

ABANT İZZET BAYSAL UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGY USE AND ENGLISH
LANGUAGE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AMONG
UNIVERSITY PREPARATORY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Ömer Faruk İPEK

JUNE - 2012

ABANT İZZET BAYSAL UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

**LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGY USE AND ENGLISH
LANGUAGE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AMONG
UNIVERSITY PREPARATORY SCHOOL STUDENTS**

M.A. THESIS

By
Ömer Faruk İPEK

Thesis Supervisor
Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Amanda YEŞİLBURSA

JUNE - 2012

TO THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

This thesis titled "Language Learning Strategy use and English Language Achievement Among University Preparatory School Students" and presented by Ömer Faruk İPEK has been approved as a thesis of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.
1/6/2012

Examining Committee Members:

Member (Supervisor)

: Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Amanda YEŞİLBURSA



Member

: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Paşa Tervik CEPHE



Member

: Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşe Selmin SÖYLEMEZ



Prof. Dr. Soner DURMUŞ

Director of Institute

ABSTRACT

LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGY USE AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AMONG UNIVERSITY PREPARATORY SCHOOL STUDENTS

İpek, Ömer Faruk

M.A., Program of English Language Teaching

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Amanda YEŞİLBURSA

May 2012, xv + 73 Pages

This study intended to investigate the language learning strategies used by learners of English as a foreign language, and the relationship of these strategies with students' academic achievement at Abant İzzet Baysal University and to find out the difference in strategy use between 445 (168 male, 277 female) students from Abant İzzet Baysal University English Preparatory School participated in the study. At the time of the study all the participants were in the same proficiency level (A2). The data were gathered through strategy inventory for language learning (SILL) of Oxford (1990), which was translated to Turkish by Demirel (2009), and B2 level achievement examination scores.

The instrument, based on Oxford's (1990) classification of the language learning strategies, is composed of 50 items in six subscales. The participants responded to the inventory during A2 level. The data were analyzed through SPSS (16.0) to find (a) the construct validity of SILL with the current sample, (b) the LLS use profile of the current sample, (c) significant differences in the frequency of strategy use between successful and unsuccessful students, and (d) the correlation between strategy use and success in the B2 level achievement examination.

The findings of the study revealed that after conducting EFA and CFA to get valid data, thirty four items of the inventory were taken out, and six categories decreased to four categories named; memory, metacognitive, compensation, and social strategies. It is revealed that students use social strategies most and memory strategies least. Also it was found out that successful students use metacognitive and compensation strategies. The last finding was that the correlation between social and metacognitive strategies was the highest while the correlation between compensatory and memory strategies is the lowest.

Keywords: Language, Language Learning Strategies, Language Learning Achievement.

ÖZ

ÜNİVERSİTE HAZIRLIK OKULU ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN DİL ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ VE İNGİLİZ DİLİ AKADEMİK BAŞARILARI

İpek, Ömer Faruk

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngilizce Öğretmenliği A.B.D.

Tez Danışmanı: Yard. Doç. Dr. Ayşegül Amanda YEŞİLBURSA

Mayıs 2012, xv + 73 Sayfa

Bu çalışma, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi hazırlık okulu öğrencilerinin dil öğrenme stratejilerinin kullanıp kullanmadıkları, bu stratejilerin öğrencilerin akademik başarılarına etkisi, ve öğrencilerin dil öğrenme stratejileri kullanımlarındaki farklılıkları araştırmak için yapılmıştır. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Hazırlık okulunda okuyan 445 (168 erkek, 277 kız) öğrenci bu çalışmaya katılmıştır. Çalışmanın yapıldığı sırada, bütün öğrenciler aynı seviyedeydiler (A2). Veriler Oxford (1990) tarafından hazırlanan, Demirel (2009) tarafından Türkeçe çevrilen dil öğrenme stratejileri envanteri (SILL) ve B2 seviyesi başarı sınavı sonuçları kullanılarak toplanmıştır.

Oxford (1990) tarafından oluşturulan dil öğrenme stratejileri envantari 50 maddelik 6 kategoriden oluşmaktadır. Katılımcılar envantere A2 seviyesinde iken cevap vermişler, ve B2 kuru sonunda yapılan başarı sınavı sonuçlarıyla kıyaslama yapılmıştır. Veriler SPSS (16.0) programı kullanılarak a) SILL anketinin mevcut katılımcılar ile yapılan geçerlik durumunu, (b) mevcut katılımcıların dil öğrenme stratejilerini kullanımlarını, (c) başarılı ve başarısız öğrenciler arasındaki dil öğrenme stratejileri kullanım farklılığını, (d) B2 seviyesi başarı sınavına göre öğrencilerin kullandıkları dil öğrenme stratejileri arasındaki korelasyon farklılıklarını araştırmak için yapılmıştır.

