A)	Undecided (U)	Disagree (D)	Strongly disagree (SD)
X				

Please respond to each statement quickly, without too much thought. Try not to change your responses after you choose them. Please answer all the questions.

	SA	A	U	D	SD
1. When I'm reading something in English, I feel impatient when I don't totally understand the meaning.					
2. It bothers me that I don't understand everything the teacher says in English.					
3. When I write English compositions, I don't like it when I can't express my ideas exactly.					
4. It is frustrating that sometimes I don't understand completely some English grammar.					
5. I don't like the feeling that my English pronunciation is not quite correct.					
6. I don't enjoy reading something in English that takes a while to figure out completely.					
7. It bothers me that even though I study English grammar, some of it is hard to use in speaking and writing.					
8. When I'm writing in English, I don't like the fact that I can't say exactly what I want.					

Appendix-2 Translated Version of SLTAS

Yabancı Dil Belirsizlik Toleransı Ölçeği

Aşağıdaki ifadelerin her birini okuyunuz. Lütfen ifadelere İngilizce öğreniminize uyum sağlayacak şekilde cevap veriniz. Her bir ifadeye katılıp katılmadığınıza karar veriniz.

Lütfen her bir ifadeye hızlıca, çok düşünmeden karar veriniz. Cevaplarınızı verdikten sonra değiştirmemeye çalışınız.

Lütfen tüm soruları cevaplayınız.

		Kesinlikle Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum
1.	İngilizce konuşan birisini dinlerken, dinlediğim şeyi tam olarak anlamadığımda sabırsızlanırım.					
2.	Öğretmenin İngilizce olarak dediği şeylerin hepsini anlamadığımda rahatsızlık duyarım.					
3.	İngilizce'yi kullanırken, düşüncelerimi tam olarak anlatamadığımda bu durum hoşuma gitmez.					
4.	Birisi İngilizce konuşurken, dilbilgisini bazen tam olarak anlamadığımda moralim bozulur.					
5.	İngilizce telaffuzumun tamamen doğru olmamasından hoşlanmam.					
6.	İngilizce olarak kendimi ifade etmekte zorlandığım bir konuda konuşmayı sevmem.					
7.	İngilizce dilbilgisi çalışmama rağmen, bunun bir kısmının konuşmada kullanımının zor olması beni rahatsız eder.					
8.	İngilizce'yi kullanırken, demek istediğim şeyi tam anlamıyla diyemediğim zaman bu durumdan hoşlanmam.					
9.	Öğretmen, anlamını bilmediğim İngilizce bir kelime kullandığında rahatsız olurum.					
10.	İngilizce konuşurken, düşüncelerimi açıkça ifade edemiyorsam rahatsız olurum.					
11.	Bazen kendi dilimdeki kelimelerin İngilizce'deki tam karşılığını bulamadığımda bu durumdan hoşlanmam.					
12.	İngilizce bir şeyler dinlerken sevmediğim şeylerden biri dinlediğim şeyin anlamını tahmin etmek zorunda olmamdır.					

Appendix-3 Official Permission of Provincial Directorate for National Education of İzmir

T.C.
İZMİR VALİLİĞİ
İl Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü

ARAŞTIRMA DEĞERLENDİRME FORMU

ARAŞTIRMA SAHİBİNİN	
Adı Soyadı	Sinem COŞKUN
Kurumu / Üniversitesi	Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngilizce Öğretmenliği
Araştırma yapılacak iller	İzmir
Araştırma yapılacak eğitim kurumu ve kademesi	Menemen Emiralem Atatürk Ortaokulu
Araştırmanın konusu	An Exploratory Study on the Relationship Between the Ambiguity Tolerance And Participation of the English Language Learners (İngilizce Öğrencilerinin Belirsizlik Toleransları ile Derse Katılımları Arasında İlişki Üzerine Bir Çalışma)
Üniversite / Kurum onayı	---
Araştırma/proje/ödev/tez önerisi	Yüksek Lisans tezi
Veri toplama araçları	Öğrenci gözlemi Yabancı Dil Belirsizlik Toleransı Ölçeği (Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale).
Görüş istenilecek Birim/Birimler	-----
KOMİSYON GÖRÜŞÜ	
İlgi: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nın 07/03/2012 tarihli ve 3616 sayılı Araştırma, yarışma ve Sosyal Etkinlik İzni Konulu, 2012/13 Sayılı Genelgesi, Genelge gereğince; araştırma başvurusu olması gereken nitelikler açısından incelenmiş olup, araştırmanın 2016-2017 öğretim yılında eğitim öğretimi aksatmayacak ve eğitim kurumları yöneticilerinin uygun gördüğü şekli ile yapılmasına oybirliği ile karar verilmiştir.	
Komisyon Kararı	Oybirliği ile alınmıştır.
Muhalef üyenin Adı ve Soyadı: ---	Gerekçesi: -----

