

T.C.
ABANT İZZET BAYSAL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

**THE ROLE OF LEARNING STRATEGIES IN LEARNING
ENGLISH GRAMMAR**

Mesut KULELİ

2011

T.C.
ABANT İZZET BAYSAL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ
YABANCI DİL EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI

**THE ROLE OF LEARNING STRATEGIES IN LEARNING
ENGLISH GRAMMAR**

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Hazırlayan
Mesut KULELİ

Danışman
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kadir Vefa TEZEL

2011

EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ'NE

Mesut KULELİ'ye ait “The Role of Learning Strategies in Learning English Grammar” adlı çalışması, jürimiz tarafından Yabancı Dil Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı'nda **YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ** olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Akademik Unvan	Adı ve Soyadı	İmza
Üye (Tez Danışmanı):	Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kadir Vefa TEZEL	
Üye	: Doç. Dr. Şaduman KAPUSUZUOĞLU.....	
Üye	: Yrd. Doç. Dr. İbrahim And UYANIK	

Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Onayı

Prof. Dr. Soner DURMUŞ
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürü

ABSTRACT

THE ROLE OF LEARNING STRATEGIES IN LEARNING ENGLISH GRAMMAR

The aim of this study is to find out the effects of instruction of learning strategies on students' grammar achievement. The study was conducted in Fall semester in 2010-2011 academic year.

There were 50 participants (16 female, 34 male) in this study, 26 (9 female, 17 male) of them in the experimental group and 24 (7 female, 17 male) of them in the control group. All participants were prep class students at Düzce University. They didn't take the placement exam that was given in the first week, so they were placed into classrooms randomly.

The data were gathered through three instruments. One was Grammar Achievement Test given as pretest and posttest to both control and experimental groups. This test was prepared by the researcher and its reliability check was carried out through ITEMAN For Windows 3.5. In the test, there were 30 multiple choice questions covering the units that were taught for six weeks of strategy training. The participants in both experimental group and control group took this test both before the six-week strategy training sessions and after the six-week strategy training sessions. The data were analyzed thorough SPSS 15.0 and paired sample t-test and, independent sample t-test and frequency statistics were used.

Another data collection instrument was the weekly quizzes. 10 quizzes were administered to students in both groups after each unit. One quiz was given for one unit and thus the performance of students in both groups was tested for each unit. The quizzes consisted of fill in the blanks, multiple choice and error correction questions

taken from the Assessment pack of the course book. The data obtained through quizzes were analyzed through independent sample t-test.

The third data collection instrument was self-evaluation chart asking the students in the experimental group to fill in their weekly target in the quiz, their weekly performance in the quiz, which strategies were used to learn the previous unit, and state whether the strategies worked and why they thought the strategies worked or didn't work. The data from self-assessment chart were used to find out which strategy was used most by students in the discussion section..

Because there was a significant difference between the post-test scores of the experimental group and control group favoring the former, it is possible to conclude that learning strategy instruction plays a significant role in learning grammar. Out of ten quizzes, in six of them, there was a significant difference between the experimental group and control group favoring the former one while there was no significant difference between the two groups in three quizzes, and there was significant a difference favoring the control group only in one quiz.

No significant difference was found between female and male students' post-test and quiz averages in both groups. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that gender didn't play a role in learning grammar both when the participants are taught learning strategies and when they aren't. As a last point, the most commonly used strategies were Rule Formation and Rule exercises strategies according to the Self-evaluation charts of the students.

Key words: Language learning strategies, English Grammar, Instruction of Language Learning strategies

ÖZ

İNGİLİZCE DİLBİLGİSİ'Nİ ÖĞRENMEDE ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİNİN ROLÜ

Bu çalışmanın amacı, öğrencilerin dilbilgisi öğreniminde, öğrenme stratejilerinin öğretiminin etkilerini bulmaktır. Araştırma, 2010-2011 akademik yılında Sonbahar döneminde gerçekleştirildi.

Bu çalışmada 50 katılımcı (16 bayan, 34 erkek) yer aldı, bu katılımcıların 26'sı deney grubunda (9 bayan, 17 erkek) 24'ü ise (7 bayan, 17 erkek) kontrol grubunda yer aldı. Tüm katılımcılar, Düzce Üniversitesi Hazırlık Okulu'nda okuyan öğrencilerdir. Bu katılımcılar, ilk hafta yapılan yerleştirme sınavına girmediler, bu yüzden bulundukları sınıflara rastgele yerleştirildiler.

Veriler üç tane veri toplama aracı ile elde edildi. Araçlardan biri, hem kontrol grubuna hem de deney grubuna ön test ve son test olarak uygulanan Dilbilgisi Başarı Testi idi. Bu test araştırmacı tarafından geliştirildi ve güvenilirliği ITEMAN For Windows 3.5 programı yoluyla kontrol edildi. Bu testte, altı haftalık strateji öğretimi seansları boyunca işlenen üniteleri kapsayan 30 adet çoktan seçmeli soru vardı. Hem kontrol grubu hem de deney grubundaki öğrenciler, hem altı haftalık strateji öğretimi seanslarından önce, hem de bu seanslardan sonra bu teste girdiler. Testten elde edilen veriler SPSS 15.0 programı yoluyla analiz edildi ve paired sample t-test, independent sample t-test ve frekans istatistikleri kullanıldı.

Diğer bir veri toplama aracı haftalık quizlerdi. Her üniteden sonra, hem kontrol grubu hem de deney grubu öğrencilerine toplam 10 tane quiz verildi. Her bir ünite için 1 quiz verildi ve böylece her iki gruptaki öğrencilerin her ünite için performansı ölçülmüş oldu. Quizlerde, boşluk doldurma, çoktan seçmeli ve hata düzeltme soruları yer aldı, ve bu sorular kullanılan ders kitabının Ölçme ve Değerlendirme Paketi takviye kitabından

alındı. Quizlerden elde edilen veriler independent sample t-test yoluyla analiz edildi.

Üçüncü veri toplama aracı, deney grubundaki öğrencilere quizlerdeki haftalık hedeflerini, quizlerden elde ettikleri sonuçları, hangi stratejileri kullandıklarını, ve bu stratejilerin faydalı olup olmadığını, ve sebeplerini yazmalarını gerektiren Kişisel Değerlendirme Tablo'sudur. Kişisel Değerlendirme Tablo'sundan elde edilen veriler ve öğrenciler tarafından hangi stratejinin en çok kullanıldığı belirlendi ve sonuçları Tartışma bölümünde sunuldu.

Deney grubu ve kontrol grubunun son test ortalama puanları arasında, deney grubunun lehine bir anlamlı fark olduğu için, öğrenme stratejisi öğretiminin dilbilgisi öğreniminde önemli bir rol oynadığı sonucu ortaya çıkmıştır. 10 quizin 6'sında, deney grubu lehine bir anlamlı fark çıkmış, 3 quizde anlamlı fark görülmemiş, sadece 1 quizde ise kontrol grubu lehine anlamlı fark bulunmuştur.

Her iki gruptaki bayan ve erkek öğrencilerin son test ortalama puanları arasında anlamlı fark bulunamamıştır. Bu yüzden, hem öğrenme stratejileri öğretildiğinde, hem de öğretilmediğinde cinsiyetin dilbilgisi öğrenimi üzerinde önemli bir rol oynamadığı sonucuna varmak mümkündür. Son bir nokta olarak, öğrencilerin doldurduğu Kişisel Değerlendirme Tablosu'na göre en yaygın kullanılan stratejiler, Kural Oluşturma ve Kuralları Egzersiz yapma stratejileridir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri, İngilizce Dilbilgisi, Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Öğretimi

To my dear wife, Sezin ÇATANA KULELİ

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to show my gratitude to a number of people without whose commendable efforts it would have been hardly possible for me to finish this thesis.

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor Assist. Prof. Kadir Vefa Tezel who did his best to help me in every step of my thesis with his invaluable experience and wisdom. He always showed the right direction even in the most hopeless times.

I am grateful to Assist. Prof. Yusuf Şen, my Head of Department at Duzce University Prep School, for his continuous support and even active participation throughout this six-week study. He was really very helpful in designing this study and arranging class hours and getting the formal consent from the University Administration to conduct this research. I am also grateful to my colleagues who helped me in data collection. I am particularly grateful to Dr. Aslıhan KUYUMCU VARDAR for her precious advice and support in every step of this research.

I would like to show my greatest gratitude to my wife, Sezin ÇATANA KULELİ who was always there whenever I needed mental support. Thanks to her great support during this study, I always felt strong urge to continue and finish this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZ	v
DEDICATION	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
 CHAPTER I	 1
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Statement of Problem	3
1.2. Significance of the Study	4
1.3. Limitations of the study	6
1.4. Definition of Terms	6
1.4.1. Students	6
1.4.2. Course book	6
1.4.3. Learning strategies	9
 CHAPTER II	 12
2. Review of Literature	12
2.1. Theoretical Framework	12
2.1.1. Learning strategies	12
2.1.2. Language learning strategies and the good language learner	13
2.1.3. Language of strategy instruction	14
2.1.4. Separate versus integrated instruction of strategies	16
2.1.5. Classification of strategies	17
<i>Rubin's (1981) classification of strategies</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Naiman et.al's (1978) classification of strategies</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) classification of strategies</i>	<i>18</i>

<i>Oxford's (1990) classification of strategies</i>	19
2.2. Related Studies	20
CHAPTER III	30
3. Method	30
3.1. Research Questions	30
3.2. Design of the Study	31
3.3. Setting	31
3.4. Period	34
3.5. Participants	35
3.6. Data Collection Instrument	36
3.6.1. English grammar achievement test	36
3.6.2. Unit quizzes	39
3.6.3. Self-evaluation chart	40
3.7. Data collection procedure	40
3.8. Data analysis	41
CHAPTER IV	42
4. Results and Findings	42
4.1. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the First Research Question	42
4.2. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the Second Research Question	43
4.3. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the Third Research Question	44
4.3.1. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 1	45
4.3.2. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 2	46
4.3.3. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 3	47
4.3.4. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 4	48
4.3.5. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 5	48
4.3.6. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 6	49
4.3.7. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 7	50

4.3.8. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 8	51
4.3.9. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 9	52
4.3.10. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 10	53
4.4. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the Fourth Research Question	55
4.5. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the Fifth Research Question	57
4.6. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the Sixth Research Question	58
4.7. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the Seventh Research Question	59
4.8. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the Eighth Research Question	62
4.8.1. The percentage of strategies for week 1	62
4.8.2. The percentage of strategies for week 2	63
4.8.3. The percentage of strategies for week 3	63
4.8.4. The percentage of strategies for week 4	64
4.8.5. The percentage of strategies for week 5	64
4.8.6. The percentage of strategies for week 6	65
4.9. Conclusion	65
4.10. Suggestions for Further Research	68
REFERENCES	70
APPENDICES	74
A. Grammar Achievement Test	74
B. Self Evaluation Chart	79
C. Quiz 1	80
D. Quiz 2	83
E. Quiz 3	85
F. Quiz 4	87
G. Quiz 5	89

H. Quiz 6	91
I. Quiz 7	95
J. Quiz 8	98
K. Quiz 9	101
L. Quiz 10	104

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1. The ratio of male and female participants	35
Table 3.2. The ratio of experimental group and control group participants	35
Table 4.1. T-test results regarding the significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of experimental group	43
Table 4.2. T-test results regarding the significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of control group	44
Table 4.3. T-test results regarding the difference between experimental group and control group in quiz 1	45
Table 4.4. T-test results regarding the difference between experimental group and control group in quiz 2	46
Table 4.5. T-test results regarding the difference between experimental group and control group in quiz 3	47
Table 4.6. T-test results regarding the difference between experimental group and control group in quiz 4	48
Table 4.7. T-test results regarding the difference between experimental group and control group in quiz 5	49
Table 4.8. T-test results regarding the difference between experimental group and control group in quiz 6	50
Table 4.9. T-test results regarding the difference between experimental group and control group in quiz 7	50
Table 4.10. T-test results regarding the difference between experimental group and control group in quiz 8	52
Table 4.11. T-test results regarding the difference between experimental group and control group in quiz 9	52
Table 4.12. T-test results regarding the difference between experimental group and control group in quiz 10.....	53
Table 4.13. T-test results concerning the difference between experimental group and control group in terms of their pre-test score averages	56

Table 4.14. T-test results concerning the difference between experimental group and control group in terms of their post-test score averages	56
Table 4.15. T-test results concerning the difference between pre-test and post-test scores of male and female students in experimental group	57
Table 4.16. T-test results concerning the difference between pre-test and post-test scores of male and female students in control group	58
Table 4.17. T-test results concerning the difference between the quiz scores of male and female students	60
Table 4.18. The percentage of strategies used in the first week	62
Table 4.19. The percentage of strategies used in the second week	63
Table 4.20. The percentage of strategies used in the third week	63
Table 4.21. The percentage of strategies used in the fourth week	64
Table 4.22. The percentage of strategies used in the fifth week	64
Table 4.23. The percentage of strategies used in the sixth week	65

CHAPTER I

1. Introduction

There is a long-standing but still unsettled controversy over the importance of grammar in English Language Teaching profession. The controversy mostly arises from the fact that, as Zhang (2009) states, many see grammar as only “static structures of a language” and therefore they needn’t be taught in a language classroom as learners can already acquire them on their own. Whereas certain circles accept grammar as the indispensable component of any language program, others consider it to enjoy only a secondary role in language teaching. The latter view holds that since grammar rules are learned consciously, and they don’t necessarily help the learner in his performance but acting only as a monitor in performance, learning shouldn’t necessarily precede “acquisition”. Even when grammar helps a learner “monitor” his performance, it might fall short at times because the learner might not find enough time to monitor his performance during a conversation, but once the language has been acquired, the grammar of that particular language doesn’t contribute to communication, therefore teaching those grammar rules aren’t necessary (Krashen ,1982, cited in:Aydemir, 2007). However, in teaching English as a foreign language, grammar teaching remains as a vital tool for learners to discover and use as the advantages of learning English as a second language are absent.

Grammar is the bridge between language and the production of language through communication or writing. In the production of a language, all new statements are possible only through the formal rules of that target language. The items that come together and form a statement are coordinated based on the grammatical rules of the language. No utterance is accidental or free from rules, but rather all of them are formed in a manner established by the grammar of language. Students with a good command of

the target language grammar can acquire that language faster and can take more risks in its production. Grammar teaching in the classroom can indeed “result in substantial gains in L2 proficiency” (Cowan, 2009).

Even when it is accepted that grammar should be taught in classrooms, there comes out an equally permanent controversy over whether it should be taught explicitly or implicitly. In implicit teaching, no reference is made to formal grammar rules whereas in explicit teaching, the students are directly given the grammar rules or expected to come up with the grammar rules by themselves after they are given a set of examples. Many have taken the former as the ideal way of teaching grammar, but the importance of explicit teaching has been demonstrated just as effectively. Ortega (2000) has even shown that in his analysis of 49 studies, explicit grammar teaching proved to be better and yielded longer-lasting results than implicit teaching.

Seeing that grammar is so vital for any language learner and now that in a preparatory class in a university, the language teachers have quite a limited time to teach all this grammar in the most effective way possible, it is beyond doubt that some types of strategies ought to be employed by both teachers and learners. Without the use of appropriate strategies in a language class and without teaching those strategies to the students whether explicitly or implicitly, it is inevitable that the students will be discouraged by the bombardment of language forms that they face everyday. To eliminate the obvious discouragement, if students are given a tool to empower them in eliminating such a significant problem, they will have a more confident and positive outlook to overcome the complexities of the target language. One such tool is language learning strategies. If students are taught the necessary language learning strategies, and when the teacher assigns tasks that are compatible with those strategies about any grammar point, the learning pace of the students is going to accelerate and they will be more motivated to learn the language and its grammar, seeing that they have achieved something with the use of appropriate cognitive, metacognitive, affective, social, compensatory and memory strategies.

Language learning strategies do not produce exactly the same effect on all

learners. O'Malley et al. (1985) found that students vary in the strategies they choose and the way they employ those strategies. "Different students adopt different behaviours or strategies to learn a new language. Some learners who are very shy and introvert learn a second language through grammar drills and sentence analysis. On the other hand, sociable and extrovert learners avoid grammar drills but seek out social conversation in English. They are satisfied that they can get the general meaning without knowing every word" (Ghani, 2003 p. 31) Therefore, a variety of learning strategies should be presented to students, and, accordingly, the tasks assigned should urge students to make as much use of those strategies as possible in order that the students could find out their own learning strategy.

1.1. Statement of Problem

English remains a problem in the minds of students, and they can't overcome it since they believe that they will never become good at English. This is a problem that will linger in students' minds for as long as they will need English. A professional intervention is essential at this point. A potentially powerful element to be used at this point is a tool that will empower students mentally and pedagogically. Language learning strategies stand out as a strong candidate for this goal.

Language learning strategy is an unclear abstract term for a student who is trying to learn a foreign language. Within this limited time in the prep classes of universities, and with so many grammar rules to teach, it is beyond doubt that a teacher should teach grammar learning strategies so that his students can monitor their learning and take responsibilities in their own learning. It is in the brains of the students that all learning process takes place, so it is necessary to help students process this information more effectively and permanently in their brains. This study has set out to teach grammar more efficiently by helping students become aware of learning strategies and become self-conscious of their learning strategy preferences to enhance the effectiveness of English instruction in the confines of an academic year in an English as a foreign language context.

1.2. Significance of the Study

Language learning strategies have been gaining recognition and popularity all over the world. This study aims to find out whether students use the grammar learning strategies they have been taught and whether these learning strategies help them achieve better results in grammar. So far, much research has been conducted on learning strategies and grammar learning strategies in particular. However, quite a few studies have tried to teach the necessary learning strategies in grammar. The studies present in Turkey have tried to find out whether or not students use learning strategies through questionnaires and tried to find a relationship between the use of learning strategies and students' achievement. No strategy teaching was ever provided to students, and students were only asked about which strategies they employed and whether they were aware of those strategies or not. The results obtained from those questionnaires were analyzed in accordance with the learning strategies classification of Rebecca Oxford's taxonomy (1990).

This study has a pioneering role in that students were taught the necessary learning strategies explicitly before a grammar topic was taught. This study doesn't only explain learning strategies as classified by Rebecca Oxford (1990) but also shows their application and appropriateness in a language class besides the students' preference over certain strategies and the frequency with which the student employs those strategies.

For six weeks, the students were given the appropriate learning strategies for the particular grammar topic for one hour every week, and during the grammar classes, the tasks were chosen in line with the strategies appropriate for that topic. The students were guided to use those learning strategies consciously or unconsciously in completing the tasks so that they could have an opportunity to personally apply those strategies and become conscious of their own learning strategies. Moreover, the students' awareness of the learning strategies has been raised that way. More than one strategy was taught every week because of the fact that no two students learn the same way, and they may need to change their strategies seeing that one doesn't work according to the results of

the quizzes given at the end of each week.