Bu çalışmanın sonuçları açıklayıcı ve doğrulayıcı factor analizi uygulandıktan sonra, otuz dört maddenin envanterden çıkarılması gerektiğini, varolan altı kategorinin dört kategori olarak belirlenmesini ortaya çıkarmıştır. Öğrencilerin en sık olarak sosyal stratejileri kullandıklarını, en az ise hafıza stratejilerini kullandıklarını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Ayrıca, başarılı öğrencilerin en sık üstbilişsel ve yerine getirme stratejilerin kullandıklarını ortaya koymuştur. En son olarak, sosyal ve üstbilişsel stratejilerin en yüksek korelasyona sahip olduğu belirlenmiştir. En düşük korelasyona sahip stratejiler ise yerine getirme ve hafıza stratejileri olduğu belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dil, Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri, Dil Öğrenme Başarısı

To my lovely son, Hasan Mete....

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to express my gratitude for my thesis supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Amanda Yeşilbursa, who supported me thorough my M.A. period with great patience and understanding.

For her continuous support during my professional life, I would like to special thanks to Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşe Selmin Söylemez.

I would also like to express my special thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Altay Eren for his invaluable contributions to the statistics used in this study.

For his motivating and encouraging support, I would also like to specially thank to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Paşa Tevfik Cephe from Gazi Universtiy.

Also, I would like to thank to my family and my dear wife Esma İpek for her support with patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZ.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiv

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Research Questions	4
1.4. Significance of the Study	4
1.5. Setting	5

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

2. Introduction.....	7
2.1. Trends in English Language Teaching	7
2.1.1. The age of methods	8
2.1.2. The postmethod condition	10
2.2. Different Approaches to Learning Psychology	13
2.2.1. Behaviorism	13
2.2.2. Cognitivism	15
2.3. Individual Differences	16
2.3.1. Aptitude	17
2.3.2. Motivation	17
2.3.3. Age	18

2.3.4. Learning styles	18
2.4. Language Learning Strategies	19
2.4.1. Defining language learning strategies	19
2.4.2. The good learner research	20
2.4.3. Taxonomies of language learning strategies	21
<i>O'malley & Chamot's classification of language learning strategies</i>	21
<i>Rubin's classification of language learning strategies</i>	23
<i>Oxford's language learning strategies</i>	24
2.5. Research Instruments for Measuring Language Learning Strategies	26
2.5.1. Strategy inventory for language learning	26
2.6. International Studies on Language Learning Strategies and Language Achievement	28
2.7. Turkish Studies on Language Learning Strategies and Language Achievement	29
2.8. Recent Developments	30

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

3. Introduction.....	33
3.1. Research Design	33
3.2. The Context of the Study	34
3.3. Participants	35
3.4. Data Collection Instruments	35
3.4.1. Strategy inventory for language learning questionnaire (SILL)	35
3.4.2. Achievement scores	36
3.5. Data Collection Procedures	37
3.6. Data Analysis Procedures	37
3.6.1. Data analysis procedures for research question 1	38
3.6.2. Data analysis procedures for research question 2	38
3.6.3. Data analysis procedures for research question 3	38
3.6.4. Data analysis procedures for research question 4	39

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS and DISCUSSION

4. Introduction.....	40
4.1. Results	40
4.1.1. Results relating to research question 1	40
<i>Results of the exploratory factor analysis</i>	41
<i>Results of the confirmatory factor analysis</i>	42
4.1.2. Results relating to research question 2	42
4.1.3. Results relating to research question 3	43
4.1.4. Results relating to research question 4	44
4.2. Discussion	45
4.2.1. Discussion relating to research question 1	45
4.2.2. Discussion relating to research question 2	47
4.2.3. Discussion relating to research question 3	49
4.2.4. Discussion relating to research question 4	50

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

5. Overview of the Study.....	53
5.1. Summary of the Findings.....	54
5.2. Implications for Teaching.....	56
5.3. Directions for Future Research and Limitations of the study	57

REFERENCES.....	58
------------------------	-----------

APPENDICES

Appendix A	66
Appendix B.....	73

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 4 - 1. Pattern matrix.....	41
TABLE 4 - 2. LLS use profiles of the ecurrent sample.....	43
TABLE 4 - 3. Paired samples t-tests of the students' performance on achievement test.....	43
TABLE 4 - 4. Correlations between strategy use and success in B2 level achivement test.....	44

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1. O'Malley and Chamot's classification of language learning strategies	22
FIGURE 2. Features of language learning strategies.....	25

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AIBU.....	Abant İzzet Baysal University
CFA.....	Confirmatory Factor Analysis
Dil-Mer.....	The Language Teaching and Research Centre
EFA.....	Exploratory Factor Analysis
EFL.....	English as a Foreign Language
ELT	English Language Teaching
FA.....	Factor Analysis
LLS.....	Language Learning Strategies
SILL.....	Strategy Inventory for Language Learners
SLA.....	Second Language Acquisition

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Ömer Faruk İPEK

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction

This chapter presents the background to the study, the setting in which the research was conducted, the purpose, the research questions, the significance of the study, and the setting. By looking at each section in details, it will enable an explicit understanding of the study.