KOMİSYON

25/05/2017

(Başkan)
M. Fatih YARGELİ
Müdür Yardımcısı

Üye
Dr. Resul YAYUZ
Öğretmen

Üye
Nurdan MARAL
Öğretmen

Üye
Emre BAKIRAK
Öğretmen

Üye
Gökçe GÖÇERİ
Öğretmen

Appendix-4 Orijinallik Raporu



DOKUZ EYLÜL ÜNİVERSİTESİ EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ
YÜKSEK LİSANS/DOKTORA TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ORJİNALLİK RAPORU



Tarih: 18/07/2017

Tez Başlığı:

An Exploratory Study on the Relationship Between the Ambiguity Tolerance and Participation of the English Language Learners

(İngilizce Öğrencilerinin Belirsizlik Toleransları ile Derse Katılımları Arasında İlişki Üzerine Bir Çalışma)

Yukarıda başlığı belirtilen tez çalışmamın a) Kapak sayfası, b) Giriş, c) Ana bölümler ve d) Sonuç kısımlarından oluşan toplam 88 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 17/07/2017. tarihinde **tez danışmanım tarafından** Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Kütüphane ve Dokümantasyon Daire Başkanlığı'nın sağladığı İntihal Tespit Programından (Turnitin-Tez İntihal Analiz Programı) aşağıda belirtilen **filtreleme tiplerinden biri**(uygun olanı işaretleyiniz) uygulanarak alınmış olan orijinallik raporuna göre, tezimin **benzerlik oranı % 12** dir.

- <http://www.kutuphane.deu.edu.tr/tr/turnitin-tez-intihal-analiz-programi/> adresindeki Tez İntihal Analiz Programı Kullanım Kılavuzunu okudum ☒

Filtreleme Tipi 1(Maksimum %15) ☐**Filtreleme Tipi 2(Maksimum %30) ☒**

☐ Kabul/Onay ve Bildirim sayfaları hariç, ☐ Kaynakça hariç, ☐ Alıntılar dâhil, ☐ Altı (6) kelimeden daha az örtüşme içeren metin kısımları hariç.	☒ Kabul/Onay ve Bildirim sayfaları hariç, ☒ Kaynakça dâhil, ☒ Alıntılar dâhil.
EK 1- İntihal Tespit Programı Raporu İLK SAYFA Çıktısı. ☒ EK 2- İntihal Tespit Programı Raporu (Tümü) Cd İçinde. ☒	

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu Uygulama Esasları'nı inceledim ve yukarıda belirtilen azami benzerlik oranlarına göre tez çalışmamın herhangi bir intihal içermediğini; aksinin tespit edileceği muhtemel durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

Gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.

Adı Soyadı: Sinem COŞKUN

Öğrenci No: 2014950093

Anabilim Dalı: Yabancı Diller Eğitimi

Programı: İngilizce Öğretmenliği

Statüsü: Yüksek Lisans ☒

Doktora ☐

ÖĞRENCİ

Sinem COŞKUN

18/07/2017

DANIŞMAN

Prof. Dr. Feryal ÇUBUKÇU

18/07/2017

Açıklamalar

1: Bu formu teslim etmeden önce sizden istenen bilgileri uygun kutucuğu (☐) işaretleyerek doldurunuz.

Kullanıcı şifre vb. konusunda sorun yaşanması durumunda Üniversitemiz Merkez Kütüphanesinde bulunan Turnitin yetkilisine (Ali Taş Tel: +90 (232) 3018026 veya ali_tas@deu.edu.tr) başvurunuz.

2: Yüksek Lisans/Doktora Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu* formu tezin çıktısı ve elektronik nüshalarının içerisinde ekler kısmında yer alır.

3: Tez savunmasında düzeltme alınması durumunda bu form güncellenerek yeniden hazırlanır.

4: Turnitin-Tez İntihal Analiz Programına yükleme yapılırken Dosya Başlığı (document title) olarak **tez başlığının tamamı**, Yazar Adı (author's first name) olarak **öğrencinin adı**, Yazar Soyadı (author's last name) olarak **öğrencinin soyadı** bilgisini yazınız.