Because of its scope and the way it goes about regarding the problem, the results of this study may also provide insights to universities with prep schools as regards how they may plan their grammar teaching. Because grammar is the main part of the language that is taught in universities today, each prep program wants to overcome the obstacle of time limit. Everyone complains that there isn't enough time to teach all formal grammar forms of the language and that students don't study properly which leads to failures in the program objectives. This study aims to provide an example to show that rather than leaving the students to their own willpower and learning methods, teachers should take responsibilities in teaching them the necessary grammar learning strategies explicitly, adapt the tasks in line with those strategies, and enable their students to find out their own learning strategies, after which the classroom environment turns into a learner-centered setting rather than the teacher giving everything and the students just listening passively.

Much research has been devoted to learner-centered approach in language classrooms, yet this doesn't mean that the student will do everything and the teacher won't play any role but it means that the teacher will initiate the learning process and then get out of the stage gradually with everything well-designed and provided to learners. Hence, the learners take responsibility for their own learning both in the classroom and out of the classroom if provided with grammar learning strategies. This study clearly shows how to turn the class into a learner-centered environment even during the grammar classes.

Another significant aspect of this study is that students are asked to explain whether they benefited from the strategy instruction or not by using the self-assessment chart given to them every week on which the grammar topic was written. There are questions asking which strategies they used the previous week; whether those strategies helped them learn the particular grammar topic; and the reason for the effectiveness and / or ineffectiveness of those strategies. The results of that chart have been presented in this study both quantitatively and qualitatively.

1.3. Limitations of the study

This study was conducted in the prep school of one university. In this sense, its results may not be generalized to other university prep schools. For its results to be generalizable, it should be replicated in other schools and results should be compared.

The period of grammar instruction was six weeks in this study because of the reasons that will be explained in the data collection part of the methodology chapter. Had students received more instruction in grammar strategy instruction, better results from the already good results would have been expected.

1.4. Definition of Terms

1.4.1. Students

The students in this study are all first-year prep class students in Duzce University. Both the experimental group and the control group consist of students that didn't take placement exam and were placed randomly to those classes. Therefore, both groups are homogenous in terms of the language backgrounds of the students. Both groups were given five weeks of language program in which they attended 26 hours of instruction every week which were given by three different lecturers. That program was meant to prepare the students for the skills classes that were to be given from the sixth week onwards in which they would be taught academic English through skills like listening & speaking and reading & writing. Therefore, the students in both groups had finished the second volume of the course book Focus on Grammar by the time they are involved in this study.

1.4.2. Course book

The course book has an integrated skills approach to language teaching and learning. It is a five-volume book. The first volume is for the beginning level, the

second volume is for high-beginning students. In the second book, the following grammar points have already been covered and the students begin this study knowing these points of grammar:

Present of “be”

Past of “be”

Nouns

Descriptive adjectives

Prepositions of place, wh- Questions

The simple present

Possessive nouns and possessive adjectives

Demonstrators

One / ones

Present progressive tense

The imperative

Can / could

Suggestions

Simple Past tense (regular & irregular verbs)

There is / There are

Pronouns

Non-action verbs

Gerunds & infinitives

Future (will & be going to)

May / might for possibility

Possessives

Can / may for permission

Requests, desires, offers

Giving advice

Have to / don't have to / must / mustn't

The comparative

Adverbs of manner

Enough / too

The superlative

In this study, the third volume of the book, which is for intermediate level, has been covered. It comes with a workbook in which there are grammar exercises for each topic in the students' book. It also comes with a teachers' book and an assessment pack in which there are diagnostic exams, achievement exams and unit exams for each topic in the students' book.

Grammar topics covered in this study:

1. Simple Present Tense & Present Progressive
2. Imperative
3. Simple Past
4. Past Progressive & Simple Past
5. Used to
6. Future (will & be going to)
7. Future Time Clauses
8. Wh Questions (Subject and Object)
9. Reflexive and Reciprocal Pronouns
10. Phrasal verbs

Grammar topics covered in listening-speaking lesson in experimental and control groups during this six-week study:

1. There is / are, There was / were
2. Simple Past tense with regular verbs
3. Simple Past and Past Progressive tenses
4. Future with be going to
5. Should for ideas and opinions

Grammar topics covered in reading-writing lesson in experimental and control groups during this six-week study:

1. There is / are
2. Simple past
3. Comparatives
4. Should for opinion
5. very, too

1.4.3. Learning strategies taught in this study

In a language program which intends to teach as much as possible in as time span as short as possible, it is beyond doubt that learning strategies should be employed by the students. Learning strategies are “specific actions, behaviors, steps or techniques --such as seeking out conversation partners, or giving oneself encouragement to tackle a difficult language task -- used by students to enhance their own learning” (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992, p.63) Strategies are the tools for active, self-directed involvement needed for developing L2 communicative ability (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). Successful language learners tend to select strategies that work well together in a highly orchestrated way, tailored to the requirements of the language task (Chamot & Kupper, 1989). In the classification of Oxford (1990), learning strategies can be classified into six groups: cognitive, metacognitive, memory related, compensatory, affective and social.

With cognitive strategies, the learner directly deals with the language material and tries to make it more comprehensible. That cognitive strategies help the learners significantly in EFL classrooms was indicated in the study by Oxford and Ehrman (1995). In the present study, two cognitive strategies, namely “rule formation” and “rule exercises” were taught to the students in the experimental group. As the study was conducted in EFL context, the students learning grammar prefer to formulate the rules of the particular grammar topics and later do formal exercises on those topics, the rule of which they have learned so that they can use those grammar points as part of their language proficiency in diverse registers such as writing or speaking.

Metacognitive strategies are employed by learners to manage the whole learning process. With metacognitive strategies, the learners themselves can decide whether the strategies they are using are of any help or which strategy helps the most and which strategy helps the least looking at the results. In this study, “identifying one’s own needs and strategies”, “evaluating the success of any type of learning strategy”, and “short term goal setting” were taught to the students under metacognitive strategies. Those strategies were presented to the students and the students were made to practice

those strategies through self-evaluation chart they were asked to fill in before and after quizzes every week. Students can only evaluate the success of learning strategies if they set short-term or long-term goals. If the students achieve their targets for the particular week, they state the strategies that they have been using are beneficial thereby the students can themselves decide on which strategy to use the next time they need to learn similar topics.

Memory-related strategies are particularly used by the students in vocabulary learning. Those strategies help the learner link one new item with an already known item or already familiar sound or picture. In this study, “flash cards”, “body movement” and “elaboration” were taught to the students under memory-related strategies through which the students were expected to learn Phrasal Verbs, the grammar point of the sixth week. Flash cards are motivating and attention-seeking for the students trying to learn new vocabulary items. As learning new words is a strenuous task, it should be made as enjoyable as possible in classroom environment and out of the classroom. Colorful cards are one of the best means of turning this arduous task into an enjoyable activity. In elaboration strategy, students build on what they already know about the topic. Even though phrasal verbs take on new meanings, most of the phrasal verbs bear something from the original meaning of the verb alone. Therefore, the students who know the meaning of the original verb in its isolated form can learn its new form more easily when they see that original verb as a phrasal verb. Elaboration strategy was chosen to enable students to activate their previous knowledge in learning phrasal verbs.

When a student comes up against an unknown vocabulary item or phrase, he might try to guess the meaning from the context, or when he cannot remember the right word to utter during a conversation, he might try to find its synonym and use it. In such circumstances, the learner is said to be using compensatory strategies. They help us continue with the process whether it is reading, listening or speaking even when there is something missing for us in this conversation. Compensatory strategies weren't among those taught to the students in this study. If the study had set out to determine the effects of grammar on students' listening and speaking skills, compensatory strategies could have been included in this study, as well.

Affective strategies are about the learners' feelings and thoughts before and after learning a particular topic. Identifying one's own mood and anxiety level, talking about feelings, rewarding oneself for good performance, and using deep breathing or positive self-talk are among the affective strategies. In a study with South African EFL learners, Oxford and Dreyer (1996) showed that affective strategies were important in achievement while Mullins (1992), in a study with EFL learners in Thailand, showed that affective strategies had negative effects on certain measures of EFL proficiency. In the present study, no affective strategies have been taught to the students.

Social strategies help the learners get in touch with the others and the teacher in the class while dealing with the language. With social strategies, learners ask the teacher and their classmates all confusing points and don't leave even one single point that is not understood. In their study with South African EFL learners, Dreyer and Oxford (1996) showed that there was a close link between social strategies and proficiency in EFL. In the present study, "cooperating with peers", "asking questions for verification" and "asking questions for clarification during a task" have been taught to the students under social strategies. The rationale behind teaching Asking Questions and Social Cooperation strategies is that when the students learn the correct form of a grammar point from others rather than trying to find their own mistakes on their own, this saves time and energy for the students and they can go on to learn other aspects of the language in this saved time which would be wasted with mistakes otherwise.

CHAPTER II

2. Review of Literature

This chapter consists of two parts. In the first part, theoretical framework of learning strategies will be presented. In the second part, related studies focusing on learning strategies will be reviewed and summarized.

2.1. Theoretical Framework

2.1.1. Learning strategies

O'Malley and Chamot (1990) describe learning strategies as the special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information. As is clear from the explanation, learning strategies are effective not only in learning the new material, but also in retaining the newly learned material better. So, learning strategies are helpful in more than one way. Oxford (1986) states that learning strategies are important for four key reasons: Firstly, appropriate learning strategies contribute to successful language performance. Successful language learners report using appropriate strategies and this can explain their outstanding performances (Rubin, 1975). Consciously or non-consciously, successful language learners generally make use of appropriate learning strategies (Politzer & McGroarty 1985). Second, the students become responsible for their own pace and success of learning if they are provided with appropriate learning strategies. When learners are taught the appropriate learning strategies, they practice those strategies even outside the school, and in the course of time they become good users of those strategies and can achieve even when there is no formal education. Third, learning strategies are teachable to the learners not

only in ESL context but also in EFL context. A teacher doesn't have any role in determining the aptitude, gender, learning style, personality, and general cognitive style of a student, but what a teacher can do for learners is that he introduces them to learning strategies and by giving practice opportunities, enables the students to use appropriate learning strategies. Fourth, a teacher who addresses learning strategies in his/her program will have an expanded role in the language learning context. Saying that learning strategies make the learner responsible for his own learning doesn't necessarily mean that the teacher's role in the class wanes. On the contrary, the teacher takes on an expanded role such as bringing the appropriate tasks that will match the learning strategies and enable the learner to use those strategies on those tasks.

2.1.2. Language learning strategies and the good language learner

It is a well-established fact that good language learner is the one who takes responsibility for his own learning, uses appropriate strategies in learning the new material, and extends the learning time beyond the formal classrooms. All these qualities of a good language learner require one thing in common: the use of learning strategies.

Rubin (1975) classified the qualities of a good language learner relating all of them to learning strategy use:

1. A good language learner is a good guesser. A good guesser uses all relevant information the context provides and gets the meaning of the missing information. Guessing requires a good command of discourse knowledge and a good command of grammatical structures and lexical structures.
2. A good learner feels a strong urge to communicate with others or learn from communication with others. Even if the good language learner doesn't know the word for an object, he paraphrases it or uses non-verbal cues and does his best to get his message across. Good language learner takes all risks and never refrains from making mistakes.
3. Good language learner is not inhibited. The risks he takes don't stop him from taking more and more risks and don't make him feel foolish.

4. A good language learner constantly looks for patterns for classification of the information. The good language learner constantly analyzes, categorizes and synthesizes.
5. A good language learner practices. This learner practices pronouncing words or making up sentences. He looks for opportunities to practice the language with the native speakers, attend cultural events such as movies. He initiates conversation with the teacher or with classmates in the class.
6. A good language learner can learn from his own mistakes. He always monitors the speech of his own and of others.
7. A good language learner attends to meaning as much as grammar. He knows that grammar rules aren't everything and the discourse and speech acts are important to get the best meaning of an utterance.

As is clear from the categorization of the good language learner by Rubin, making the best of learning strategies whether consciously or unconsciously makes one a good language learner. Chamot (2005) puts it that once a learning strategy is used repeatedly, it becomes familiar and it will be used automatically, but when it is necessary, most users of learning strategies will be able to call them to the awareness level.

2.1.3. Language of strategy instruction

An important issue to consider in language learning strategy instruction is the language that will be used, that is, the students' native language, target language, or both. Considerable research has been carried out on whether strategy instruction should be given in the target language or in the students' native language, and the debate hasn't been quite settled yet. Chamot (2005) posits that in first language contexts, strategies are taught in a language medium at which the students are proficient, yet in ESL and EFL contexts, this is not the case.

There are three views of introducing strategies in language classrooms. Students' proficiency level is the key factor in the conception of these views. The

learners who are at the beginner or pre-intermediate level may not understand strategy instruction in the target language. Therefore, it may not be a good idea to teach the learning strategies in the target language for such a group. However, that those learners won't understand the learning strategies if taught in the target language doesn't mean that these strategies should be postponed until after the learners become intermediate level language learners. Macaro (2001) states that it is not possible to refrain from using native language for strategy instruction for beginner and pre-intermediate level learners and clearly favors using the first language in strategy instruction for low-level language learners. However, Chamot et al. (1999) suggested that the teacher give the strategies' names in the target language and explain them to the students in the target language as simply as possible and thereafter model using the learning strategies again and again so that the students could understand how to use them. There is a third view gaining recognition that the teacher could use a combination of the native and target languages in strategy instruction. Grenfell & Harris (1999) looked into strategy instruction by secondary French and German teachers in London. In this instruction, the materials used by the students for planning and evaluating their own work were in English (in their native language) while checklists, strategy description and strategy activities were in simplified target language. Similarly Ozeki (2000) investigated EFL learner Japanese college students being given strategy instruction. Questionnaires, journal prompts, and self-evaluation checklists were written in simplified target language, English, but students could respond in Japanese. Strategy instruction was carried out in the target language, English. In Chamot and Keatley's (2003) ESL literacy study, bilingual teachers first used the students' native language in strategy instruction and then asked the learners in the target language, in English, to use these strategies in similar reading tasks. This went quite smoothly, however the teachers who used only the target language, English, in strategy instruction came up against a great many difficulties with low level learners. This showed that bilingual teaching of learning strategies using a simple target language with low level learners yielded better results than strategy instruction only in the target language.

2.1.4. Separate versus integrated instruction of strategies

One of the currently debated areas of strategy instruction is whether the strategies should be taught separately or in integrated manner. In separate instruction of strategies, the strategy itself is taught by the teacher and the teacher teaches the strategy explicitly. In explicit strategy instruction, the learners are taught the learning strategy formally by the teacher explaining and modeling the use of the strategies on sample tasks and then providing opportunities for the students to use the same strategies on certain other tasks and allowing the students to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies. In separate instruction, the only focus is on the strategies, the teacher and the learners don't care about the content of the task and they only try to understand how to use the strategy on tasks. Jones et al. (1987) favored separate instruction of learning strategies saying that students will learn learning strategies better if they focus all their attention on developing strategic processing skills rather than concern themselves with the content. Derry and Murphy (1986) find separate instruction advantageous to learners and add that learning strategies can be generalized into other contexts and tasks if they are taught separately and learned appropriately by the students. A good example of separate strategy instruction may be Dansereau's (1985) Computer Assisted Cooperative Learning Program (CACL) in which pairs of students were taught to use various reading comprehension strategies presented to them and practiced by the computer.

In integrated strategy instruction model, students learn the learning strategies in context rather than in separate form. Wenden (1987) considers separate instruction of strategies as obstacles for the learner in applying the same strategies in other contexts and the learning strategies which were learned separately may not be evident to the learner in terms of place of use. Chamot and O'Malley (1987) suggest that practicing strategies on authentic academic and language tasks facilitates the transfer of strategies to similar tasks encountered in other classes. Dansereau (1985), after administering his CACL Program with the instruction of strategies separately, found that the learners had difficulty adapting the strategies to particular kinds of text materials. Thereupon, he developed a strategy training program in which the strategies were designed for specific

types of science texts, thereby integrating the strategies into tasks. This was helpful for students' retention of material read in science books. Derry (1984) suggested incidental learning model, in which students receive short periods of separate strategy training followed by reminders to use the strategies in content classrooms, thereby integrating the separately learned learning strategies into tasks.

2.1.5. Classification of Strategies

Various researchers have tried to classify learning strategies. Out of the studies and observations they conducted on learner groups, they categorized the strategies the good learners use in learning new language material. In this section, four significant classifications will be discussed. These are classifications by Rubin (1975), Naiman et al (1978), Chamot and O'Malley (1990) and Oxford (1990).

Rubin's (1981) classification of strategies:

The observations Rubin (1975) carried out on effective learners ensured him that students apply learning strategies and these strategies can be classified. Rubin then (1981) made a classification subsuming learning strategies under two primary categories and various subgroups.

In Rubin's (1981) classification, the primary categories are "Strategies that Directly Affect Learning" and "Processes that Contribute Indirectly to Learning". In his first primary strategy group, there were strategies directly affecting learning such as clarification / verification (like asking for how to use a word or expression), monitoring (like correcting errors in others' pronunciation), memorization (like mnemonics, writing repeatedly), guessing / inductive inferencing (like guessing meaning from keywords), deductive reasoning (like comparing the native language to the target language) and practice (like repeating sentences, experimenting with sounds).

In his second primary strategy group, there were strategies indirectly contributing to learning such as creating opportunities for practice (like initiating

conversation with a native speaker of a classmate in the target language) and production tricks (like using synonyms or formulaic interaction).

Naiman et.al's (1978) classification of strategies:

Naiman et al classified learning strategies under five broad categories. These broad categories were common to all good language learners interviewed. A number of secondary learning strategies were formulated, as well and these secondary strategies were represented only in some of the good learners. This classification system was based on interviews with 34 good language learners and a previous strategy classification model by Stern (1975).

The first category is “active task approach” and it has some subgroups such as responding positively to learning opportunity, adding related language learning activities to regular classroom program and practicing. The second category is “realization of language as a system” and it has some subgroups such as analyzing individual problems, making L1/L2 comparisons, and analyzing target language to make inferences. The third category is “realization of language as a means of communication and interaction” and this has some subgroups such as emphasizing fluency over accuracy, seeking communicative situations with L2 speakers. The fourth category is “management of affective demands” and it has certain subgroups such as finding sociocultural meanings and coping with affective demands in learning. The fifth category is “monitoring L2 performance” and it has a subgroup like constantly revising L2 system by testing inferences and asking L2 native speakers for feedback.

O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) classification of strategies:

O'Malley and Chamot (1990) made a broader classification of learning strategies. In their classification, there are three major learning strategies and these major strategies have a number of subgroups.