1.1. Background to the Study

Language teaching in general and English Language Teaching (ELT) in particular has changed tremendously over the centuries. Principally, language teaching in twentieth century underwent numerous changes and innovations. “Language learning, teachings are dynamic, fluid, mutable processes. There is nothing fixed about them” (Larsen-Freeman, 2004: 186). Unlike the teaching of other subjects – Maths, Physics, etc. which have by and large remained the same, the ELT tradition has been subject to tremendous change, especially throughout the twentieth century. Approximately, every decade a new approach or methodology comes into practice (Karn, 2007).

Pica (2000) states that there has been a growing body of research that is related to instructional issues, observations, and concerns. Numerous studies have found that to guide the learning process, second language (L2) learners benefit from a variety of experiences. These range from direct instruction and correction of students to

conversational communication. What the studies have shown, moreover, is that such experiences need to be offered, not randomly or eclectically, but rather, in a highly selective and principled way. Selection depends on stages of L2 development, strategies of cognitive processing, and features of linguistic complexity

The last century made a new trend in ELT. This was called “Language Learning Strategy (LLS)”. LLSs have become popular in ELT in recent years because of the findings of cognitive language learning theory assumes humans as processors of information (Cephe & Yeşilbursa, 2006).

Many researchers studied LLS to make their students more responsible for their own learning. Rubin (1975), O’Malley and Chamot (1990), and Oxford (1989) were some of the researchers that started and contributed to the LLS. As cited in Yalçın (2006) in terms of language learning, learning strategies are strategies that help a learner develop a language system (Rubin, 1987). To understand the process of language acquisition, researchers are concerned with learning strategies rather than communication strategies or production strategies which relate to language use (O’Malley, Chamot & Kupper, 1995). A great deal of research has been conducted to identify and classify language learning strategies. Some of the research has handled how learning strategies function in the second language acquisition process, and other researchers have dealt with the teachability of strategies (Vance, 1999).

As cited in Chamot (2005), Grenfell and Harris (1999) asserts that learning strategies are procedures that facilitate a learning task. Strategies are most often conscious and goal-driven, especially in the beginning stages of tackling an unfamiliar language task. Once a learning strategy becomes familiar through repeated use, it may be used with some automaticity, but most learners will, if required, be able to call the strategy to conscious awareness. Learning strategies are important in second language learning and teaching for two major reasons. First, by examining the strategies used by second language learners during the language learning process, we gain insights into the metacognitive, cognitive, social, and affective processes involved in language learning. The second reason supporting research into language learning strategies is that less

successful language learners can be taught new strategies, thus helping them become better language learners.

In the last decade, researchers in second language acquisition (SLA) have been attempting to provide an empirical basis for learning strategies, as the means by which learners internalize L2 rules. Earlier work on learning strategies focused on the good language learner while others have centered on promoting learner autonomy. In spite of this body of research, serious questions have begun to be raised. The results of instruction in learning strategies have been less than satisfactory. It is suggested that we lack sufficient knowledge about strategies which unsuccessful learners use. In addition, there is a tendency for researchers to generate different sets of learning strategies, resulting in overlapping and poorly defined categories (LoCastro, 1994).

Nacera (2010) states that many researches in second or foreign language have been done in the last century, dealing with LLS. These researches had a practical goal which was the exploration of the ways of empowering or rising language learner to become more self-directed, resourceful, flexible, and effective in their learning. However, language learning is a huge field of research, dealing with many topics. Language learning strategies are seen as particularly important in the enhancement of learner autonomy because the use or adoption of appropriate strategies allows learners to take more responsibility (Dickinson, 1987).

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Students learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in universities often face the difficulties in learning English and to reach a required level of proficiency that universities ask from them. Therefore, most of the students spend more time than a year in preparatory schools to pass their proficiency examinations that the university administration puts as an obligation to continue their education in their departments. What generally observed is that while some learners experience great difficulty in learning a new language, others adapt to the learning atmosphere quickly and make

progress easily. It is natural that some students are better and faster than others in learning English. However, this does not explain the difference between successful and unsuccessful students learning English. Obviously, there are other factors which lead students to success or failure. Woodrow (2006), for example, lists individual differences such as self-efficacy, motivation, and language learning strategy use as factors in adaptive language learning.

This study aims to explore the language learning strategies utilized by students of English at the Preparatory School of Abant İzzet Baysal University. It also aims to analyze the use of language learning strategies in accordance with students' academic achievement in English language.

1.3. Research Questions

The following questions were addressed in the current thesis;

1. What is the construct validity of SILL with the current sample?
2. What is the LLS use profile of the current sample?
3. What significant differences are there in the frequency of strategy use between successful and unsuccessful students?
4. Is there a relationship between strategy use and success in the B2 level achievement examination?

1.4. Significance of the Study

The necessity for English in advance level in Turkey is a must in developing with the result of globalization today. Advanced level of English is required in almost all fields, from academic studies to business, from trade to international affairs, from education to travel. As English has been the lingua franca for almost a century, the English language is popular and necessary in universities in Turkey. Some of the

universities in Turkey have English as a medium of instruction; and some others offer English instruction in some of their faculties and departments. Therefore, most universities provide English preparatory classes for students.

In most Preparatory classes in Turkey, the education takes two semesters. In some of the departments, students are obliged to pass the proficiency examination of that university or get an accepted score from nationally accepted examinations such as KPDS or UDS, or internationally recognized examinations such as TOEFL, FCE, or IELTS. Every year, approximately 750 students go through preparatory school in Abant İzzet Baysal University. To be more effective in English language education, several studies and researches have been conducted. However, to the researcher's knowledge, this thesis study is the only study that looks into the relationship between language learning strategies and academic achievement in English language learning in preparatory school in general. The results of the study might help with producing new ideas to better training of the English language at the institution.

1.5. Setting

The current study is conducted in the English Preparatory School of Abant İzzet Baysal University. Abant İzzet Baysal University is a public university located in Bolu having a large variety of undergraduate and graduate programs. The students of the university come from all over Turkey, not only from Bolu and the neighboring region. The medium of instruction is both Turkish and English.

There are three kinds of instructional designs. They are full medium of English in departments such as Maths, Physics, Biology, and Chemistry. The students have to pass the proficiency examination that the preparatory school does, or present their language level document taken from KPDS, UDS, TOEFL, FCE, or IELTS examinations. The second type of instructional design is that students studying at physical education school, education faculty, physical rehabilitation school, or vocational school do not study English as a medium of instruction, so they do not get

preparatory school education. The third and last type is optional faculties and departments. Faculties such as engineering, administration and economics, and the department such as psychology study one year in preparatory school, but they do not need to pass the proficiency examination or present their language documents.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2. Introduction

In this section, first of all, the trends in English language teaching (ELT) will be presented and relevant literature will be mentioned. Second, different approaches to educational psychology will be defined. Third, the concept of individual differences in language learning will be reviewed briefly; and finally, language learning strategies (LLS), and the key concept of this thesis, will be discussed.

2.1. Trends in English Language Teaching

While it is beyond the scope of this thesis to present a detailed account of the history of ELT, it is useful to trace the developments in the field in order to provide a context for the study. As Rodgers (2001) states, ELT emerged as a recognized profession in the last century. Central to this phenomenon was the emergence of the concept of “methods” of language teaching. This concept, that is, the notion of a systematic set of teaching practices based on a particular theory of language and language learning proved to be extremely powerful, and the quest for better methods preoccupied teachers and applied linguists throughout the 20th century (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Richards (2005) groups the trends in ELT of the last 50 years as follows:

Phase 1: Traditional approaches (up to the late 1960s)

Phase 2: Classical Communicative Language Teaching (1970s to 1990s)

Phase 3: Current Communicative Language Teaching (late 1990s to the present)

The following section will deal with the first phase, also known as the “Age of Methods” (Rodgers, 2001, p: 6).

2.1.1. The age of methods

As Rodgers (2001) points out, during the age of methods, a number of quite detailed prescriptions for language teaching were proposed. For example, Situational Language Teaching evolved in the United Kingdom while a parallel method, Audio-Lingualism, emerged in the United States. These methods were followed by alternative methods such as Silent Way, Suggestopedia, Community Language Learning, and Total Physical Response. Karn (2007) stresses that these methods were very much deeply rooted in the prevailing ideas of their times. For example, Audio-Lingualism was based on the tenets of behaviorism, the dominant theory of learning in the 1950s; while Suggestopaedia and Community Language Learning were influenced by the humanistic approaches to learning that were popular in the 1960s and 1970s (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Rodgers (2001) continues to state that in the 1980s, these methods in turn were overshadowed by more interactive views of language teaching, which collectively came to be known as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), including The Natural Approach, Cooperative Language Learning, Content-Based Teaching, and Task Based Teaching. These latter approaches emphasized teaching language through communication rather than for it (Karn, 2007).