The first major group is “Metacognitive Strategies”. This has certain subgroups

such as selective attention (in which the focus is on special aspects of learning tasks as in listening for key words), planning (planning for the organization of either written or spoken discourse), monitoring (in which the information that should be remembered at a later time is comprehended) and evaluation (in which language production is evaluated after it has taken place or comprehension is checked after a receptive language activity has been completed).

The second major group is “Cognitive Strategies”. This also has certain subgroups such as rehearsal (repeating the names of the items and objects to be remembered later), organization (grouping words according to their semantic or syntactic attributes), inferencing (using information in the text to guess the meaning of unknown linguistic parts), summarizing (synthesizing what the learner has heard to be sure that he/she has learnt the material and can remember it later), deducing (applying rules to understand the language), imagery (in which visual images are used to remember an item easily), transfer (using already known linguistic information to learn new material) and elaboration (integrating new ideas with the already known information).

The third major group is “Social/affective Strategies”. This has certain subgroups such as cooperation (working with peers to solve a problem or manage a linguistic material), questioning for clarification (asking a teacher or peers questions for additional explanation or examples) and self-talk (using mental redirection of thinking to assure success or reduce anxiety about a task).

Oxford's (1990) classification of strategies:

The most comprehensive and comprehensible strategy classification was carried out by Oxford (1990). She addressed the four skills: reading, writing, listening, and speaking and suggested strategies for these four skills; however, she proposed no distinct learning strategy for grammar because she was of the opinion that grammar had attributes overlapping with those four major skills.

Oxford (1990) classified learning strategies under two major categories. For Oxford, learning strategies were either Direct Strategies which directly affect the learning process or Indirect Strategies which indirectly affect the learning process. Under Direct Strategies, there are “memory” (grouping, elaboration, contextualization), “cognitive” (repeating, formally practicing sounds, rule exercises, recognizing and using formula and patterns, recombining, practicing naturalistically, deductive reasoning, contrastive analysis, translation, transfer, taking notes, highlighting) and “compensation” (using linguistic clues, switching to mother tongue, getting help from others, using mime or gesture, adjusting the message, coining words, using synonyms) strategies. She makes a sharp distinction between memory and cognitive strategies. Under Indirect Strategies, there are “metacognitive”, (linking with already known material, paying attention, organizing, setting goals, identifying the purpose of a language task, planning, seeking practice opportunities) “affective” (lowering anxiety, encouraging oneself by making positive statements and rewarding oneself, using a checklist, writing a language learning diary, discussing your feelings with somebody else) and “social” (asking questions for clarification and verification, asking for correction, cooperating with others, developing cultural understanding) strategies. It should be noted here that unlike O’Malley and Chamot (1990), she makes a sharp distinction between affective strategies and social strategies.

2.2. Related Studies

Certain studies dealing with learning strategies have been given in this part. The studies in this part are not only related to the effects of learning strategies on foreign language grammar, but also related to other fields of language.

One of the studies instrumental in showing the long-term effects of memory strategies on learning EFL vocabulary was conducted in Turkey. In order to investigate the effects of memory strategy instruction on Turkish EFL learners’ strategy use, Baykul (2010) designed a study and tried to discover if memory strategy training contributed to the learners’ vocabulary learning levels both in the short-run and after

one week. The research was conducted on 48 students at a state Vocational and Technical High School for Girls in Turkey. The experimental group consisted of 19 students while the control group consisted of 29 students. This study was conducted in 2008-2009 academic year with a six-week study. The researcher administered a pre-test on both groups and took out the words that were known. For three weeks, the researcher gave strategy training to the experimental group and after the trainings, a strategy checklist and receptive and productive vocabulary tests were administered to both groups. Even though there wasn't significant difference between the scores of the experimental group and control group, there was a slight difference favoring the experimental group, which shows that strategy teaching contributed to students' vocabulary achievement even if not significantly.

Another study on the effects of learning strategies was carried out by Alamdari (2010) who looked into the relationship between vocabulary learning strategies the first-year students at Hacettepe University benefited from and the success these students had in learning the vocabulary items. The students were given a vocabulary learning strategy questionnaire and English Vocabulary Test. The researcher analyzed the data obtained from the Vocabulary learning strategy questionnaire and English Vocabulary Test in three parts. The first finding was that students used cognitive, determination and social strategies highly while metacognitive and memory strategies were used in medium level. Secondly, as a result of correlation coefficient and Multiple Regression statistics, it became clear that there was relationship between successful vocabulary learning and use of cognitive and social strategies. Thirdly, the researcher found that students used a number of vocabulary learning strategies, but social and cognitive strategies were the most commonly used ones by successful learners. Even though that study was conducted on a limited sample group comprising only preparatory school students in a university, its results may be taken as basis in designing a language classroom in which the teacher aims to teach vocabulary items with the help of learning strategies. As it determines very specifically which strategies helped the students achieve most, it greatly contributes to the pedagogical aspect of vocabulary teaching in an EFL context.

This present study not only seeks answers to the effects of learning strategies on English grammar but also determines the role of gender in learning grammar and to what extent gender and learning strategies interact to achieve better results. From this perspective, the study of Aslan (2009) was designed to seek similar answers. Aslan (2009) investigated the language learning strategies EFL learners made use of and tried to find out whether there was significant relationship between strategy use and success level. The researcher also tried to find out whether gender played a role in favoring a particular strategy and whether gender played a role in success levels. There were 257 participants all of whom were Atılım University English Prep School students. 153 of them were male while 104 of them were female. All these participants had the same English proficiency level. Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) of Oxford (1990) was administered to students in Turkish form which was formed by Cesur and Fer (2007). SILL is composed of 50 items in six subscales. The data obtained from SILL were analyzed through SPSS 15.0. Independent t-tests and an ANOVA test, along with post hoc procedures were performed on the data from SILL. The researcher investigated the relationship between language learning strategies, gender and academic achievement. The researcher found that there was significant relationship between males and females in achievement test favoring the latter. Moreover, females made use of more learning strategies than males. Learning strategies were positively effective in success in English. Therefore, there was significant relationship between gender, language learning strategies and achievement in English.

The effects of learning strategies on success in students' four macro-skills have also been investigated widely. As the majority of language classrooms are designed to teach the students a foreign language in such a way that those students will be able to use the foreign language in different discourses as efficiently as possible, it is beyond that the students should benefit from learning strategies to master in different aspects of language like speaking or reading. To that end, Mendi (2009) looked into the relationship between students' reported use of reading strategies, motivation and reading proficiency performance. The researcher also sought to investigate the effects of gender, language proficiency level and amount of outside reading on students' reported use of reading strategies, foreign language learning motivation and reading

proficiency performance. Out of 1192 University Prep School EFL learners in Istanbul, 334 students participated in that study. All students were intermediate level and elementary level students. The Survey of Reading Strategies developed by Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002), the Motivation/Attitude Questionnaire developed by Dörnyei (1990), an English Reading Proficiency Test and interviews were administered on the students as data collection instruments. Most of the students reported that reading in English was important for language learning; however they didn't make use of extensive reading outside of their classrooms. There wasn't significant relationship between gender and reported use of language learning strategies. Moreover, there wasn't significant relationship between reported use of language learning strategies and achievement level in English. Female students were more motivated towards learning language than male students. In English Reading Proficiency Test, females were more successful than males. There came out a positive relationship between reading strategy use and motivation; and there came out a positive relationship between reading performance and motivation. Therefore, it may be possible to conclude that if the students were presented with reading learning strategies, they would be more motivated towards reading in that foreign language.

The global trend in language classrooms has been over student-centered approach over years now. Rather than the teacher determining the types of activities and tasks in classes, it should be the students that trigger the teacher to choose activities according to their own learning styles and learning strategy preferences. The teachers should find out the students' learning styles whether through survey, observation or through interviews with students. To determine the relationship between university preparatory class students' language learning strategies, learning styles and their language academic success, Cesur (2008) carried out a descriptive study. There were 376 participants from 8 different universities in Istanbul. The researcher administered Turkish version of Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory of Language Learning, and Turkish version of Cohen, Oxford and Chi's (2001) Learning Style Survey to find out about the students' language learning strategies and learning styles. To find out the academic success of the students, the researcher developed an English Language Test and administered it to the students. The results showed that Turkish university prep

students made use of compensation strategies most. Metacognitive strategies were the second most frequently used ones. After metacognitive strategies came memory, cognitive, social and affective strategies in order of frequency, respectively. Females and science students used more learning strategies. It also became clear that there was strong relationship between cognitive, memory, compensation strategies and academic success in foreign language.

Learning strategies do not only contribute to students' comprehending certain aspects of the language better, but they also help students retain those aspects of the foreign language for longer periods and more easily. If the aim in any foreign language classroom is to make the students transfer the information in their working memory to long-term memory, learning strategies are great aids for the teachers to achieve this. Tunçer (2007) looked into the effects of the use of learning strategies in education on students' academic success, their level of retention, and their attitudes. Even though the focus of the study was learning strategies, they weren't investigated in language learning but in other fields. Even so, that study is instrumental in showing the effects of learning strategies on retention of academic information by students. The researcher chose an experimental group and a control group; and administered a pre-test and a post-test to both groups. The achievement test of the unit of "Community Workers", attitude scale for Social Studies lesson, lessons plans that are designed with the aim of teaching learning strategies and the texts about the unit of "Community Workers" were used as data collection instruments. The data obtained from these tools were analyzed through SPSS and t-test was used to compare the experimental group and control group. In 5th grade of Social Studies lesson, there came out a significant difference between the experimental group and control group in terms of academic success, favoring the experimental group. In 5th grade of Social Studies lesson, there was no significant difference between the experimental group and control group in terms of students' attitudes towards lessons. As a last point, there was significant difference between the experimental group and control group in terms of students' level of retention, favoring the experimental group. That study paved the way to further studies in foreign language teaching. If learning strategies help students retain academic information in social sciences, they might be helpful in retention of foreign language, as well.

Students' preference over certain learning strategies may also be affected by the students' level of English, as well. While students in beginner level may have a taste for some strategies, students in intermediate level may prefer some other strategies. To find out whether there is really such a tendency among students of different levels, Gurata (2008) sought answers to which learning strategies Turkish EFL learners make use of in learning grammar and grammar structures; the effect of gender and proficiency level on the use of learning strategy; and the relationship between the use of learning strategies and achievement in grammar tests. The study was conducted on 176 participants all of whom were students at Middle East Technical University (METU), School of Foreign Languages. There were participants from three different proficiency levels (pre-intermediate, intermediate, and upper-intermediate). A 35-item questionnaire was given to the participants to understand the grammar learning strategies. The results of the study showed that learning grammar was important for Turkish EFL learners; and these very same learners made use of various strategies in learning grammar. There came out a difference between males and females in terms of strategy use. Moreover, the level of proficiency had a significant effect on the type of strategy used. Finally, there was significant relationship between strategy use and the students' grammar achievement. Hence, language teachers should pay close attention to the level of proficiency of the students while assigning tasks by which the students will be made to make use of learning strategies. The learning tasks assigned by the teacher should be compatible with the students' proficiency level.

Most of the related studies presented in this chapter were conducted on university students. However, the effect of learning strategies should also be investigated in lower grades like high school or primary school. In order to find out the effects of learning strategies on high school students' learning vocabulary, Aydemir (2007) conducted an experimental study to look into the effects of the instruction of vocabulary learning strategies on students' vocabulary achievement. 9th grade students of a high school in Bursa were chosen as the participants of that study. One classroom was chosen as the experimental group and another one as the control group. The study was conducted in 2006-2007 academic year. The researcher collected data through a Vocabulary Learning Strategy Use Test and a Vocabulary Learning Strategies

Questionnaire. The data obtained from these tools were analyzed through SPSS 11.0. The researcher used t-test, frequencies and percentages as the statistical tools. In the post-test, the experimental group, which was given vocabulary learning strategy instruction by the researcher, scored better than the control group, which wasn't provided with any vocabulary learning strategy instruction. Therefore, we are safe to conclude that instruction of vocabulary learning strategies contributes to students' learning vocabulary items better. That study may be a motive for further studies to compare the effects of learning strategies on different grades. It may also be a motive for the authorities in Ministry of Education to take learning strategies into account while doing needs analysis and drawing up curricula for high school foreign language classes.

So far, all studies included in this chapter have been on the correlation between learning strategy use and academic performance. It should also be noted that a teacher should drive the students into using learning strategies even after first presenting them in the classroom. Learning strategies are particularly helpful if they are incorporated into students' studying behaviors even when out of the classroom. Regarding this, the study by Evcim (2008) may throw light into the issue in which she tried to find out which learning strategies were used by university prep class students and the effects of these strategies on the retention of vocabulary. The researcher chose two groups from Kocaeli University Department of Foreign Languages. The experimental group consisted of 23 students. The control group, likewise, consisted of 23 students, too. The researcher administered Strategy Inventory for Language Learning and a Vocabulary Test on the students to ensure that these two groups are equal to one another so that the results can be discussed safely. To determine the language learning strategies of the students, the researcher applied "Strategy Inventory for Language Learning", developed by Rebecca Oxford (1990), and translated into Turkish checking its validity and reliability by Melek Demirel (2007). Moreover, to determine the proficiency level of the students, the researcher developed a vocabulary test and checked its validity and reliability. The results of the study showed that there wasn't significant difference between the pre and post Strategy Inventory for Language Learning test results of the experimental group. There was no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in terms of post Strategy Inventory for Language Learning

test results. There was significant difference between the pre-test and post-test vocabulary test scores of the experimental group. There was significant difference between the post-test scores of the experimental group and control group favoring the experimental group. Therefore, even though learning strategy instruction contributed to students' academic performance in learning vocabulary, this didn't have a significant effect on students' reported use of learning strategies. Teachers should assign tasks both in and out of the classroom in such a way that they should facilitate the students' use of learning strategies.

While certain strategies may have positive correlation with academic performance, some strategies may have no effect on students' language performance. Taking individual differences into consideration, just as no two students learn in the same way, no two strategies will be beneficial to students in the same way. Likewise, the same learning strategy may help in one aspect of the language while it may be totally useless in another aspect of the language. To this end, Uslan (2006) conducted a study to find out whether there was significant relationship between learning strategy use and achievement in grammar and which strategies were reported to be used by the students most and which strategies were reported to be used least commonly. There were 596 participants, all of whom were students at an intensified language preparation program at Dokuz Eylül University Foreign Languages School. A Likert type "Grammar Learning Strategies Scale" containing 28 items and a grammar test containing 50 questions were used as data collection tools. The data were analyzed through mean, standard deviation, t-Test and percentage statistical techniques. Social-affective strategies were reported to be the most frequently used strategies while compensation strategies were reported to be the second most frequently used strategies. Female participants were found to use more learning strategies than male participants. The participants in master programs were found to use more strategies than the freshman students. Successful students were found to use more learning strategies than unsuccessful students. There was a significant correlation between the use of compensation strategies and achievement. No significant correlation was found between the use of cognitive, social-affective and comparison strategies and achievement. Regarding those results, teachers should adjust their classes according to the grade of

the students and the preference of the students.

There should be mutual interest in learning strategies both by the teacher and the students. Only if the teacher can demonstrate and convince the students about the effectiveness of learning strategies can those students' awareness be raised to make use of learning strategies. In order to find out the reciprocal attitudes of students and teachers towards learning strategies, Tezgiden (2006) tried to find out the effects of vocabulary learning strategy instruction on learners' strategy use. Learner and teacher attitudes towards strategy instruction were also investigated in that study. The participant group was a pre-intermediate English prep class at Afyon Kocatepe University, School of Foreign Languages and their teacher. The researcher prepared lesson plans for three weeks and the teacher of the class gave strategy instruction for that three-week period. Classroom observation, vocabulary learning strategies questionnaires, learner and teacher interviews and learning diaries were used as data collection instruments. Both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed and the results of the analysis showed that there was significant relationship between strategy instruction and strategy use; however, there was no significant relationship between strategy instruction and learner perceptions of usefulness. Not only the students but also the teacher had positive attitudes towards strategy instruction.

When students are taught learning strategies explicitly in classrooms, they are more likely to benefit from those strategies. Accordingly, the experimental groups which are provided with learning strategy instruction and learning tasks compatible with those strategies in various studies proved to be better learners than the control groups which weren't taught any learning strategies. If the students aren't taught learning strategies, they might not benefit from learning strategies as much. As learning strategies are teachable and learnable concepts, the study by Yalçın (2003) is instrumental in showing the natural tendency of students towards using learning strategies without any instruction from the teacher. In that study, Yalçın tried to find out whether there was significant relationship between the use of grammar learning strategies and the students' achievement without any instruction from the teacher. The participants were 425 prep school students from Gaziantep University. A 43-item

questionnaire, four midterm exams, 22 quizzes and one final exam were used as data collection tools. Frequencies, percentages, means, t-test and one way ANOVA were used as statistical techniques in the analysis of the data. The findings showed that the participants used grammar learning strategies. There wasn't statistically significant relationship between grammar learning strategies and achievement in grammar. Both successful and unsuccessful students made use of grammar learning strategies equally. Considering those results, if the students are left on their own in terms of learning strategies and if those strategies are not taught by the teacher, learning strategies may not work well for students as was the case in study by Yalçın.

Most of the studies on learning strategies focus on the effects of learning strategies on students' academic performance. When the studies are conducted experimentally, that is, when the teacher teaches learning strategies besides language content, there tends to come out a significant relationship between learning strategies and language performance. Different strategies may be beneficial in different aspects of language. Grammar and vocabulary knowledge in the foreign language have been found to be significantly related to learning strategies. However, in descriptive studies, generally there was not a significant relationship between learning strategies and academic performance in foreign language, which shows that the teacher should motivate the students to use learning strategies appropriately and design the language courses accordingly so that those students can use those strategies to master in the foreign language.

CHAPTER III

3. Method

In this chapter, the general design of the study is discussed. Research questions, research model, detailed information about the participants, data collection instruments and data collection procedure are given in this chapter.

3.1 Research Questions

This study aimed to seek answers to the following 8 research questions:

1. Is there a significant difference between the pre-test scores and post-test scores of the students in experimental group regarding the use of learning strategies?
2. Is there a significant difference between the pre-test scores and post-test scores of the students in the control group?
3. Is there a significant difference between the 10 quiz scores of the experimental group and control group regarding the use of learning strategies?
4. Are the pre-test and post-test scores of the students in the experimental group significantly different from the pre-test and post-test scores of the students in the control group?
5. Is there a significant difference between male and female students in the experimental group in terms of their pre-test scores and post-test scores regarding the use of learning strategies?
6. Is there a significant difference between male and female students in the control group in terms of their pre-test scores and post-test scores?
7. Is there a significant difference between genders in terms of 10 quiz scores?