Despite their differences, all these methods were similar in that they all consisted of sets of prescriptions as to what teachers and learners should do in the language classroom. These prescriptions determined what material the teacher should present, and when and how to teach it. They also determined for learners what approach they should take towards the teaching materials and classroom activities. In other words, specific roles for teachers, learners and instructional materials were clearly spelled out (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Where there was a consensus on the right way to teach foreign languages, many teachers now share the belief that a single right way does not exist. It is certainly true that no comparative study has consistently demonstrated the superiority of one method over another for all teachers, all students and all settings. Some teachers prefer to practice one of the methods to the exclusion of others. Other teachers prefer to pick and choose in a principled way among the methodological options that exist, creating their own unique blend (Dodget, 2003).

Each of the different methods has contributed new elements and has attempted to deal with some issues of language learning. However, they were derived in different historical context, stressed different social and educational needs and have different theoretical consideration. Therefore, in teaching practice, in order to apply these methods effectively and efficiently, practitioners should keep the following in mind: who the learners are, what their current level of language proficiency is, what sort of communicative needs they have, and the circumstances in which they will be using English in the future, and so on. In a word, no single method could guarantee successful results (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Although methodologists were in search of more effective methods of teaching foreign languages, many realized that no single method could ever be a panacea for the solution of problems in ELT. Hence, a pessimistic view developed among the methodologists themselves. For example, Larsen-Freeman (1987) argued against the superiority of any particular method. Surveying the early practices of ELT methodology since the 1960s, she concluded that " the science of language teaching has not reached the point of being able to consistently demonstrate the superiority of one methodology over another for all teachers and all students and all settings ... and perhaps it never will" (p.5). Long (1991) even stated that methods did not matter because they did not exist.

Thus, teachers and researchers came to realize that no single research finding and no single method of language teaching would bring total success in teaching a second language especially as it was seen that certain learners seemed to be successful

regardless of methods or techniques of teaching (Brown, 2000). This newer understanding in foreign language teaching methodology has been described as the postmethod condition because of a set of newer beliefs and assumptions surrounding foreign language teaching practices (Arıkan, 2006). The following section will deal briefly with the main concepts of the postmethod condition.

2.1.2. The postmethod condition

The postmethod condition is characterized by leaving methods-only arguments to find effective strategies to teach in the most appropriate and effective way while considering the practitioner's views and roles in preparing and teaching language materials. Hence, according to the general perception of this era, instead of looking for the best language teaching method to follow, the language teacher must find the most effective strategies and techniques to enrich her or his teaching repertoire. This understanding of the individual journey of the language teacher has grown in contrast to the mainstream and widespread model of language teacher education programs which have been characterized by imposing methodological concerns rather than inviting the individual language teacher to find her or his way to best teaching practices (Arıkan, 2006). According to this post-method pedagogy, as Kumaravadivelu (2001) summarizes:

“As a pedagogy of possibility, postmethod pedagogy rejects the narrow view of language education that confines itself to the linguistic functional elements that obtain inside the classroom... The boundaries of the particular, the practical, and the possible are inevitably blurred. They interweave and interact with each other in a synergistic relationship in which the whole is greater than the sum of its parts (p. 545).”

Recent exploration in L2 pedagogy signals a shift away from the conventional concept of method toward a “postmethod condition” that can potentially refigure the relationship between theorizers and teachers by empowering teachers with knowledge, skill, and autonomy. The postmethod condition is a state of affairs that compels us to refigure the relationship between the theorizers and practitioners of method. As conceptualizers of philosophical underpinnings governing language pedagogy,

theorizers have traditionally occupied the power center of language pedagogy while practitioners of classroom teaching have been relegated to the disempowered periphery. If the conventional concept of method entitles theorizers to construct knowledge – oriented theories of pedagogy, the postmethod condition empowers practitioners to construct classroom-oriented theories of practice. If the concept of method authorizes theorizers to centralize pedagogic decision making, the postmethod condition enables practitioners to generate location-specific, classroom-oriented innovative practices (Kumaravadivelu, 1994, p: 27).

Current theory and research has encouraged a trend towards an eclectic mixing of teaching methods. This has been called 'the postmethod condition' (Kumaravadivelu 1994). It implies a renewed focus on the teacher's role as an informed decision-maker in the classroom, after what seems like a long period of neglect in the professional literature. Although communicative principles are still significant signposts, there is currently a search for broader guiding principles to the complex choices teachers must make in their work.

The nature of such guiding principles is still far from clear. Prabhu (1990) has argued that a teacher's own evolving 'sense of plausibility' is the truest guide to decision making. On the other hand, others influenced by post-modernist critical theories, such as Seedhouse (1996), assert that the constraints of institutional discourse are unavoidable in any account of teaching practice. Between these two extremes lie various balanced models, such as Brown's (1994) 'enlightened eclecticism' responding to the needs of 'multiple worldwide contexts', and Kumaravadivelu's (1994) 'principled pragmatism' based on a set of method-neutral teaching strategies.

According to a survey done by Bell (2005) few teachers define methods in the narrow pejorative sense used by post methodologists. Most teachers think of methods in terms of techniques which realize a set of principles or goals and they are open to any method that offers practical solutions to problems in their particular teaching context. Given this degree of openness, it is not surprising that when asked to describe their own methodology, teachers overwhelmingly use the term 'eclectic'. Teachers' eclecticism

appears to be based on an awareness of the existence of different methods and a willingness to draw from each of them. Eclecticism is most often connected to notions of teacher autonomy and context sensitivity. A knowledge of methods is equated with a set of options, which empowers teachers to respond meaningfully to particular classroom contexts. In this way, knowledge of methods is seen as crucial to teacher growth.

Block (2001) argues the place of both the teachers and the theoreticians to have a word to decide the classroom setting. Adamson (2004) has argued that ‘Methods are still useful props for teachers in constructing their own pedagogy’. And that pedagogy, as Cummings (1989) has described, is highly personalized ‘based on unique experiences, individual conceptions, and their interactions with local contexts’. The evidence here suggests that teacher attitude to methods is highly pragmatic. Their interest in methods is determined by how far they provide options in dealing with their particular teaching contexts. By looking so, these ideas support the intuitions of Diane Larsen-Freeman:

“People who say we are beyond methods are making more of a political statement than anything else. I think they misconstrue what a method can be. They’re saying there is no room in language teaching for formulas, for prescriptive practices to be imposed on teachers worldwide. Certainly I have no quarrel with that. But I think it’s a big mistake to mix up method and its implementation or how a method is used. I wouldn’t want to impose a method on anybody, but it seems to me the more methods we have, the more we see the variety of human experience, the more we have a bigger palette from which to paint our picture. We have more choices . . . It is a question of expanding, revising one’s thought-in-action repertoire “(2001, p: 5).

One of the consequences of the postmethod condition is that researchers in the field of ELT have started to look to educational psychology to provide a theoretical basis for many of the new classroom applications (Williams & Burden, 1998). The following section will provide an overview of the major theories of educational psychology which have contributed to developments in the field of ELT.

2.2. Different Approaches to Learning Psychology

Designing effective instruction goes beyond systematically executing various steps within an instructional design model. Among a host of considerations, effective instructional design should take into consideration the theoretical bases in which it is grounded. This is not to say that learning theory offers instructional designers answers to design problems but instead, offers clarity, direction and focus throughout the instructional design process. Three learning theories, specifically behaviorism, cognitivism, and constructivism, are addressed within the scope of instructional design (McLeod, 2003).

As the current thesis is mainly depends on cognitivism, this concept will widely be discussed below. However, since the methodology of ELT has been affected by the theory of behaviorism, this trend will also be mentioned in order to create a context for the emergence of cognitive theory.

2.2.1. Behaviorism

The theory of behaviorism concentrates on the study of overt behaviors that can be observed and measured. It views the mind as a "black box" in the sense that response to stimulus can be observed quantitatively, totally ignoring the possibility of thought processes occurring in the mind (Good & Brophy, 1990).

In the traditional behaviorist model, learners undergo some form of conditioning. Ultimately, the goal of conditioning is to produce a behavioral result. In an academic venue, changing behavior is more difficult to measure than in other contexts, like a karate class, where there are observable physical behaviors that result from physical stimuli. For example, in the hypothetical karate class, if students do not form straight lines they are punched in the shoulder (stimuli), after a few people get out of line, and get punched, the line becomes noticeably straighter (behavioral response). However, in an academic context, behaviorists substitute verbal behavior (e.g. responding appropriately to a question) for physical behavior. The behaviorist would

interpret, for example, a student's correct answer to a question as a sign of successful conditioning, and then continue to reinforce correct responses behaviorally by assigning good grades. Often, the form of conditioning used to achieve desirable verbal behavior is a lecture-based pedagogy. Behaviorism thus views the student as an unreflective responder. In a behaviorist paradigm, the student is engaged in the educational process only in that she displays the appropriate verbal behavior (e.g. checking the correct box on a multiple choice test). There is no subjective element to learning—either in determining what to study or in how information is interpreted, used, or understood (Boghossioian, 2006).

The primary focus of the *behavioral* perspective is on behavior and the influence of the external environment in shaping the individual's behavior. As such, the primary responsibility of the instructional expert is to identify and sequence the contingencies that will help students learn. Teachers should then state the objectives of the instruction as learners' behaviors. Learning is inferred from behavior, so it is important to identify the goal behavior, this involves breaking that goal behavior into a set of simple behaviors and arranging them in a sequence of frames that will help students progress toward the goal (Baruque & Melo, 2003).