8. Which learning strategy is used most commonly by the students in the experimental group in different weeks?

3.2 Design of the Study

This is an experimental study comparing the results of the experimental group with those of the control group. The aim of the study is to find out whether teaching learning strategies explicitly within the classroom contributes to the students' higher achievement in grammar lessons. Necessary data were obtained both quantitatively and qualitatively. A grammar achievement test and ten quizzes were administered to obtain the achievement scores of the students both in the experimental group and the control group. Moreover, a self-assessment chart was given to students in the experimental group, and they were asked to write down which learning strategies they used in the previous week and state whether those strategies helped them learn the particular grammar topic in an easier and better way. Through grammar achievement test and quizzes, quantitative data were obtained while qualitative data were obtained through the self-assessment charts. The data were analyzed through SPSS 15.0 (Statistical Package of Social Sciences) and independent sample t-test and frequency and percentage statistics were used.

3.3 Setting

The study was conducted at the Düzce University English Preparatory School. The study was conducted on an informed group of students. At this point, a brief summary about the system at prep school may be necessary to pave the way to showing how the participants were chosen.

At Düzce University, the preparatory program is a must for tourism, landscape architecture, Forest Industry, Forest Engineering, Computer Engineering, and Electricity and Electronics Engineering departments. The students take a proficiency

exam at the beginning of the semester. The proficiency exam involves vocabulary, grammar, reading, function, and dialogue questions. All questions are multiple-choice. At the end of the exam, the students are required to write an essay of 450-500 words, clearly explaining their opinions about the topic that they will choose among the three options given. If the students can get 65 points out of 100, they are to take and pass the oral exam too, which is given one-day after the results of the written exam are revealed. In the year this study was conducted, only one student was able to get 65 out of 100 in the written exam; however, he couldn't pass the oral exam and was therefore admitted to the preparatory program.

After the proficiency exam results are announced officially, the students take a placement exam. The placement exam is a two-level multiple-choice exam. The first part consists of 30 questions and 18 of the questions are for the beginner level, while the rest 12 are for the pre-intermediate level. There are grammar, vocabulary, and function questions in this first part. The results of the first exam are announced within one hour after the exam, and the students who have got 15 correct answers or higher scores out of the first exam are entitled to take the second exam two hours after the first part of the exam. In the second part of the placement exam, there are 30 multiple-choice questions. There are 8 questions for the beginner level, 8 questions for the pre-intermediate level, 8 questions for the intermediate group and 6 questions for the upper-intermediate level. There are grammar, vocabulary, function, and dialogue questions in the second test. There is no question for the advanced level since if there were any advanced level students; they would already have passed the proficiency exam which mostly consists of upper-intermediate and advanced level questions. In this second part of the placement exam, the students who have got 25 correct answers are placed into B1 level classes. The students who got 17-24 correct answers are placed into A2 level classes and the students who got 9-16 correct answers are placed into A1 level classes starting from the top grade which is 16, to the bottom grade which is 9. The students who have got 8 or fewer correct answers are also placed into A1 level classes, but they are classified along with the students who have given fewer than 15 correct answers in the first part of the placement exam rather than the ones who have taken the second exam. In the end, each section has 24-26 students.

In this study, there were also students who didn't take either the proficiency exam or the placement exam. As nothing was known about their English background, they were placed into the A1-1, A1-2, and A1-3 sections (or maybe A1-4 or A1-5 if the number of them is too many as was the case in 2010-2011 academic year) purely randomly, and those classrooms were reserved for those students who didn't take the placement exam, and no student who took the placement exam could be a part of those classrooms. In the course of time, if some students proved superior to others in those random classes, they were admitted to higher level sections like A2 or even B1, taking their first few quiz scores, or midterm scores into consideration if there is any.

The students in the B1 level classrooms receive 24 hours of English instruction per week. 6 hours are allocated to Grammar; 9 hours are allocated to Listening & Speaking and another 9 hours are allocated to Reading & Writing. They are taught by 3 different teachers, one for Grammar, one for Reading & Writing and one for Listening & Speaking. From the first day of the school onwards, they receive those 3 different courses.

The situation is different in the A level classes. All A level classes receive 26 hours of English per week. The hours for Grammar are the same as in the B level classes, and 6 hours are allocated to Grammar. However, for Reading & Writing and for Listening & Speaking courses, the A level classes receive 10 hours of instruction for each. What is more, all A level students receive 5 weeks of course book instruction from 3 different teachers who will be their Grammar, Listening & Speaking, and Reading & Writing teachers from the 6th week onwards. During these five weeks, a number of units from the course book are covered so that the students can feel comfortable in Listening & Speaking, and Reading & Writing classes from the 6th week on. From the 6th week onwards, all classes use the same books for all three different lessons.

The assessment of the students is done through 4 midterms (2 in the first semester, and another 2 in the second semester), 8 Listening & Speaking quizzes, 7 Reading & Writing quizzes, and 6 Grammar quizzes, weekly homework assignments

for all three lessons, and one final exam. In the midterms, there are Grammar, Listening, Reading, Writing, and function questions, and one day after the written exam, there is the oral exam for Speaking. The average of all midterms accounts for 20% of the final grade of the students. The average of all quizzes accounts for 20% of the final score, and the average of all homework assignments accounts for 20% of the final score. The final exam, which is comparable to a proficiency exam given at the beginning of the semester, accounts for 40% of the final score. The students who get 65 points or higher as the final score are considered “successful” while the ones who get lower than 65 average as the final score are counted “unsuccessful”. Even the unsuccessful students can continue their education in their own departments the next year, and they won’t repeat the preparatory class even if they can’t pass it successfully.

3.4. Period

This study was conducted for 6 consecutive weeks. The students in both groups received 6 hours of grammar every week. The experimental group received one more hour for explicit strategy teaching every week. The topics in the grammar course were taught in a total of 36 hours.

The study was conducted for 6 weeks even though a regular semester is 17 weeks long. The reason for this is that; in the first week of the academic year students took a proficiency test and an oral exam and attended orientation programs run by their departments. Classes began on the Monday of the second week. For the next 5 weeks (week 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), a course book titled “Focus on Grammar 2” was covered in all A-level (beginner level) classrooms to form a basis in students so that they can successfully continue their English studies throughout the rest of the academic year. Between weeks seven and seventeen, during which this study was conducted, three instructors taught three different courses in each section. One instructor taught reading-writing, one taught listening-speaking, and one taught grammar. There were no classes for one week for the university was closed for a religious holiday; one week was also spent on written and oral midterms, and a total of 6 hours of Grammar classes went into

common quizzes of reading-writing and listening-speaking classes which were administered at the same time in all classes. Therefore, 6 weeks of active teaching time have been devoted to that study.

3.5. Participants

For a purely random selection and minimum difference between the two groups, the experimental group and control group were selected from the A level classes whose students didn't take the placement exam and were randomly placed into their classrooms.

There were 50 participants in total. There were 34 male participants (68,0%) and 16 female participants (32%). The number of male participants was twice as many as female participants since that is the general gender tendency in the preparatory school. Table 3.1 shows the same information in numeric form.

Table 3.1. The ratio of male and female participants

		<i>f</i>	%
Gender	Male	34	68,0
	Female	16	32,0
Total		50	100,0

Of those 50 participants, 26 were in experimental group (52,0%) and 24 were in control group (48,8%). Table 3.2 shows the distribution of students in the experimental and the control group.

Table 3.2 The ratio of experimental group and control group participants

		<i>f</i>	%
Group	Experimental Group	26	52,0
	Control Group	24	48,0
Total		50	100,0

Most of the students in either group were high school graduates aged between

17-20; however, there were a few students in either group who finished vocational high schools and came to this university as university graduates.

The participants in the experimental group were taught language learning strategies explicitly during the 6-week study period in addition to grammar teaching while those in the control group didn't receive any learning strategy.

3.6. Data Collection Instrument

3.6.1. English Grammar Achievement Test

As the data collection instrument, an English Grammar Achievement Test was developed by the researcher. The test included 40 multiple-choice questions. The test questions were about the grammar points that would be covered in the Grammar lessons during the six-week study period. The units that would be taught during these six weeks had already been determined by a close examination of the preparatory school curriculum by the researcher, and the questions were prepared accordingly. 10 grammar subjects were taught during this six-week study period.

For each subject, 4 questions were prepared so that each unit could be represented equally in the test, and this 40-question English Grammar Achievement Test was administered on 101 students, who were also students at the preparatory school of Düzce University in order to assess the reliability of the test. The results of this pilot study were analyzed through ITEMAN For Windows 3.5. Point Biserial was adopted as the type of correlation that would be used to determine the reliability of each item in the test and .30 was the lowest standard score for any item to be considered reliable.

As a result of the analysis, the items 1, 11, 22, 25, 27, 28, 33, 34, 36, and 38 were taken out of the test and the new English Grammar Achievement Test included 30 questions, again each unit represented equally with three questions for each. The point

biserial correlation is a measure of association between the right and wrong answers the students get out of an item and the total scores students get when summing up their scores across the remaining items. It is constrained to be between -1 and +1. If point biserial value is positive and high, this means that the students who have got high scores on the overall test have also got the particular item right and the students who have received low scores from the overall test have also got the particular item wrong. The items 28 and 33 were above the critical value of .30 Point Biserial, yet they were still taken out of the test because each grammar point in this achievement test could only be tested through 3 questions for validity concerns and these two items had the lowest Point Biserial scores among their parallel question items in the test. Below are the reliability results for the 10 items that were taken out of the initial form of the test.

Item Statistics				Alternative Statistics										
Seq. No.	Scale -Item	Prop. Correct	Disc. Index	Point Biser.	Alt.	Prop. Total	Endorsing Low	Endorsing High	Point Biser.	Key				
1	1-1	.47	.38	<u>.29</u>	A	.32	.52	.20	-.27					
					B	.16	.16	.10	-.04					
					C	.01	.00	.00	-.07					
					D	.05	.06	.07	.03					
					E	.47	.26	.63	.29	*				
					Other	.00	.00	.00						
11	1-11	.18	.17	<u>.15</u>	A	.27	.45	.07	-.34					
					B	.11	.06	.10	.05					
					CHECK THE KEY				C	.18	.10	.27	.15	*
					C was specified, E works better				D	.23	.26	.13	-.12	
					E	.22	.13	.43	.31	?				
					Other	.00	.00	.00						
Seq. No.	Scale -Item	Prop. Correct	Disc. Index	Point Biser.	Alt.	Prop. Total	Endorsing Low	Endorsing High	Point Biser.	Key				
22	1-22	.33	.17	<u>.20</u>	A	.18	.23	.13	-.17					
					B	.17	.19	.13	-.07					
					C	.33	.19	.37	.20	*				
					D	.14	.16	.13	-.05					
					E	.19	.23	.23	.03					
					Other	.00	.00	.00						
25	1-25	.18	.20	<u>.26</u>	A	.21	.13	.30	.20					
					B	.18	.06	.20	.06					

					C	.30	.48	.17	-.27	
					D	.18	.10	.30	.26	*
					E	.14	.23	.03	-.23	
					Other	.00	.00	.00		
27	1-27	.25	.27	<u>.24</u>	A	.14	.16	.13	.01	
					B	.12	.10	.03	-.14	
					C	.25	.13	.40	.24	*
					D	.12	.23	.00	-.27	
					E	.38	.39	.43	.05	
					Other	.00	.00	.00		
28	1-28	.46	.54	.50	A	.18	.19	.10	-.18	
					B	.16	.19	.07	-.16	
					C	.09	.13	.03	-.12	
					D	.46	.26	.80	.50	*
					E	.12	.23	.00	-.27	
					Other	.00	.00	.00		
33	1-33	.35	.44	.45	A	.19	.16	.10	-.09	
					B	.35	.23	.67	.45	*
					C	.14	.19	.00	-.25	
					D	.21	.19	.20	-.06	
					E	.12	.23	.03	-.21	
					Other	.00	.00	.00		
34	1-34	.07	.00	<u>.10</u>	A	.13	.19	.07	-.17	
					B	.36	.26	.53	.22	?
	CHECK THE KEY				C	.29	.16	.27	.05	
	D was specified, B works better				D	.07	.10	.10	.10	*
					E	.16	.29	.03	-.27	
					Other	.00	.00	.00		

Item Statistics					Alternative Statistics					
Seq. No.	Scale -Item	Prop. Correct	Disc. Index	Point Biser.	Alt.	Prop. Total	Endorsing Low	High	Point Biser.	Key
----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---
36	1-36	.32	.14	<u>.03</u>	A	.26	.23	.27	.05	
					B	.13	.19	.03	-.14	
	CHECK THE KEY				C	.16	.29	.07	-.15	
	E was specified, D works better				D	.14	.06	.27	.19	?
					E	.32	.23	.37	.03	*
					Other	.00	.00	.00		
38	1-38	.31	.14	<u>.14</u>	A	.25	.19	.23	.09	
					B	.31	.26	.40	.14	*
					C	.08	.10	.03	-.13	

D	.26	.42	.13	-.25
E	.11	.03	.20	.13
Other	.00	.00	.00	

As has been said, the final form of the English Grammar Achievement Test consisted of 30 questions, and the reliability of the test was measured through ITEMAN For Windows 3.5 again and the Alpha value of test was found to be 0.881, which is above the critical point of 0.700 in order for a test to be considered reliable. Below is the cumulative statistical summary of the 30 items that were included in the final version of the test.

Scale:	1

N of Items	30
N of Examinees	101
Mean	12.208
Variance	42.957
Std. Dev.	6.554
Skew	0.594
Kurtosis	-0.806
Minimum	2.000
Maximum	28.000
Median	10.000
Alpha	0.881
SEM	2.264
Mean P	0.407
Mean Item-Tot.	0.459
Mean Biserial	0.591
Max Score (Low)	7
N (Low Group)	33
Min Score (High)	16
N (High Group)	32

3.6.2. Unit quizzes

For each unit that would be covered from the book during this six-week study, a quiz was given to both the experimental group and the control group to see whether the strategies that were taught in a particular week and particular topic helped the experimental group achieve higher in Grammar. There were 10 units, and accordingly 10 quizzes. All 10 quizzes were adapted from the Assessment Pack of the course book

Focus on Grammar. There are achievement tests for each unit in this Assessment Pack and the students can't get this pack because only some teachers are given this pack. The questions in the achievement tests in this pack were included in the unit quizzes; no modification or alteration was made on the questions, only the number of questions was reduced.

3.6.3. Self-evaluation chart

To obtain qualitative information, a self-evaluation chart was prepared by the researcher. In this chart, week number and the Grammar points that would be taught in that particular week were written on the top. In the chart, the students were asked to write which strategies they used every week and state whether the strategies they used worked well for learning the particular grammar point for that week, and state the reason why they think the strategies worked or didn't work.

There were also quiz targets and quiz results for each week. This was for the students to see whether the strategies they used worked well or not. The students wrote their names on the top of the chart, and each student used the same chart during this six-week study.

3.7 Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected at the beginning and end of the period of data collection and on weekly basis. Although regular attendance was taken during six weeks of study and attendance was compulsory, there were some irregular students who came for two weeks but didn't come to class for one week and then came another week but didn't turn up the next week. Those students who were absent the previous class weren't given quizzes and weren't asked to fill in the chart, asking which strategies they employed and to what extent those strategies became useful. Therefore, the number of students who took the weekly quizzes and evaluated their own success and the benefits of the learning strategies varied each week both in the experimental group and the control group.

After each unit, a quiz was administered to both the experimental group and the control group. The experimental group was explicitly taught the learning strategies and their homework assignments were given in such a way that they would be able to use the strategies that they were taught while doing their homework. On Monday every week during the study, the students were given the quizzes of the previous week's units in the presence of the researcher, knowing that these quizzes would count in their final quiz average.

Before taking the quizzes, the experimental group was given the chart they had written their names on. They were told the number of questions in the quiz and asked to write down their target in this test and the strategies that they used in studying the previous week's units. After all students filled in those two blanks on the Self-evaluation chart, they were given the quizzes and after the teacher corrected the quizzes and announced the results of the quizzes, the students were asked to write down the score of the quiz and compare it to their already set targets on the same chart and then decide whether the strategies worked or not and what made them think that the strategies worked or didn't work, which enabled the researcher to obtain the qualitative data. After the charts were filled for the week, the researcher collected the charts back lest the students should forget them at home for the next week. The teacher distributed the charts before quizzes and collected them back every week during the study.

3.8 Data Analysis

The quantitative data obtained through English Grammar Achievement Test and 10 quizzes were analyzed using SPSS for Windows 15.0 (Statistical Package of Social Sciences). Independent Sample t-test was used to compare the results of the experimental and control groups. Frequency and percentage statistics were used to give the population of the experiment and the control groups and the male and the female participants. The data from the self-evaluation chart were analyzed qualitatively by the researcher.

CHAPTER IV

4. Results and Findings

In this chapter, the results of research questions are presented with the help of the tables and figures. All tables and figures are based on the results obtained from the SPSS analysis. The qualitative data concerning the last research question are based on the personal answers of the students on the Self-evaluation chart. Independent Sample t-test was used in order to answer the questions concerning the difference between the two groups.

4.1. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the First Research Question

“Is there a significant difference between the pre-test scores and post-test scores of the students in experimental group regarding the use of learning strategies” was asked to see whether there was a significant difference between the pre-test scores and post-test scores of the students in the experimental group. Since the students received six weeks of English grammar instruction and language learning strategies, they were expected to improve in grammar. To understand the effect of this six-week study, their pre-test and post-test results were analyzed through paired sample t-test. The statistical significance level was accepted to be $p < .05$ as was the case in all other research questions analysis.

The difference the experimental group students achieved between the pre-test and post-test, designed in line with the purpose of the study, is seen in table 4.1.

Table 4.1. T-test results regarding the significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group

	Test	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Experimental Group	Pre-test	26	14,92	5,20	-7,71	25	,000*
	Post-test	26	20,92	4,41			

*p<.05

As seen in Table 4.1, regarding the significance level to be $p<.05$, there is a significant difference between pre-test scores and post-test scores of experimental group, as indicated with the result of $t_{(25)} = -7,71$. This significant difference results from the fact that their pre-test score average ($\bar{X} = 14,92$) is lower than their post-test score average ($\bar{X} = 20,92$). The significant difference favoring the post-test clearly shows that the six-week study worked well for the experimental group. As the tasks and the assignments the students were required to complete were chosen in such a way that they could make use of the strategies that they were taught in the particular weeks, this difference can be attributed to strategy teaching.

4.2. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the Second Research Question

The second research question “Is there a significant difference between the pre-test scores and post-test scores of the students in the control group” was asked to see whether there was significant difference between the pre-test scores and post-test scores of the students in the control group. Even though the control group didn’t receive any kind of language learning strategy during this six-week study and only received regular content instruction with the grammar teacher covering the units as is the case in other classrooms, they were still expected to improve thanks to regular grammar teaching hours. To understand the effect of this six-week regular grammar instruction, their pre-test and post-test results were analyzed through paired sample t-test. The statistical significance level was accepted to be $p<.05$ as was the case in all other research question analysis.

The results of this research question are very important because the grammar teacher of both the experimental group and control group is the same person, that is, the researcher. Thus, the researcher taught the same grammar content in both groups and made sure the grammar content was taught as clearly as possible in both groups. This way, researcher bias was eliminated. The only difference in both groups was strategy instruction in the experimental group.

The difference in the control group students' pre-test and post-test results is presented in table 4.2.

Table 4.2. T-test results regarding the difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the control group

	Test	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Control Group	Pre-test	24	14,20	5,63	-6,20	23	,000*
	Post-test	24	17,58	5,64			

*p<.05

As seen in table 4.2, regarding the significance level to be $p < .05$, there is significant difference between pre-test scores and post-test scores of control group, as indicated with the result of $t_{(23)} = -6,20$. This significant difference results from the fact that their pre-test score average ($\bar{X} = 14,20$) is lower than their post-test score average ($\bar{X} = 17,58$). The significant difference favoring the post-test clearly shows that the six-week regular grammar instruction worked well for the control group, which eliminates probable doubts about researcher bias. These results show that the researcher didn't carry out any manipulation on the control group to come up with a significant difference between experimental and control groups' pre-test and post-test results. The control group advanced in grammar as was expected of a class which undergoes regular grammar instruction.

4.3. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the Third Research Question

The third research question was asked to see whether there was a significant difference between the 10 quiz scores of the experimental group and the control group.

The quiz results of the both groups were analyzed through independent sample t-test for each quiz. This question is important in that the students indicated whether the strategies they used worked well for them or not on the self-evaluation chart after each quiz and the results of those quantitative data obtained through quizzes were compared with the qualitative data obtained through the self-evaluation charts. This question is also important in that the results made it clear which strategies worked well in a particular unit and which strategies didn't bring about any difference in grammar achievement.

4.3.1. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 1

The first quiz was on Present Progressive Tense and Present Simple Tense. Students were expected to differentiate between the two tenses. As part of the instruction, students were taught Rule Formation, Rule Exercises, Short-term Goal Setting, Identifying One's Own Needs, Asking Questions, Social Cooperation, and Evaluating One's Own Strategies. The results of Quiz 1 were analyzed through independent sample t-test. Statistical significance level was accepted to be $p < .05$. The difference between the results of the experimental group and the control group in Quiz 1 is given in table 4.3.

Table 4.3. T-test results regarding the difference between the experimental group and the control group in quiz 1

	Group	N	Mean	S	T	sd	p
Quiz1	Experimental	26	19,59	3,13	2,01	48	,051
	Control	24	17,73	3,45			

* $p < .05$

As seen in table 4.3, regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there wasn't a significant difference between the scores of experimental group and control group in Quiz 1, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = 2,01$. There wasn't a significant difference between the average of the experimental group ($\bar{X} = 19,59$) and the average of the control group ($\bar{X} = 17,73$) in Quiz 1 even though there was a slight difference, favoring the experimental group. This shouldn't be surprising because this was the very first

week of strategy teaching and the students had just learned some strategies, and, considering that they hadn't received any strategy instruction beforehand, they might be still unclear about how and when to use learning strategies.

After the first quiz, the self-evaluation chart results showed that of 24 students who had taken this quiz, 21 (88%) stated that the strategies worked well for them, 2 (8%) stated that strategies partly worked for them, and 1 participant (4%) stated that the strategies didn't help them in learning the content better. That most of the students indicated that the strategies they used helped them learn the grammar point better runs parallel to the difference in Quiz 1 results, favoring the experimental group even if not significant.

4.3.2. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 2

The second quiz was on Imperatives. As part of the instruction, students were taught Rule Formation, Rule Exercises, Short-term Goal Setting, Identifying One's Own Needs, Asking Questions, Social Cooperation, Body Movement and Evaluating One's Own Strategies. The results of Quiz 2 were analyzed through independent sample t-test. Statistical significance level was accepted to be $p < .05$. The difference between the results of the experimental group and the control group in Quiz 2 is given in table 4.4.

Table 4.4. T-test results regarding the difference between the experimental group and the control group in quiz 2

	Group	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Quiz2	Experimental	26	13,52	3,11	2,28	48	,027*
	Control	24	11,42	3,41			

* $p < .05$

As seen in table 4.4, regarding the significance level to be $p < .05$, there was a significant difference between the scores of the experimental group and the control group in Quiz 2, as indicated in the result of $t_{(48)} = 2,28$. This significant difference may be attributed to the fact that the quiz score average of the experimental group ($\bar{X} = 13,52$) is higher than that of the control group ($\bar{X} = 11,42$).

4.3.3. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 3

The third quiz was on Simple Past Tense. Students were expected to refer to past events with the second forms of verbs. As part of the instruction, students were taught Rule Formation, Rule Exercises, Short-term Goal Setting, Identifying One's Own Needs, Asking Questions, Social Cooperation, and Evaluating One's Own Strategies. The results of Quiz 3 were analyzed through independent sample t-test. Statistical significance level was accepted to be $p < .05$. The difference between the results of experimental group and control group in Quiz 3 is given in table 4.5.

Table 4.5. T-test results regarding the difference between experimental group and control group in quiz 3

	Group	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Quiz3	Experimental	26	39,98	3,42	5,02	48	,000*
	Control	24	32,53	6,67			

* $p < .05$

As seen in table 4.5, regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there was a significant difference between the scores of experimental group and control group in Quiz 3, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = 5,02$. The reason for this significant difference is that the average score of experimental group ($\bar{X} = 39,98$) was higher than the average score of the control group ($\bar{X} = 32,53$). Quiz 2 and Quiz 3 were administered for the units in the same week, that is, the second week. At the end of the second week, of the 26 students who had taken these quizzes, 14 students (54%) stated that the strategies that they used for the second week helped them a lot while 11 students (42%) stated that the strategies that they used for the second week partly worked, which means that 25 students (96%) thought that the strategies for that week helped them learn the material better. 1 student (4%) stated that the strategies didn't work well for the second week's units and quizzes. Therefore, the significant difference between the experimental group and the control group for Quiz 2 and Quiz 3 shouldn't be surprising for the majority of the students stating in the self-evaluation chart that the strategies that they learned and used that week helped them learn the grammar points better.

4.3.4. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 4

The fourth quiz was on Past Progressive Tense and Simple Past Tense. Students were expected to differentiate between the two tenses. As part of the instruction, students were taught Rule Formation, Rule Exercises, Short-term Goal Setting, Identifying One's Own Needs, Asking Questions, Social Cooperation, and Evaluating One's Own Strategies. The results of Quiz 4 were analyzed through independent sample t-test. Statistical significance level was accepted to be $p < .05$. The difference between the results of experimental group and the control group in Quiz 4 is seen in table 4.6.

Table 4.6. T-test results regarding the difference between the experimental group and the control group in quiz 4

	Group	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Quiz4	Experimental	26	21,77	3,80	3,43	48	,001*
	Control	24	16,88	6,12			

* $p < .05$

As seen in table 4.6, regarding the significance level to be $p < .05$, there was a significant difference between the scores of the experimental group and the control group in Quiz 4, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = 3,43$. This significant difference results from the fact that the average score of the experimental group ($\bar{X} = 21,77$) was higher than the average score of the control group ($\bar{X} = 16,88$).

4.3.5. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 5

The fifth quiz was on Used to. Students were expected to refer to past habits. As part of the instruction, students were taught Rule Formation, Rule Exercises, Short-term Goal Setting, Identifying One's Own Needs, Asking Questions, Social Cooperation, and Evaluating One's Own Strategies. The results of Quiz 5 were analyzed through independent sample t-test. Statistical significance level was accepted to be $p < .05$. The difference between the results of the experimental group and the control group in Quiz 5 is given in table 4.7.

Table 4.7. T-test results regarding the difference between experimental group and control group in quiz 5

	Group	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Quiz5	Experimental	26	17,38	1,60	3,40	48	,001*
	Control	24	13,58	5,44			

*p<.05

As seen in table 4.7, regarding significance level to be $p<.05$, there is a significant difference between the scores of the experimental group and the control group in Quiz 5, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)}=3,40$. That the average score of the experimental group ($\bar{X}=17,38$) is higher than the average score of the control group ($\bar{X}=13,58$) has brought about a significant difference. Quizzes 4 and 5 were administered for the units of the same week, that is, the third week. In both quizzes, there was a significant difference, favoring the experimental group. Of the 22 participants who had taken these quizzes, 18 students (82%) stated on the self-evaluation chart that the strategies they used for that week worked well for them in learning the language material while 4 students (18%) stated that the strategies they used partly helped them in learning the language material for that week. It can be concluded that 100% of the students reported having benefited from the learning strategies positively.

4.3.6. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 6

The sixth quiz was on the Future Tense. Students were expected to refer to future events and differentiate between “will” and “be going to”. As part of the instruction, students were taught Rule Formation, Rule Exercises, Short-term Goal Setting, Identifying One’s Own Needs, Asking Questions, Social Cooperation, and Evaluating One’s Own Strategies. The results of Quiz 6 were analyzed through independent sample t-test. Statistical significance level was accepted to be $p<.05$. The difference between the results of the experimental group and the control group in Quiz 6 is seen in table 4.8.

Table 4.8. T-test results regarding the difference between the experimental group and the control group in quiz 6

	Group	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Quiz6	Experimental	26	22,09	3,39	1,63	48	,110
	Control	24	20,56	3,26			

*p<.05

As seen in table 4.8, regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there wasn't a significant difference between the scores of the experimental group and the control group. However, the average score of the experimental group was ($\bar{X} = 22,09$) while the average score of control group was ($\bar{X} = 20,56$). Yet, the difference wasn't statistically significant. This shows that the strategies used by the students for this grammar unit didn't make a great contribution to their learning the language material.

4.3.7. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 7

The seventh quiz was on Future Tense Time Clauses. Students were expected to combine two sentences with time clauses. As part of the instruction, students were taught Rule Formation, Rule Exercises, Short-term Goal Setting, Identifying One's Own Needs, Asking Questions, Social Cooperation, and Evaluating One's Own Strategies. The results of Quiz 7 were analyzed through independent sample t-test. Statistical significance level was accepted to be $p < .05$. The difference between the results of the experimental group and the control group in Quiz 7 is given in table 4.9.

Table 4.9. T-test results regarding the difference between the experimental group and the control group in quiz 7

	Group	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Quiz7	Experimental	26	23,80	6,91	-,10	48	,920
	Control	24	23,98	5,40			

*p<,05

As seen in table 4.9, regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there wasn't significant difference between the scores of the experimental group and the control group in Quiz 7, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = -,10$. The average score of the

experimental group was ($\bar{X}=23,80$) while the average score of the control group was ($\bar{X}=23,98$). The results were really very close to each other, but there wasn't a significant difference between the experimental group and control group; this shows that the strategies used by the students for this grammar unit didn't make a great contribution to their learning the language material.

The quizzes 6 and 7 were given in the same week, that is, the fourth week. Of the 24 students who had taken these quizzes that week, 18 students (75%) stated on the self-evaluation chart that the strategies that they used for that week worked well for them, 4 students (17%) stated that the strategies they used partly worked for them while 2 students (8%) stated that strategies didn't work for them for that particular week. Although 92% of the students report using the learning strategies beneficially for the given units, these strategies didn't make a significant change in students' learning Future Tenses and Future Time Clauses as the topics for the week. One reason for this lack of significant difference between the scores of the experimental and the control groups might have been that both groups covered Future Tense as the grammar content of the units in their Listening & Speaking classes in this very same week. The introduction of the Future Tenses as the grammar point in Listening & Speaking class units for the same week might have affected the outcomes of student groups in the quiz results for the week in question.

4.3.8. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 8

The eighth quiz was on *Wh-* Questions. Students were expected to ask questions and answer them accordingly. As part of the instruction, students were taught Rule Formation, Rule Exercises, Short-term Goal Setting, Identifying One's Own Needs, Asking Questions, Social Cooperation, and Evaluating One's Own Strategies. The results of Quiz 8 were analyzed through independent sample t-test. Statistical significance level was accepted to be $p<,05$. The difference between the results of the experimental group and the control group in Quiz 8 is given in table 4.10.

Table 4.10. T-test results regarding the difference between the experimental group and the control group in quiz 8

	Group	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Quiz8	Experimental	26	17,19	2,41	4,03	48	,000*
	Control	24	13,85	4,72			

*p<.05

As seen in table 4.10, regarding significance level to be $p<.05$, there was a significant difference between the scores of the experimental group and the control group in Quiz 8, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)}=4,03$. The significant difference may be attributed to the fact that the average of the experimental group ($\bar{X}=17,19$) was higher than the average score of the control group ($\bar{X}=13,85$).

4.3.9. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 9

The ninth quiz was on Reflexive and Reciprocal Pronouns. As part of the instruction, students were taught Rule Formation, Rule Exercises, Short-term Goal Setting, Identifying One's Own Needs, Asking Questions, Social Cooperation, and Evaluating One's Own Strategies. The results of Quiz 9 were analyzed through independent sample t-test. Statistical significance level was accepted to be $p<.05$. The difference between the results of the experimental group and the control group in Quiz 9 is given in table 4.11.

Table 4.11. T-test results regarding the difference between the experimental group and the control group in quiz 9

	Group	N	Mean	S	t	sd	P
Quiz9	Experimental	26	29,56	2,78	4,03	48	,000*
	Control	24	24,47	5,75			

*p<.05

As seen in table 4.11, regarding significance level to be $p<.05$, there was a significant difference between the scores of the experimental group and the control group in Quiz 9, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)}=4,03$. The significant difference may be attributed to the fact that the average of the experimental group ($\bar{X}=29,56$) was

higher than the average score of the control group ($\bar{X}=24,47$). Quiz 8 and Quiz 9 were administered in the same week, that is, the fifth week of the study. Of the 21 participants who had taken these quizzes, 15 students (71%) stated in the self-evaluation chart that strategies worked well for them for that grammar point while 4 students (19%) stated that strategies partly worked for them that week. The rest 2 students (10%) stated that the strategies they used for that week didn't help them learn the material better. 90% of the participants reported having benefited from the learning strategies for the particular units, and the analysis of the quizzes for these particular units showed a significant difference favoring the experimental group, which means that learning strategies contributed to students' learning the language material better.

4.3.10. The results of data analysis obtained from quiz 10

The tenth quiz was on Phrasal Verbs. As part of the instruction, students were taught Short-term Goal Setting, Identifying One's Own Needs, Asking Questions, Social Cooperation, Flash Cards, Elaboration, Physical Response, Repetition and Evaluating One's Own Strategies. The results of Quiz 10 were analyzed through independent sample t-test. Statistical significance level was accepted to be $p<.05$. The difference between the results of the experimental group and the control group in Quiz 10 is given in table 4.12.

Table 4.12. T-test results regarding the difference between the experimental group and the control group in quiz 10

	Group	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Quiz10	Experimental	26	13,84	3,89	-2,15	48	,037*
	Control	24	16,77	5,66			

* $p<.05$

As seen in table 4.12, regarding significance level to be $p<.05$, there was a significant difference between the scores of experimental group and control group in Quiz 10, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = -2,15$. The average score of the experimental group ($\bar{X}=13,84$) was lower than the average score of the control group ($\bar{X}=16,77$), which brought about the significant difference favoring the control group.

Throughout the 6-week study, it was only in the quiz 10 that a significant difference was in favor of the control group. In the sixth week of the study, the unit which was devoted to phrasal verbs rather than a discrete grammar point was taught. Also, unlike the former 9 units, the students were given totally different and novel learning strategies than the ones that they had been taught in the previous 5 consecutive weeks. As the grammar point was based on vocabulary learning rather than a formal grammar point, and the strategies were totally novel to the students in the experimental group, the students might not have benefited from the strategies as much as they expected and were expected of even though they were assigned tasks and homework in such a way that they could use the new learning strategies. After Quiz 10, of the 23 students who had taken the quiz, 1 student (4%) stated in the self-evaluation chart that the strategies worked well for the particular unit while 5 students (22%) stated that the strategies partly worked for them in learning the language material. 17 students (74%) stated that the strategies for the week didn't help them learn the material better. This is the only week in which majority of the students reported that the strategies didn't help them whatsoever, therefore, it is not surprising that Quiz 10 yielded significant difference, favoring the control group.

Considering the previous five weeks, during which the students in the experimental group were given the same strategies and accordingly appropriate tasks every week, students' reported use of learning strategies increased as the number of weeks increased. Rule Formation and Rule Exercises strategies were always the most commonly used strategies in the first five weeks without any exception. Asking Questions strategy tended to be the least commonly used one. Even so, while only 4% of the students reported using Asking Questions strategy in the first week, in which Asking Questions strategy was the least commonly used one, 38% of the students reported using Asking Questions strategy in the second week, in which it was the least commonly used one. In the third and fourth weeks, in which Asking Questions strategy was reported to have been used the least commonly by the students just as was the case in the first two weeks, 32% of the students used Asking Questions strategy in the third week while this number rose to 58% in the fourth week. In the fifth week, Social Cooperation Strategy was the least commonly used one with a percentage of 76%. As

learning strategies were used more and more commonly as the number of weeks of strategy instruction progressed, and as there came out a strongly significant difference between the experimental group and the control groups' quiz scores as the number of weeks progressed, it would be safe to conclude that memory strategies would have brought about similar results if they hadn't been limited to only one week due to constraints placed by the administration. If memory strategies had been presented to the students and if the students had been able to use them for a longer duration rather than one week, there might have been a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group, favoring the experimental group in the tenth quiz on Phrasal Verbs.

4.4. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the Fourth Research Question

The fourth research question "Are the pre-test and post-test scores of the students in the experimental group significantly different from the pre-test and post-test scores of the students in the control group?" was asked to see whether the pre-test and post-test scores of the students in the experimental group were significantly different from the pre-test and post-test scores of the students in the control group. This is an important question in that the whole study is based on the assumed difference the strategy teaching sessions in this six-week study would make in favor of the experimental group. In order to answer that question, both the pre-test results and the post-test results of the two groups were analyzed using independent-sample t-test.

The difference between pre-test results of control group and experimental group is given in table 4.13.

Table 4.13. T-test results concerning the difference between the experimental group and the control group in terms of their pre-test score averages

	Group	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Pre-test	Experimental	26	14,92	5,20	,47	48	,643
	Control	24	14,21	5,63			

*p<.05

As seen in table 4.13, regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there wasn't a significant difference between the pre-test score averages of the experimental group ($\bar{X} = 14,92$) and the control group ($\bar{X} = 14,21$), as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = ,47$. This is the starting point of this research study since this points to the fact that the two groups were similar to each other in English grammar before any kind of strategy training was given to the experimental group. This is also important in that should any significant difference come out in the post-test results in favor of the experimental group, this difference can securely be attributed to the strategy training given to the experimental group with all other external factors taken under control by the researcher teacher.

The difference between post-test results of the experimental group and control group is given in table 4.14.