To cite Brown (2006: 1), language teaching in the 1960s “seemed to putter along unceremoniously with various amalgams of structural approaches (Fries, 1952) and audio-lingual methodology (Pitman 1963; Brooks 1964) that stressed oral practice through pattern drills and a good deal of behaviorally-inspired conditioning (Skinner 1957)”. In behaviorism learning happens due to imitation, and in the case of language learning situations, knowledge occurs thanks to the imitative processes of the students. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that everything we say has already been heard. This is the process which children follow when learning their first language. They copy and reproduce everything they listen to. However, the question arises of what if something new is produced. Behaviorists explain this phenomenon through analogy. In other words, people generalize what they have learned previously.

Behaviorists consider that the majority of human behavior are learned and this

happens due to environmental influence. Therefore, learning is a change of behavior. For this change in behavior to take place it is necessary to apply some processes such as a stimulus presentation, a produced response for the final application of a feedback process. This last step is considered as the most important part in behaviorist learning (Ramaprasad, 1983).

However, behaviorism soon came under criticism. Mergel (1998) summarizes the fall out of favor of the behaviorist approach to learning as people began to find limitations in the behaviorist approach to understanding learning, but after a while behaviorists were unable to explain certain social behaviors. Similarly, Lightbrown and Spada (1993) state that for second language acquisition, as for first language acquisition, the behaviorist account has proven to be at best an incomplete explanation for language learning. Psychologists have proposed new, more complex theories of learning.

While behaviorism was being used in psychology and education and new studies on human behavior were developed, and a new theory emerged. For this new theory the centre of human knowledge and learning is placed in the mind of every human being as well as in the information processing stage: Cognitivism.

2.2.2. Cognitivism

While the behavioral perspective has an external focus, the *cognitivist* one has an internal one. Learning is described as a change in knowledge stored in memory. As a consequence, the instructional expert is challenged with organizing new information for presentation, carefully linking new information to previous knowledge and using a variety of techniques to guide and support the mental processes of the student (Williams & Burden, 1997).

In education, cognitivism presents as its main characteristics those established by Ausubel (1987), Bruner (1966), Piaget (1998) and Vygotsky (1988). According to Ausubel, learning should be meaningful for the student. This aspect means that

everything that is presented to the student should have a meaning in the environment in which the student lives. An essential characteristic for learning to take place is that it should go from the general to the specific. The teacher should present first the rule and later the examples that apply to the rule. It is necessary to take into account that for learning to take place the student relies on some cognitive structures that are organized hierarchically. These structures determine the cognitive process of the student.

In cognitivism, the learning process that takes place in the classroom is meaningful. The teacher should facilitate it by means of the relation the student should establish between his/her background knowledge and the new knowledge. For discovery learning to be meaningful it is also necessary for the student to establish the relation to different solutions assigned to different problems. Memoristic learning is passive and receptive as a norm, but it can be accommodated to become a significant one by means of the relation established among other kinds of learning, therefore, this kind of learning cannot surpass the level of the student and it should always appear in a specific context (Varela, 2003).

The teaching of foreign languages was also influenced by this theory, therefore, cognitivism appeared as an underlying theory for the methods used in the teaching of foreign languages that appeared during the 60's such as the Cognitive Code, Silent Way, Community Language Learning. These methods show the use of cognitive psychology theories in the learning process of languages. The techniques used in these methods focus on meaningful learning and also in the contextualization of the foreign language aspects (Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Larsen-Freeman, 2001).

2.3. Individual Differences

Many variables have been suggested as possible characteristics of individuals that will influence how successful different individuals will be at learning another language. Among them, the most frequently investigated appear to be language aptitude, attitudes and motivation, learner styles, learning strategies, and age, and each

of these classes of variables has been shown to relate to measures of achievement in a second language (Gardner, 1997).

2.3.1. Aptitude

Harmer (2007) claims that some students are better at learning than others. At least that is the generally held view, and in the 1950s and 1960s it crystallized around the belief that it was possible to predict a student's future progress on the basis of linguistic aptitude tests. Lightbrown and Spada (2006) assert that it is possible that people have different aptitudes for different kinds of study. However, if we consider aptitude and intelligence for learning language in general, our own experience of people we know who speak two or more languages can only support the view that 'learners with a wide variety of intellectual abilities can be successful language learners. This is especially true if the emphasis is on oral communication skills rather than metalinguistic knowledge' (p.57). Differences in foreign language ability are apparently only felt in societies where foreign learning is treated as a problem rather than everyday fact of life (Cook, 1991).

2.3.2. Motivation

Motivation is probably the most frequently used catch-all term for explaining the success or failure of virtually any complex task. It is easy to figure that success in a task is due simply to the fact that someone is motivated. It is easy in second language learning to claim that a learner will be successful with proper motivation. Such claims are of course not erroneous, for countless studies and experiments in human learning have shown that motivation is a key to learning (Crooks & Schmidt, 1991). Obviously, the motivation to learn is important. However, it has been noted that those who experience some success are among the most motivated to learn. Thus, motivation may be as much a result of success as a cause (Yule, 1985).