Table 4.14. T-test results concerning the difference between the experimental group and the control group in terms of their post-test score averages

	Group	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Post-test	Experimental	26	20,92	4,41	2,34	48	,023*
	Control	24	17,58	5,64			

*p<,05

As seen in table 4.14, regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there was a significant difference between the post-test score averages of the experimental group ($\bar{X} = 20,92$) and the control group ($\bar{X} = 17,58$), as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = 2,34$. That the pre-test results were similar to one another and all other factors had been taken under control by the researcher, this significant difference between the post-test results of the experimental group and the control group points to the fact that strategy training

sessions in this six-week study contributed greatly to learning grammar in experimental group.

4.5. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the Fifth Research Question

The aim of the fifth question “Is there a significant difference between male and female students in the experimental group in terms of their pre-test scores and post-test scores regarding the use of learning strategies?” was to see whether there was a significant difference between the male and the female students in the experimental group in terms of their pre-test scores and post-test scores. The results were analyzed using independent sample t-test. The aim of this question was to understand whether strategy teaching makes any difference in different genders’ grammar learning.

The difference between the pre-test and the post-test scores of the male and the female students in experimental group is seen on table 4.15.

Table 4.15. T-test results concerning the difference between the pre-test and the post-test scores of the male and the female students in experimental group

	Group	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Pre-test	Male	17	14,94	5,26	,02	24	,981
	Female	9	14,89	5,40			
Post-test	Male	17	20,65	4,91	-,43	24	,670
	Female	9	21,44	3,47			

*p<.05

As seen in table 4.15, regarding significance level to be $p<.05$, there was no significant difference between pre-test scores of the males ($\bar{X}=14,94$) and the females ($\bar{X}=14,89$) in the experimental group, as indicated with the result of $t_{(24)}=.02$. This shows that neither gender was superior to the other in terms of English grammar.

As seen in table 4.15, regarding significance level to be $p<.05$, there was no significant difference between the post-test scores of the males ($\bar{X}=20,65$) and the females ($\bar{X}=21,44$) in the experimental group, as indicated with the result of $t_{(24)}= -,43$.

This point to the fact that English grammar of both genders in the experimental group improved following the six-week study; however strategy teaching sessions didn't bring about significant difference between genders in addition to the overall improvement in the experimental group.

4.6. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the Sixth Research Question

The aim of the six research question "Is there a significant difference between male and female students in the control group in terms of their pre-test scores and post-test scores?" was to find out whether there was a significant difference between the male and the female students in the control group in terms of their pre-test scores and post-test scores. To this end, independent sample t-test was used. In the analysis of the fifth research question, it was reported that strategy teaching didn't make a significant difference in terms of English grammar in different genders. The effect of grammar teaching in the male and female students in the control group was also a question for investigation in this study. To that end, the pre-test and post-test results of the control group students were compared.

The difference between pre-test and post-test scores of male and female students in control group is given on table 4.16.

Table 4.16. T-test results concerning the difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the male and female students in control group

	Group	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Pre-test	Male	17	15,06	6,13	1,16	22	,258
	Female	7	12,14	3,81			
Post-test	Male	17	18,24	5,53	,88	22	,389
	Female	7	16,00	6,03			

*p<.05

As seen in table 4.16, regarding significance level to be $p<.05$, there was not significant difference between pre-test scores of males ($\bar{X}=15,06$) and females ($\bar{X}=12,14$) in the control group, as indicated with the result of $t_{(22)}=1,16$. This shows

that neither gender was superior to the other in terms of English grammar.

As seen in table 4.16, regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there was also no significant difference between the post-test scores of the males ($\bar{X} = 18,24$) and the females ($\bar{X} = 16,00$) in the control group, as indicated with the result of $t_{(22)} = .88$. This points to the fact that English grammar of both genders in the control group also improved as a result of the six-week regular grammar instruction, however regular grammar instruction didn't bring about any statistically significant difference between the males and the females in the control group just as the lack of significant difference in the male and female members of the experimental group.

4.7. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the Seventh Research Question

The seventh question “Is there a significant difference between genders in terms of 10 quiz scores?” was asked to see whether there was significant difference between different genders in terms of 10 quiz scores. No significant difference came out in the English grammar ability of the experimental and control groups. To find out any significant difference between males and females regarding a particular grammar point, an independent sample t-test was used for each quiz to see any probable difference. The differences in the quiz averages of males and females are given on table 4.17.

Table 4.17. T-test results concerning the difference between the quiz scores of the male and the female students

	Group	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Quiz1	Male	34	18,53	3,45	-,49	48	,623
	Female	16	19,04	3,34			
Quiz2	Male	34	12,56	3,68	,15	48	,884
	Female	16	12,41	2,80			
Quiz3	Male	34	35,67	7,13	-1,19	48	,241
	Female	16	37,96	4,27			
Quiz4	Male	34	19,30	5,44	-,23	48	,820
	Female	16	19,69	6,02			
Quiz5	Male	34	15,17	4,39	-,91	48	,365
	Female	16	16,38	4,26			
Quiz6	Male	34	21,09	3,73	-,81	48	,424
	Female	16	21,92	2,51			
Quiz7	Male	34	22,55	6,48	-2,34	48	,024*
	Female	16	26,74	4,38			
Quiz8	Male	34	15,67	4,10	,20	48	,845
	Female	16	15,42	4,01			
Quiz9	Male	34	27,28	4,74	,33	48	,746
	Female	16	26,77	5,97			
Quiz10	Male	34	15,82	5,63	1,20	48	,236
	Female	16	14,01	3,07			

*p<.05

Regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there was no significant difference between the scores of the male and female students in Quiz 1, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = -.49$. There was no significant difference between the average of the male students ($\bar{X} = 18,53$) and the average of the female students ($\bar{X} = 19,04$) in Quiz 1.

Regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there was no significant difference between the scores of the male and female students in Quiz 2, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = .15$. There was no significant difference between the average of the male students ($\bar{X} = 12,56$) and the average of the female students ($\bar{X} = 12,41$) in Quiz 2.

Regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there was no significant difference between the scores of the male and the female students in Quiz 3, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = -1,19$. There was no significant difference between the average of the male students ($\bar{X} = 35,67$) and the average of the female students ($\bar{X} = 35,96$) in Quiz 3.

Regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there was no significant difference

between the scores of the male and the female students in Quiz 4, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = -.23$. There was no significant difference between the average of the male students ($\bar{X} = 19.30$) and the average of the female students ($\bar{X} = 19.69$) in Quiz 4.

Regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there was no significant difference between the scores of the male and the female students in Quiz 5, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = -.91$. There was no significant difference between the average of the male students ($\bar{X} = 15.17$) and the average of the female students ($\bar{X} = 16.38$) in Quiz 5.

Regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there was no significant difference between the scores of the male and the female students in Quiz 6, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = -.81$. There was no a significant difference between the average of the male students ($\bar{X} = 21.09$) and the average of the female students ($\bar{X} = 21.92$) in Quiz 6.

Regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there was a significant difference between the scores of male and female students in Quiz 7, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = -2.34$. There was a significant difference between the average of the male students ($\bar{X} = 22.55$) and the average of the female students ($\bar{X} = 26.74$) in Quiz 7 favoring the latter. Quiz 7 was about Future Time Clauses. Surprisingly enough, Quiz 7 was one of the three quizzes in which there was no significant difference between the experimental and control groups, and it is the only test in which there came out a significant difference between genders. The underlying reason for such an odd result of this quiz – odd in the sense that it gives out contrasting results compared with general tendency in all other quizzes – might have been that these students learned future tenses and future time clauses in Listening & Speaking classes in the same week, and this might have interfered with the results of the seventh quiz.

Regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there was no significant difference between the scores of the male and the female students in Quiz 8, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = .20$. There was a significant difference between the average of the male students ($\bar{X} = 15.67$) and the average of the female students ($\bar{X} = 15.42$) in Quiz 8.

Regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there was no significant difference between the scores of the male and the female students in Quiz 9, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = .33$. There was no significant difference between the average of the male students ($\bar{X} = 27,28$) and the average of the female students ($\bar{X} = 26,77$) in Quiz 9.

Regarding significance level to be $p < .05$, there was no significant difference between the scores of the male and the female students in Quiz 10, as indicated with the result of $t_{(48)} = 1,20$. There was no significant difference between the average of the male students ($\bar{X} = 15,82$) and the average of the female students ($\bar{X} = 14,01$) in Quiz 10..

4.8. The Results and Findings of Data Analysis Regarding the Eighth Research Question

The last research question “Which learning strategy is used most commonly by the students in the experimental group in different weeks?” aimed to find out what learning strategy the students in the experimental group reported having used most for each week. The data were obtained through self-evaluation chart given to the students to fill in before and after each quiz. Thus, the data are qualitative by nature. In this chart, the students indicated what strategies they made use of to learn the grammar point of the previous week. They weren’t limited to a certain amount of strategies; they had the chance to write down as many strategies as they benefited from. The results were analyzed using frequency and percentage statistics.

4.8.1. The percentages of strategies in week 1

The percentages of the strategies used in the first week are given on table 4.18.

Table 4.18. The percentages of strategies used in the first week

strategy	percentage	number of students
Rule Formation	0,96	23
Rule Exercises	1,00	24
Short-term Goal Setting	0,58	14
Social Cooperation	0,42	10
Self-evaluation	0,08	2
Asking Questions	0,04	1

As seen in table 4.18, in the first week, out of 24 students, 24 students (100%)

used Rule Exercise strategy while Rule Formation strategy became the second most used by 23 students (96%). 14 students (58%) reported having used Short-term Goal Setting strategy; 10 students (42%) reported having used Social Cooperation strategy. Two least used strategies were Self-evaluation strategy by 2 students (8%) and Asking Questions strategy by 1 student (4%).

4.8.2. The percentages of strategies in week 2

The percentages of the strategies used in the second week are given in table 4.19.

Table 4.19. The percentages of strategies used in the second week

strategy	percentage	number of students
Rule Formation	0,88	23
Rule Exercises	0,81	21
Short-term Goal Setting	0,62	16
Social Cooperation	0,54	14
Self-evaluation	0,54	14
Asking Questions	0,38	10

As seen on table 4.19, in the second week, out of 26 students, 23 students (88%) reported having used Rule Formation strategy; 21 students (81%) reported having used Rule Exercises strategy; 16 students (62%) reported having used Short-term Goal Setting strategy; 14 students (54%) reported having used Social Cooperation strategy; and 14 students (54%) reported having used Self-evaluation strategy. The least used strategy was Asking Questions strategy by 10 students (38%).

4.8.3. The percentages of strategies in week 3

The percentages of the strategies used in the third week are given in table 4.20.

Table 4.20. The percentage of strategies used in the third week

strategy	percentage	number of students
Rule Formation	0,91	20
Rule Exercises	0,73	16
Short-term Goal Setting	0,41	9
Social Cooperation	0,32	7
Self-evaluation	0,32	7
Asking Questions	0,32	7

22 students filled in the self-evaluation chart in the third week. As seen in table 4.20, the most commonly used strategy was Rule Formation strategy by 20 students (91%) in the third week. Rule Exercises strategy was reported to have been used by 16 students (73%) while Short-term Goal Setting strategy was reported to have been used by 9 students (41%). Social Cooperation strategy, Self-evaluation strategy and Asking Questions strategy were reported to have been used by 7 students (32%).

4.8.4. The percentages of strategies in week 4

The percentages of the strategies used in the fourth week are given in table 4.21.

Table 4.21. The percentage of strategies used in the fourth week

strategy	percentage	number of students
Rule Formation	0,92	22
Rule Exercises	0,88	21
Short-term Goal Setting	0,63	15
Social Cooperation	0,75	18
Self-evaluation	0,58	14
Asking Questions	0,58	14

In the fourth week of the study, in which 24 students took part, Rule Formation strategy was reported to have been used by 22 students (92%) and became the most commonly used strategy. Rule Exercises strategy was the second most commonly used strategy by 21 students (88%). Social Cooperation strategy was used by 18 students (75%) while Short-term Goal Setting strategy was used by 15 students (63%). Two least used strategies were Self-evaluation strategy and Asking Questions strategy by 14 students (58%).

4.8.5. The percentages of strategies in week 5

The percentages of the strategies used in the fifth week are given in table 4.22.

Table 4.22. The percentages of strategies used in the fifth week

strategy	percentage	number of students
Rule Formation	0,95	20
Rule Exercises	0,95	20
Short-term Goal Setting	0,81	17
Social Cooperation	0,76	16
Self-evaluation	0,90	19
Asking Questions	0,81	17

In the fifth week, in which 21 students took part, Rule Formation strategy and Rule Exercises strategy were the most commonly used strategies by 20 students (95%). Self-evaluation strategy was stated to have been used by 19 students (90%) while Short-term Goal Setting and Asking Questions strategies were used by 17 students (81%). The least commonly used strategy was Social Cooperation strategy by 16 students (76%).

4.8.6. The percentages of strategies in week 6

The percentages of the strategies used in the sixth week are given in table 4.23.

Table 4.23. The percentage of strategies used in the sixth week

strategy	percentage	number of students
Repetition	0,26	6
Flash Cards	0,09	2
Physical Response	0,00	0
Elaboration	0,78	18

In the sixth week, in which 23 students took part, the most commonly used strategy was Elaboration strategy by 18 students (78%). Repetition strategy was used by 6 students (26%) while Flash Cards strategy was used by 2 students (9%). Physical Response strategy, which is particularly suitable for verbs, wasn't used by any student in the class even though the unit was Phrasal Verbs in this week.

4.9. Conclusion

According to the results of pre-test, the experimental group and the control group were similar to each other in terms of English Grammar background. This is an important finding in that without this condition being settled, no finding could be attributed to the strategy training given to the experimental group for six consecutive weeks. At the end of six weeks of instruction, there were important differences in the post-test results of the experimental and the control groups. This shows that both groups benefited from instruction in English grammar. Yet, the significant difference of the post-test results between the experimental group and control group shows the impact of

strategy instruction in the experimental group. This difference is verbalized by the students' responses to the self-evaluation chart which was filled out every week. Even though those results weren't supported by Yalçın (2003) who found no significant relationship between learning strategies and grammar achievement, it was a descriptive study and students in the experimental group didn't receive any strategy instruction unlike the present study.

Regarding the weekly performances of both groups, there came out a significant difference between the average quiz scores of the experimental group and control group in the second, third, fourth, fifth, eighth, and ninth quizzes, favoring the experimental group. This shows that learning strategies helped the students learn better on a weekly basis. However, there came out no significant difference between the average quiz scores of the experimental group and control group in the first, sixth, and seventh quizzes. The underlying reason for such a lack of significant difference in the first week may be attributed to the fact this was the first time the students were given learning strategies and that they might have experienced hesitation in using them. The reason for the lack of significant difference in the sixth and seventh quizzes may be attributed to the fact that both groups covered the same grammar units, that is Future Tenses and Future Tense Time Clauses, in their Listening & Speaking class in that very same week and this might have interfered with the quiz results of that week. A significant difference between the tenth quiz scores of the experimental group and the control group favoring control group was observed as well. The underlying reason for such a finding may be that the unit for that week was Phrasal Verbs and the experimental group had been taught new strategies that they hadn't been taught in the previous weeks to deal with vocabulary items, and that the students might not have learned to use memory strategies effectively in only one week. Baykul (2010) came up with similar results in a three-week study suggesting that there was no significant relationship between memory strategy instruction and students' vocabulary knowledge even though the experimental group which received memory strategy instruction was slightly higher than the control group in weekly quizzes. However, Aydemir (2007) found that vocabulary learning strategy instruction contributes significantly to vocabulary learning. This result was in stark contrast with the present study results. Such a difference might

have stemmed from the fact that Aydemir conducted the study during a whole semester while Baykul's study was confined to three weeks and memory learning strategy instruction was confined to only one week in this present study.

Regarding the role of gender in learning grammar, there was no significant difference between pre-test and post-test scores of male and female students in the experimental group, which shows that even after being taught learning strategies, gender didn't have a significant role in Grammar. Moreover, there was no significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test scores of the male and the female students in the control group, which shows that gender didn't have a significant role in Grammar.. Regarding the quiz scores, in nine quizzes out of ten, no significant difference was found between the average scores of the males and the females in the experimental and the control groups combined. There was a significant difference between females and males only in the seventh quiz. These findings indicate that gender didn't make a significant difference in learning English Grammar when learning strategies were taught and when they were not taught. These results are in sharp contrast to the findings of Aslan (2009) who found significant relationship between gender, language learning strategies and English achievement. In Aslan's study, girls used more language learning strategies than boys and girls' English proficiency was significantly higher than that of boys'.

Regarding the results of the self-evaluation chart, Rule Exercises strategy became the most commonly used strategy in the first week, employed by all students in the experimental group. In the second, third and fourth weeks, Rule Formation strategy became the most commonly used learning strategy with the percentages 88%, 91%, and 92% respectively. In the fifth week, Rule Formation and Rule Exercises strategies became the most commonly used ones with a rate of 95% each. In the sixth week, in which only memory strategies were given, Elaboration Strategy became the most commonly used one. As the results show, Rule Formation is the most commonly used strategy while Rule Exercises is the second most commonly used strategy in total in learning Grammar while Elaboration is the most commonly used strategy in learning vocabulary items. While cognitive strategies were the most commonly used strategies in

this study, Cesur (2008) found that compensation strategies were the most commonly used ones whereas cognitive strategies were among the two least commonly used strategies ranking the fifth of the six major learning strategies.

4.10. Suggestions for Further Research

This research sought answers to such issues as the effect of learning strategies and the role of gender in grammar learning. This study was carried out for six weeks. For a more comprehensive understanding, similar studies may be carried out for longer periods of time so that long-term effects of learning strategies may be determined.

In this study, the experimental group consisted of 26 students while the control group consisted of 24 students and the number of the male students was almost twice the number of the female students. Other studies may be carried out on groups in which the number of male and female students is even so that the probable role of gender in Grammar may be understood more precisely.

Even though attendance was compulsory, there were absent students each week both in the experimental group and the control group. These absent students weren't given the weekly quizzes. Similar research can be conducted on groups whose students attend classes regularly.

In this study, the groups were taught by three different teachers. Similar studies can be conducted in groups where only one teacher teaches throughout the semester so that it is guaranteed that the students won't cover the same grammar units in another course by another teacher, which would eliminate the intervention factor which was the case in the seventh quiz.

Besides researchers, administrators may also benefit from results of similar studies. As this study and many other related studies have come up with a significant relationship between students' academic success and learning strategies, policy-makers

and implementers may take this into consideration in devising curricula for language classes to be taught in schools.

Course books may be prepared in such a way that both the teachers and the students should be able to make use of appropriate learning strategies given the tasks that they need to carry out. With course books catering to the needs of EFL learners with the appropriate strategies that have been demonstrated to contribute to student achievement, teachers may drive the students into using those strategies both in and out of the classroom.

Teacher trainers should also take such considerations into account. Now that learning strategies make significant difference in students' learning a foreign language, new teachers' awareness should be raised as regards the importance of learning strategies in EFL context and already working teachers may be provided with in-service training by which they can be awakened about the importance of learning strategies.

REFERENCES

- Alamdari, S. (2010). *The relationship between vocabulary learning strategies employed by university level English language learners and their success*. Published MA Thesis, Ankara: Hacattepe University School of Social Sciences.
- Aslan, O. (2009). *The role of gender and language learning strategies in learning English*. Published MA Thesis, Ankara: METU Graduate School of Social Sciences.
- Aydemir, U.V. (2007). *The effect of language learning strategies instruction on student success in English teaching*. Published MA Thesis, Bursa: Uludağ University Graduate School of Social Sciences.
- Baykul, B. (2010). *Memory strategies in second language vocabulary learning*. Published MA Thesis, Bursa: Uludağ University Graduate School of Educational Sciences.
- Cesur, M. (2008). *A model explaining and predicting the relationship between university prep class students' language learning strategies, learning styles and academic success in foreign language*. Published Phd Thesis, Istanbul: Yıldız Teknik University Graduate School of Social Sciences.
- Chamot, A.U. (2005) Language learning strategy instruction: current issues and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 112-130.
- Chamot, A.U., Keatley, C.W. (2003) Learning strategies of adolescent low literacy Hispanic ESL Students. Paper presented at the 2003 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Chamot, A.U. & Kupper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22/1, 13-21.

- Chamot, A.U. & O'Malley, J.M. (1987). A cognitive academic language learning approach: A bridge to the mainstream. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 227-49.
- Cohen, A.D. (2003) The learner's side of foreign language learning: where do styles, strategies and tasks meet? *IRAL*, 41, 279-291
- Cowan, R. (2009). *The teachers' grammar of English*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Dansereau, D. (1985). Learning strategy research. In J.W. Segal, S.F. Chipman, & R. Glaser (Eds.). *Thinking and Learning Skills*. (Vol. 1). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. 209-39.
- Dreyer, C. & Oxford, R., 1996: Learning strategies and other predictors of ESL proficiency among Afrikaans-speakers in South Africa. In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-cultural Perspectives* (pp. 61-74). Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.
- Ekmekçi, N.M. (1999). *Vocabulary learning strategies and their effects on Turkish EFL learners' outcomes*. Published MA Thesis, Eskişehir: Anadolu University Graduate School of Social Sciences.
- Evcim, H. (2008). *Increasing vocabulary knowledge of university prep class students through language learning strategies*. Published MA Thesis, Bolu: AIBU Graduate School of Social Sciences.
- Ghani, M. (2003). Language learning strategies employed by L2 learners. *Journal of Research (Faculty of languages & Islamic studies)*, 4, 31-36.
- Gürata, A. (2008). *The grammar learning strategies employed by Turkish university preparatory school EFL students*. Published MA Thesis, Ankara: Bilkent University Graduate School of Education.
- Grenfell, M., Harris, V. (1999) *Modern Languages and learning strategies: In theory and practice*. London: Routledge

- Jones, B.F., Sullivan Palincsar, A., Sederburg Olge, D., & Glynn Carr, E. (Eds.). (1987). *Strategic teaching and learning: Cognitive instruction in the content areas*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Macaro, E. (2001) *Learning strategies in foreign and second language classrooms*. London: Continuum
- Mendi, H.B. (2009). *The relationship between reading strategies, motivation and reading test performance in foreign language learning*. Published MA Thesis, Istanbul: Marmara University Graduate School of Social Sciences.
- Mullins, P., 1992: *Successful English Language Learning Strategies of Students Enrolled in the Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, United States International University, San Diego, CA.
- Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H.H. & Todesco, A. (1978). *The Good Language Learner*. Toronto: Modern Language Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- O'Malley, J.M. and Chamot, A.U. (1990) *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: University Press
- Oxford, R.L., 1990: *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Oxford, R.L. (2003) *Language learning styles and strategies: an overview. Learning Styles & Strategies*. Oxford: GALA
- Oxford, R. and Crookall, D. (1989) Research on language learning strategies: methods, findings and instructional issues. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 404-419.
- Oxford, R.L. (1986) *Second language learning strategies: current research and implications for practice*. Los Angeles: California University

- Oxford, R.L., & Ehrman, M.E., 1995: Adults' language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *System*, 23, 359-386
- Ozeki, N. (2000) Listening strategy instruction for female EFL college students in Japan. Tokyo: MacMillan Language House
- Politzer, R. & McGroarty, M. (1985). An exploratory study of learning behaviors and their relationship to gains in linguistic and communicative competence. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19/1, 103-123.
- Rubin, J. (1975) What “the good learner” can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9, 41-51
- Scarcella, R. & Oxford, R., 1992: The Tapestry of Language Learning: The Individual in the Communicative Classroom. Boston: Heinle & Heinle
- Tezgiden, S.Y. (2006). *Effects of instruction in vocabulary learning strategies*. Published MA Thesis, Ankara: Bilkent University Graduate School of Education.
- Tunçer, B. (2007). *The effect of learning strategy use on students' academic success, retention level and attitudes towards class*. Published MA Thesis, Çanakkale: Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University Graduate School of Social Sciences.
- Uslan, E. (2006). *The effect of learning strategy use on English grammar achievement*. Published MA Thesis, İzmir: Dokuz Eylül University Graduate School of Education.
- Wenden, A. (1987a). How to Be a Successful Language Learner: Insights and Prescriptions from L2 Learners. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin, J. (Eds.). *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Prentice-Hall. 103-116.
- Yalçın, E. (2003). *An analysis of the relationship between the use of grammar learning strategies and student achievement at English preparatory school at the University of Gaziantep*. Published MA Thesis, Gaziantep: University of Gaziantep Graduate School of Social Sciences.

APPENDICES

APPENDICE A. GRAMMAR ACHIEVEMENT TEST

1. _____ the window please, it is cold in here.

- A) Don't open
- B) Not opening
- C) Not to open
- D) Not opens
- E) Not open

2. John stayed at home for two weeks, but now he _____ again.

- A) works
- B) is working
- C) worked
- D) will work
- E) was working

3. Matt looked at _____ in the mirror and combed his hair.

- A) herself
- B) himself
- C) one another
- D) him
- E) each other

4.

Jury: _____ were you at the time of the murder?

Suspect: I wasn't at home, I was out for some shopping.

- A) Who
- B) When
- C) What
- D) Whose
- E) Where

5. Look at the dark clouds all over the sky, it _____ soon.

- A) is going to rain
- B) is raining
- C) will rain
- D) rains
- E) rained

6. My daughter will go to United States as soon as she _____ her university next year.

- A) finished
- B) will finish
- C) is going to finish
- D) is finishing
- E) finishes

7. My father used to _____ for an electronics company years ago, but now he is retired.

- A) working
- B) worked
- C) work
- D) works
- E) to work

8. You should _____ your clothes in the store before you buy them.

- A) look up
- B) point out
- C) drop off
- D) bring up
- E) try on

9. Why _____ this t-shirt? You have many t-shirts at home.

- A) did you buy
- B) you bought
- C) you did buy
- D) bought you
- E) did you bought

10. She couldn't finish the whole project by _____, so she asked for help from a friend.

- A) themselves
- B) himself
- C) herself
- D) ourselves
- E) yourself

11. Shakespeare was a 17th century writer and he _____ about many different subjects.

- A) wrote
- B) write
- C) was write
- D) writed
- E) did write

12. Radiation generally _____ cancer in people's body organs.

- A) is causing
- B) caused
- C) used to cause
- D) causes
- E) had caused

13. In my youth, we _____ play in parks safely but now nowhere is safe.

- A) were used to
- B) used to
- C) got used to
- D) are used to
- E) use to

14. He was running very fast when he _____ down suddenly.

- A) was falling
- B) is falling
- C) fell
- D) falls
- E) will fall

22. Don't take a taxi from the airport because I will _____ you _____.

- A) put / away
- B) pick / up
- C) fill / out
- D) turn / down
- E) wake / up

23. He won't forgive you _____ you apologize to him.

- A) until
- B) when
- C) while
- D) as soon as
- E) after

24. _____ language is the most popular in the world?

- A) Why
- B) How much
- C) Whom
- D) Where
- E) Which

25. I was in Istanbul five years ago and I _____ for a translation company there.

- A) am working
- B) will work
- C) worked
- D) work
- E) have worked

26. Don't tire out _____ so much, friends.

- A) yourself
- B) itself
- C) himself
- D) myself
- E) yourselves

27. When someone is driving car on a busy road, you say to warn him:

- A) Don't wake up early in the mornings.
- B) Fasten your seat belt.
- C) Wear warm clothes.
- D) Make yourself at home.
- E) Don't look in front of you.

28. Before she _____ the job, she _____ two interviews with the managers of the company.

- A) will get / is having
- B) gets / will have
- C) is getting / is going to have
- D) is going to get / has
- E) got / was having

29.

A: What's the cook doing over there?

B: He _____ the soup to see if it has enough salt.

A) tastes

B) tasted

C) was tasting

D) used to taste

E) is tasting

30. When she _____ blood on her arm, she _____.

A) saw / fainted

B) was seeing / fainted

C) saw / was fainting

D) was seeing / was fainting

E) had seen / used to faint

	1 st Week	2 nd Week	3 rd Week	4 th Week	5 th Week	6 th Week
KONU	Present Simple & Present continuous	Imperative Past Simple	Past Simple & Past Continuous Used to	Future Future Time Clauses	Wh- Questions Reflexive and reciprocal pronouns	Phrasal verbs
HEDEF						
HANGİ STRATEJİ KULLANILDI?						
TEST SONUCU						
STRATEJİ YARARLI OLDU MU? SEBEP NEDİR?						

APPENDICE C. QUIZ 1

SHORT ANSWER. Write the word or phrase that best completes each statement or answers the question.

Complete each sentence. Choose between the simple present and the present progressive forms of the verbs in parentheses.

1. The telephone _____. Could you answer it, please?
(rings / is ringing)
2. Oh, we're having stew. Mmm, it _____ wonderful.
(smells / 's smelling)
3. The temperature _____ quickly today. It's already hotter than it was at this time yesterday.
(rises / is rising)
4. Look at the eclipse! The moon _____ in front of the sun, and now it's dark outside.
(passes / is passing)
5. Sylvia _____ a shower every morning after her exercise class.
(takes / is taking)
6. In Spain, most people _____ dinner after 8:00 P.M.
(eat / are eating)
7. That song _____ strange. Is something wrong with the CD player?
(sounds / is sounding)
8. Steve _____ a shower. Can he call you back later?
(is taking / takes)
9. We _____ a lot of students in our class this year.
(have / 're having)
10. Fred just left. He _____ to his biology class right now.
(goes / 's going)
11. In our area, it _____ a lot in March.
(rains / 's raining)

12. We _____. Is the music too loud for you?
(dance/ 're dancing)

13. We _____ every day. It's good exercise.
(dance/ 're dancing)

MULTIPLE CHOICE. Choose the one alternative that best completes the statement or answers the question.

Circle the letter of the correct answer to complete each sentence.

14. What _____? You look fascinated.
A) do you read B) are you reading

15. I'm reading a history of the Internet. The book _____ with a really interesting story.
A) begins B) is beginning

16. Hi, Naruyo. _____ hard today? You seem tired.
A) Do you work B) Are you working

17. What's the name of that song? It _____ familiar.
A) sounds B) is sounding

18. _____ for the airport now?
A) Do you leave B) Are you leaving

19. The World Cup _____ every four years.
A) takes place B) is taking place

20. My sister and her family live very far from us. We rarely _____ them during the week.
A) are seeing B) see

SHORT ANSWER. Write the word or phrase that best completes each statement or answers the question.

Each sentence has four underlined words or phrases. The four underlined parts of the sentence are marked A, B, C, and D. Circle the letter of the ONE underlined part that is NOT CORRECT.

21. Usually, it's raining a lot here every winter, but this year it's very dry.

A	B	C	D
1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28
29	30	31	32
33	34	35	36
37	38	39	40
41	42	43	44
45	46	47	48
49	50	51	52
53	54	55	56
57	58	59	60
61	62	63	64
65	66	67	68
69	70	71	72
73	74	75	76
77	78	79	80
81	82	83	84
85	86	87	88
89	90	91	92
93	94	95	96
97	98	99	100

22. Are you wanting to go with me, or are you studying now?

A B C D

23. Kevin usually work in the morning, but this month he's working in the afternoon.

A B C D

24. Steve is reading the "Help Wanted" section every day because he's looking for a new job.

25. Don't drink that milk: I think it's smelling bad.

A B C D

APPENDICE D. QUIZ 2

SHORT ANSWER. Write the word or phrase that best completes each statement or answers the question.

Write an affirmative and a negative imperative for each of the situations. Use the sentences in the box. Use each sentence only once.

<u>Affirmative</u>	<u>Negative</u>
Speak softly.	Don't go into the kitchen.
Walk on the sidewalk.	Don't feed the large animals.
Be polite to the waiter.	Don't pick the flowers.
Keep your hands away from the cages.	Don't write with a pen.
Use a pencil.	Don't eat or drink.

1. In math class:

- a. _____
b. _____

2. In the park:

- a. _____
b. _____

3. At the zoo:

- a. _____
b. _____

4. In a restaurant:

- a. _____
b. _____

5. In a library:

- a. _____
b. _____

MULTIPLE CHOICE. Choose the one alternative that best completes the statement or answers the question.

Circle the letter of the correct answer to complete each sentence.

6. Jill, please _____ me your e-mail address again. I lost it.

- A) give B) gives C) is giving

7. My e-mail address is mesutkuleli@yahoo.com. _____ it again!

- A) Don't lose B) Not losing C) aren't losing

SHORT ANSWER. Write the word or phrase that best completes each statement or answers the question.

Complete each sentence with an affirmative or negative imperative. Use the verbs in the box. Use some verbs more than once. Use contractions when possible.

forget enjoy lock call walk have put

8. Please _____ the dog in the morning and afternoon.
9. But _____ the dog near the Wongs' house. She chases their cat.
10. Please _____ the back door before you go out. The key is in the door.
11. Also, _____ to turn out the lights. We have high electric bills.
12. _____ newspapers in the garbage. They go in the green bin. We recycle them
13. _____ the garbage cans on the sidewalk on Tuesday morning.
14. _____ me if you have any problems.
15. Please _____ after 11:00. We go to bed early when we're on vacation.
16. _____ fun, and _____ the house.

Each sentence has four underlined words or phrases. The four underlined parts of the sentence are marked A, B, C, and D. Circle the letter of the ONE underlined part that is NOT CORRECT.

17. It 's a one-way street, so no turn left here.
A B C D
18. Read the directions and looking at the first example before you start the test.
A B C D
19. First, you turn left at the light, then go straight for about a mile.
A B C D
20. The lake is very deep on this side, so no swim here: It's dangerous.
A B C D

APPENDICE E. QUIZ 3

SHORT ANSWER. Write the word or phrase that best completes each statement or answers the question.

Complete the biography of the Chilean poet Pablo Neruda. Use the simple past tense form of the verbs in parentheses. Use contractions when possible.

Pablo Neruda, one of the world's most popular poets, (live) **1)** _____ from 1904 to 1973. He (be born) **2)** _____ in Chile, and his parents (name) **3)** _____ him Neftali Ricardo Reyes. In 1920, he (start) **4)** _____ using the name Pablo Neruda because he (not want) **5)** _____ his father to know that he (be) **6)** _____ a poet.

Early in life, Neruda (take) **7)** _____ an interest in politics. His government service (begin) **8)** _____ in 1927 and (last) **9)** _____ most of his life. He (spend) **10)** _____ six years as the Chilean consul in several Asian countries and then (go) **11)** _____ to Spain, France, and Mexico. The Spanish Civil War (break out) **12)** _____ during Neruda's term in Spain; he (feel) **13)** _____ the tragedy of the war, and he (not be) **14)** _____ the same man after that. When he (return) **15)** _____ to Chile in 1945, he (become) **16)** _____ a senator; as a senator, he (fight) **17)** _____ for human rights in his country.

At the age of twenty, Neruda (publish) **18)** _____ his most popular book, *Twenty Love Poems and a Song of Despair*. For the next forty-nine years, Neruda (write) **19)** _____. In 1971, two years before he (die) **20)** _____, he (win) **21)** _____ the Nobel Prize for literature.

Complete this biography of the American poet Robert Frost. Use the simple past tense form of the verbs in parentheses. Use contractions when possible.

Robert Frost, one of the most popular American poets, (be born) **22)** _____ in California in 1874. After his father (die) **23)** _____, his mother (take) **24)** _____ her family to New England, where Frost (spend) **25)** _____ most of his life. He (go) **26)** _____ to Harvard University, but he (not stay) **27)** _____ there very long because he (be) **28)** _____ sick all the time.

He (work) **29)** _____ as a farmer for seven years, and then he (become) **30)** _____ a teacher. He (write) **31)** _____ poetry, but he (not have) **32)** _____ much success. In 1912, he and his family (move) **33)** _____ to England. Soon several of his poems (be)

34) _____ in print.

In 1915, Frost (return) 35) _____ to the United states and (buy) 36) _____ a farm in New Hampshire. He (publish) 37) _____ many poems and later (win) 38) _____ four Pulitzer prizes. Frost (be) 39) _____ a wonderful speaker, and he often (read) 40) _____ his poems in public.

MULTIPLE CHOICE. Choose the one alternative that best completes the statement or answers the question.

Circle the letter of the correct answer to complete each sentence.

41) I drove by your house this afternoon, but you _____ home.

- A) weren't B) wasn't C) not

42) Where _____ to elementary school?

- A) you go B) you went C) did you go

43) The homework was hard. How long _____ you?

- A) it took B) did it take C) it take

APPENDICE F. QUIZ 4

SHORT ANSWER. Write the word or phrase that best completes each statement or answers the question.

Complete the telephone conversation with the simple past tense or past progressive form of the verbs in parentheses. Use contractions when possible.

- A:** Hi, I'm glad you're home! No one(answer) **1)** _____ a few minutes ago.
- B:** I (mow) **2)** _____ the lawn when the phone (ring) **3)** _____. What's up?
- A:** I (have) **4)** _____ a little accident with the car. Nothing serious □ no injuries.
- B:** Oh, that's good. How about the car?
- A:** It's OK. There (not be) **5)** _____ much damage. Luckily, I (not drive) **6)** _____ fast when I (hit) **7)** _____ the bus.
- B:** The bus! How **8)** _____ you (do) _____ that?
- A:** I (try) **9)** _____ to find a special radio station, so I (not pay) **10)** _____ attention.
- B:** **11)** _____ you (call) _____ the police?
- A:** No. It (happen) **12)** _____ right in front of the police station. An officer (appear) **13)** _____ before I even (get) **14)** _____ out of the car. After they (leave) **15)** _____, I (call) **16)** _____ the insurance company.
- B:** Well, I'm just glad you're OK.

MULTIPLE CHOICE. Choose the one alternative that best completes the statement or answers the question.

Circle the letter of the correct answer to complete each sentence.

- 17) You have a good memory. I _____ to your school for only a month.
A) went B) go C) am going
- 18) _____ when it started to rain?
A) Did you drive B) Are you driving C) Were you driving
- 19) We were having dinner while it _____.
A) raining B) was raining C) rains
- 20) What _____ when you got to the stadium?
A) were the players doing B) do the players do C) are the players doing

SHORT ANSWER. Write the word or phrase that best completes each statement or answers the question.

Each sentence has four underlined words or phrases. The four underlined parts of the sentence are marked A, B, C, and D. Circle the letter of the ONE underlined part that is NOT CORRECT.

21) Were you watching TV when I call you last night?

A B C D

22) We didn't hear the doorbell when he arrived because we ate.

A B C D

23) When the man came into the store, did he wearing a blue jacket?

A B C D

24) It rarely is snowing here, but last year it did .

A B C D

25) Were you having dinner when I was calling last night?

A B C D

26) While we were driving to work this morning, we were seeing a bad accident.

A B C D

Combine these pairs of sentences. Use the simple past tense or the past progressive form of the verbs. Use commas when necessary.

27) We walked to the movie theater.

I tripped on the sidewalk.

While _____

28) We got home.

We watched the video.

_____ when _____

29) We sat in the dark.

My heart beat very fast.

While _____

APPENDICE G. QUIZ 5**SHORT ANSWER**

Write the underlined information in a different way, using a form of used to.

1. In the nineteenth century, most women didn't go to school.

2. Before trains and cars, people didn't travel very much for pleasure.

3. Before television, people told stories and played games in the evening.

4. Rita played softball last year and the year before, but she doesn't play anymore.

5. Bob wrote articles for the school newspaper when he was a freshman, but he doesn't have time this year.

6. Emily had a good imagination when she was a child, but she doesn't make up stories anymore.

7. Bob wrote poetry when he was in high school, but he's not interested in poetry anymore.

8. He didn't tell people about his poems before, but now he doesn't mind.

9. In the past, we never worried about time, but now we always feel rushed.

10. People didn't drive as much in the past. They walked more.

MULTIPLE CHOICE. Choose the one alternative that best completes the statement or answers the question.

Circle the letter of the correct answer to complete each sentence.

11) I remember you. You _____ to go to school here.

- A) used B) use C) were used

12) When we were younger, we _____ play in the playground after school.

- A) got used to B) used to C) use to

13) When you were a child, _____ eat a lot of candy?

- A) you used to B) were you used to C) did you use to

14) When that famous gymnast was younger, she _____ practicing for six hours a day.

- A) got used to B) use to C) used to

SHORT ANSWER. Write the word or phrase that best completes each statement or answers the question.

Each sentence has four underlined words or phrases. The four underlined parts of the sentence are marked A, B, C, and D. Circle the letter of the ONE underlined part that is NOT CORRECT.

15) Before I moved to Chicago, I use to live in the country.

- A B C D

16) Years ago, I didn't used to like rock music, but now I love it.

- A B C D

17) I used to going hiking every weekend, but I don't anymore.

- A B C D

18) Did you used to live on Central Avenue when you were a child?

- A B C D

19) Jim and Rita used to ate dinner at Paul's Steakhouse every Friday night,

- A B

but now they don't.

- C D

APPENDICE H. QUIZ 6

SHORT ANSWER. Write the word or phrase that best completes each statement or answers the question.

Circle the most appropriate form to complete each sentence.

1.

A: I'm dizzy. I think I'm going to faint / I'll faint.

B: Come sit down. You'll feel better in a minute.

2.

A: There's a jazz concert in the park tonight.

B: Great! I think I'll go / I'm going. I'd like to hear some good music.

3.

A: Look at that blue sky!

B: Yes. It's going to be / It will be a beautiful day.

4.

A: I'm flying to Cairo next week.

B: Really? When will you be / you are back?

5.

A: I'm starving. I think I'm making / I'll make a sandwich.

B: Can you make me one, too?

6.

A: Do you need anything from the store?

B: I'd like a loaf of fresh bread. I'm going to make / I make some sandwiches for lunch.

7.

A: Do you have any plans for this summer?

B: Yes, I do. I'm going / I'll go to France.

8.

A: You look tired.

B: I *am* tired. Maybe I'm taking / I'll take a nap.

9.

A: I didn't understand the grammar we did today.

B: Don't worry. Soon you'll understand / you're understanding it.

10.

A: Do you have any plans for this weekend?

B: Yes, we do. We're going to go / We go camping.

11.

A: I feel strange. I think I'm going to be / I'll be sick.

B: I'll pull over and stop the car.

12.

A: What do we need for dinner?

B: We need some chopped meat. I'm going to make / I make spaghetti sauce tonight.

13.

A: Martina and I are studying / study for the test every day next week.

B: That's a great idea.

14.

A: What time does the sun rise tomorrow?

B: Tomorrow the sun rises / is rising at 5:10.

15.

A: Do you have any predictions about next year's election?

B: I think Brown is winning / will win.

16.

A: There's a time-management seminar next week.

B: Really? I think I'm going to go / I'll go. I missed the last one.

17.

A: Do you have any plans for the fall?

B: Yes. Didn't I tell you? I'm going / I'll go to Mexico for a semester.

Circle the correct verb to complete each conversation.

18.

A: Do you and Nora have plans for the weekend?

B: Yes, we're going to / 'll go to a concert on Saturday. I just bought the tickets.

19.

A: I can't believe I got into medical school.

B: You're / 'll be a doctor in just a few years!

20.

A: Oh, no! I forgot to deposit my paycheck yesterday.

B: I'll / 'm going to deposit it for you. It's on my way.

21.

A: I'm taking the train to Boston tomorrow.

B: Oh. What time does / did it leave?

22.

A: My son is really interested in science fiction.

B: Maybe he has / 'll have a career in space exploration when he grows up.

23.

A: Look at Rachel's face. I think she's going to / 'll cry.

B: Poor kid. She really wants to come with us today.

24.

A: It's almost June. What are we going to / do we do for the summer?

B: How about summer school?

25.

A: Will/ Does Mahmoud call back this afternoon?

B: He promised to call, but he's usually in class all afternoon.

26.

A: Should I make a reservation at Dino's for tonight?

B: It's already arranged. We are / were meeting there at 6:00.

Each sentence has four underlined words or phrases. The four underlined parts of the sentence are marked A, B, C, and D. Circle the letter of the ONE underlined part that is NOT CORRECT.

27. The movie starts at 7:30, so I think I go.

A B C D

28. I'm going to the party on Thursday because Friday will be a holiday and I don't have classes.

A B C D

29. She not coming with us tomorrow because she's going to go shopping with Judy.

A

B

C

D

30. It didn't rain today, and it probably don't rain tomorrow either.

A B

C D

APPENDICE I. QUIZ 7

SHORT ANSWER. Write the word or phrase that best completes each statement or answers the question.

Complete the sentences with the correct form of the verbs in parentheses. Use will in one clause of each sentence. Use contractions when possible.

1. I (fix) _____ that leaky faucet when I (get) _____ home tonight.
2. Ron (not leave) _____ here until you (call) _____.
3. When Hassan (receive) _____ the contract, he (spend) _____ you a copy.
4. We (send) _____ a mechanic as soon as someone (be) _____ available.
5. I (listen) _____ to your tape while I (drive) _____ to work tomorrow.
6. Before you (know) _____ it, the holidays (be) _____ here.
7. After the nurse (weigh) _____ you, she (take) _____ your blood pressure.
8. When dinner (be) _____ ready, I (call) _____ you.
9. Bill (not come) _____ until he (finish) _____ his math assignment.
10. Chris (feel) _____ better after he (take) _____ a nap.
11. When we (see) _____ the neighbors tonight, we (tell) _____ them the news.
12. By the time you (finish) _____ this course, your grammar (be) _____ excellent!
13. We (bring) _____ the patio furniture inside before the storm (hit) _____.
14. My grandfather (retire) _____ as soon as he (turn) _____ 62 next year.

Complete the sentences with the correct forms of the verbs in parentheses. Use will in one clause of each sentence.

15. Laila (need) _____ some new furniture when she (move) _____.
16. As soon as you (get) _____ to Oak Street, you (see) _____ the library.
17. We (stay) _____ here tonight until we (finish) _____ the report.
18. After Sid (graduate) _____ next June, he (live) _____ in the city.
19. I (read) _____ the newspaper while I (eat) _____ breakfast.
20. They (buy) _____ a car when they (save) _____ enough money.
21. Carmen (call) _____ me before she (leave) _____.
22. By the time you (turn) _____ thirty, there (be) _____ a shuttle to the moon

MULTIPLE CHOICE. Choose the one alternative that best completes the statement or answers the question.

Circle the letter of the correct answer to complete each sentence.

23. Will you buy an electric car when they _____ available?
A) become B) will become C) are becoming
24. Maggie wants to get a job as soon as she _____ next June.
A) graduates B) will graduate C) is graduating
25. When I _____ Alex, I'll tell him you're here.
A) see B) will see C) are seeing
26. Please wait here. The doctor will see you as soon as he _____ with his other patient.
A) finishes B) is finishing C) will finish

SHORT ANSWER. Write the word or phrase that best completes each statement or answers the question.

Each sentence has four underlined words or phrases. The four underlined parts of the sentence are

marked A, B, C, and D. Circle the letter of the ONE underlined part that is NOT CORRECT.

27. When Sid will graduate next June, he will live in the city.

A B C D

28. You'll see the bank, when you get to Main Street.

A B C D

29. Don't forget to come see me as soon as you'll arrive in Boston next week.

A B C D

30. How old will you be when you'll finish this course?

A B C D

APPENDICE J. QUIZ 8

SHORT ANSWER. Write the word or phrase that best completes each statement or answers the question.

Read the answers. Then complete the wh- questions about the underlined words.

1)

Q: _____ to a party last weekend?

A: Hua invited us to a party last weekend.

2)

Q: _____ late?

A: Ted came late because he had to study.

3)

Q: _____ there?

A: I saw Arnie and Sylvia there.

4)

Q: _____?

A: Arnie was wearing a white tuxedo.

5)

Q: _____ to his tuxedo?

A: Something awful happened to his tuxedo.

6)

Q: _____ on it?

A: Sylvia spilled tomato juice on it.

7)

Q: _____?

A: She felt terrible.

8)

Q: _____

A: The lights went out last night

9)

Q: _____

A: They went out at about nine o'clock.

10)

Q: _____

A: The lights went out all over Miami.

11)

Q: _____

A: They went out because there was a big storm.

12)

Q: _____

A: Suzy and Bob were playing chess when the lights went out.

13)

Q: _____

A: Suzy lit some candles.

14)

Q: _____

A: They played chess for hours by candlelight.

MULTIPLE CHOICE. Choose the one alternative that best completes the statement or answers the question.

Circle the letter of the correct answer to complete each sentence.

15) Whose baseball cap _____?

A) that's B) that is C) that D) is that

16) Kate told me about your cruise to Alaska. When _____?

A) leave you B) do you leave C) you leave D) you do leave

SHORT ANSWER. Write the word or phrase that best completes each statement or answers the question.

Each sentence has four underlined words or phrases. The four underlined parts of the sentence are

marked A, B, C, and D. Circle the letter of the ONE underlined part that is NOT CORRECT.

17) Where you went after you left last night?

A B C D

18) Who did saw you while you were leaving the bank?

A B C D

19) Whom is going to correct our tests when we finish?

A B C D

20) When the lights went out, what you were doing?

A B C D

21) What time is your party tomorrow night, and whom is going to be there?

A B C D

22) What you're doing after you finish this test?

A B C D

23) How long you and your friends stay at the beach last Saturday?

A B C D

APPENDICE K. QUIZ 9

SHORT ANSWER. Write the word or phrase that best completes each statement or answers the question.

Complete each sentence, using the correct reflexive or reciprocal pronoun in the box. Use some pronouns more than once.

each other	herself	himself	itself	myself
ourselves	themselves	yourself	yourselves	

1. When Mr. Chase was young, he taught _____ Japanese.
2. Your life isn't so hard, Bob. Stop feeling sorry for _____.
3. Did Sally enjoy _____ on the cruise she took last month?
4. By the end of the year, you and your classmates will know _____ very well and I hope you'll be friends.
5. If you and Koji want to meet Professor Chang, go over and introduce _____ to him.
6. If you don't want to go to the movies tonight, I'll go by _____.
7. Did you see the new TV drama last night? The show _____ isn't great, but the lead actress is very talented.
8. It's easy to see that the bride and groom love _____ very much.
9. Mike often imagines _____ quitting his job, buying a boat, and sailing around the world.
10. Did you and Kristina help _____ with your math homework? You have all the same answers!
11. I'm glad that all our guests are helping _____ to the food.
12. Children, please behave _____ while I'm gone.
13. We couldn't afford to pay someone to paint the house, so we painted it _____.
14. If you're hungry, Marie, make _____ a sandwich.
15. Their parents used to work all day, so Oliver and Jack took care of _____ after school.
16. Juan is going to start his own business because he wants to work for _____.

Complete each sentence, using the correct reflexive or reciprocal pronoun in the box. Use some pronouns more than once.

each other	herself	myself
themselves	yourself	

17. I'm sorry, but I can't lend you my car tonight. I need it _____.
18. Todd and I see _____ a few times a year.
19. It's a beautiful day, and a lot of people are enjoying _____ outdoors.
20. Whenever Jill walks by a store window, she looks at _____ in the glass.
21. I'm not sure why you and Ricardo dislike _____ so much. You're very much alike.
22. Good morning, Mrs. Carson. Help _____ to some coffee and donuts while you wait.

Complete each sentence, using the correct reflexive or reciprocal pronoun in the box. Use some pronouns more than once.

each other	himself	myself
ourselves	yourself	

23. When I was a child, I used to imagine _____ becoming a famous inventor.
24. Following a tragedy, it's important for friends and relatives to comfort _____.
25. Come on, Mei. Let's go introduce _____ to the new student.
26. Do you ever talk to _____ when you're alone?
27. I hope Steve didn't hurt _____ when he fell off his bike.

Complete each sentence, using the correct reflexive or reciprocal pronoun in the box. Use some pronouns more than once.

each other	itself
themselves	yourselves

28. Kids, if you eat all that cake, you're going to make _____ sick.
29. Many children spend a lot of time by _____ because their parents are away at work.
30. The music _____ wasn't bad; it was just too loud!
31. I think we'll get this job done faster if we all help _____.
32. Our neighbors pride _____ on their beautiful garden.

MULTIPLE CHOICE. Choose the one alternative that best completes the statement or answers the question.

Circle the letter of the correct answer to complete each sentence.

33. Maria often goes to the movies by _____.

- | | |
|---------------|------------|
| A) themselves | B) himself |
| C) itself | D) herself |

34. Ana didn't want to study, but she talked _____ into it.

- | | |
|------------|---------------|
| A) herself | B) himself |
| C) them | D) each other |

35. When Brad and I study together, we help _____ a lot.

- | | |
|---------|---------------|
| A) them | B) each other |
| C) us | D) her |

36. What do you like to do when you're _____ yourself?

- | | | | |
|--------|---------|-------|-------|
| A) for | B) with | C) by | D) as |
|--------|---------|-------|-------|

37. No, we can't lend you our notes because we need them _____.

- | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|
| A) themselves | B) one another | C) ourselves | D) yourself |
|---------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|

38. It's not always easy for friends to stay in touch with _____ when one of them moves to another city.

- | | | | |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| A) each other | B) ourselves | C) themselves | D) yourselves |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|

APPENDICE L. QUIZ 10

SHORT ANSWER. Write the word or phrase that best completes each statement or answers the question.

Complete the letter from someone visiting London. Choose the phrasal verb in the box that is closest in meaning to the words in the parentheses. Use the correct form of the phrasal verb.

call	dress up	eat out	find out	get together	get back	get up	sign up
lie down	talk over	wake up	write down	play around	pick out	go on	stay up

Dear Lou,

London is a wonderful city□especially for anyone who likes to (have fun) **1.**_____ and have a good time. We (rise from bed) **2.**_____ really early our first day here. First, we talked to a woman who works for the hotel, and we (learn information) **3.**_____ about all the interesting things to do. Then, while we were having breakfast, we (discuss) **4.**_____ our plans for the day. After I (write on a piece of paper) **5.**_____ all our ideas, we decided to (register) **6.**_____ for a tour. We went on the tour and (return) **7.**_____ to the hotel at around five. Since we were really tired, we (redine) **8.**_____ for a while and took a nap. When we (awaken after sleeping) **9.**_____, we were hungry. We wanted to (have a meal in a restaurant) **10.**_____ at a fancy restaurant, so we (wore special clothes) **11.**_____. Then we (select) **12.**_____ a place that sounded good and (phoned) **13.**_____ the restaurant for a reservation. After dinner, our party (continue) **14.**_____ for a few more hours. We heard some great jazz in a small club, and then we went dancing. You know me, I usually go to bed early□but we (remain awake) **15.**_____ almost all night. Let's (meet) **16.**_____ next week when I get back. See you then!

Love, Melissa

Complete the letter from someone visiting the island of Puerto Rico. Choose the phrasal verb in the box that is closest in meaning to the words in the parentheses. Use the correct form of the phrasal verb.

clear up	come along	come out	find out	get along	get back
get together	grow up	keep up	leave out	pick out	point out
put off	show up	take off	turn down		

Dear Ellen,

Here we are in beautiful Puerto Rico. Our plane (depart) **17.** _____ from New York Monday morning, and 3 1/2 hours later, we were in a new world! I'm glad we didn't (postpone) **18.** _____ this trip until next year. I wanted to meet Pedro's family, and this was a wonderful chance to (meet) **19.** _____. They're a great family. They all (relate) **20.** _____ really well, and they talk a lot. Each time I talk to someone I (learn information) **21.** _____ all kinds of interesting things about my husband. It's funny to hear some of the details that Pedro (omit) **22.** _____ when he told me about his life! Yesterday we drove to the small town where Pedro (become an adult) **23.** _____, and he (indicate) **24.** _____ all the places he used to go when he was a child. His sister (accompany) **25.** _____, too. She has a lot of energy and walks really fast; sometimes I can't even (go as fast) **26.** _____. While we were at the outdoor market, Pedro's oldest brother (appear) **27.** _____. He helped us (select) **28.** _____ some fresh fruit, but He (reject) **29.** _____ our lunch invitation because he had to (return) **30.** _____ to work. The weather here is a little strange. Every afternoon the sky suddenly gets very dark, it rains really hard for a minute or two, and then it (becomes clear) **31.** _____ and the sun (appear) **32.** _____ again.