Motivation in L2 learning has chiefly been used to refer to the long-term fairly stable attitudes in the students' minds. Two types of motivation have been talked about:

integrative and *instrumental* motivation, introduced by Gardner and Lambert (1972, 1985) the integrative motivation reflects whether student identifies with the target culture and people in some sense, or rejects them- the Focusing Question statement ‘Studying a foreign language is important to my students because they will be able to participate more freely in the activity of other cultural groups’ was actually adapted from one used by Gardner for testing integrativeness. The more that a student admires the target culture – reads its literature, visits it on holiday, looks for opportunities to practice the language, and so on – the more successful the student will be in the L2 classroom. Instrumental motivation means learning the language for an ulterior motive unrelated to its use by native speakers, such as to pass an examination to get a certain kind of job (Cook, 1991).

2.3.3. Age

The age of our students is a major factor in our decisions about how and what to teach. People of different ages have different needs, competences and cognitive skills; we might expect children of primary age to acquire much of a foreign language through play, for example whereas for adults we can reasonably expect a greater use of abstract thought.

One of the most common beliefs about age and language learning is that young children learn faster and more effectively than other age group. However, as Yu (2006) points out, it appears that older children seem to be far better learners than young ones in most aspects of language acquisition other than pronunciation. According to Harmer (2007), this relative superiority of older children as learners can be attributed to their increased cognitive abilities, which allow them benefit from more abstract approaches to language teaching. It may also have something to do with the way younger children are taught (Harmer, 2007).

2.3.4. Learning styles

According to Keefe (1979), learning styles are the cognitive and affective traits

that are relatively stable indicators of how learners perceive, interact with and respond to the learning environment. Reid (1987) claims that learning styles are the variations among learners in using one or more senses to understand, organize, and retain experience. Language learning styles, which are a student's preferred method or mode of learning, have aroused a great deal of attention and been the focus of a number of L2 studies in the years since Reid's influential work on the topic was published in 1987. Reid's 1995 definition is now the most widely accepted, as is her 1987 categorization of styles into six types – Visual (these learners prefer seeing things in writing), Auditory (prefer listening), Kinaesthetic (prefer active participation/experiences), Tactile (prefer hands-on work), Group (prefer studying with others), and Individual (prefer studying alone). The incorporation of learning styles into foreign language teaching is of great importance due to several reasons. First and foremost, the integration of learner styles makes teaching and learning a dialogue between the teacher and the learner, and within learners (Montgomery & Groat, 1998).

This section has briefly introduced some of the most frequently studied individual differences in the field of ELT. The following section will present in more detail the concept of language learning strategies (LLSs), the individual difference variable which forms the core of this thesis.

2.4. Language Learning Strategies

This section will first present a number of definitions of the LLS. Following this, the early studies on the good language learner which formed the foundation for LLSs research will be reviewed. Third, the most influential LLS taxonomies will be introduced. Fourth, LLS research instruments will be covered. Finally, this section will conclude with a look at recent developments in LLSs research.

2.4.1. Defining LLS

A review of the literature shows that there have been a number of definitions of LLSs. For example, they have been described as the techniques that individuals use to

help them learn L2 material and improve their skills (Oxford, 1986). Giving a more detailed definition, Chamot and Kupper (1989) indicated that LLSs are the techniques utilised by students in acquiring, storing, and recalling new knowledge and skills, and that some of them are observable while others are not. More recently, Dörnyei (2003) has stated that learning strategies are techniques that students apply of their own free will to enhance the effectiveness of their learning. These definitions, which emphasize the conscious use of mental techniques to improve language learning, show the firm basis of the LLS concept in the cognitive theory of learning. As Griffiths and Parr (2001) stated, there are two important consequences of this view of LLSs. First, the fact that some students are more successful at learning languages could be attributed to the use of more effective LLSs. Second, it should be possible to assist less successful language learners by promoting awareness and encouraging the use of more effective LLSs. It is the teachability aspect of LLSs that attracted the attention of researchers and teachers.

2.4.2. The good learner research

According to Oxford (2006), an important impetus in LLS research was the concept of the ‘good language learner’, which was the focus of a number of early studies. The earliest study on the characteristics of the good language learner is that of Stern (1975, cited in Griffiths, 2003). He believed that the good language learner was characterised by positive learning strategies, which included experimentation, planning, developing the new language into an ordered system, revising progressively, searching for meaning, practising, using the language in real communication, self-monitoring, developing the target language into a separate reference system and learning to think in the target language. Ten years later other studies followed (see, e.g. O’Malley, Chamot, Stewnes-Manzanares, Russo & Küpper, 1985; Politzer & McGroarty, 1985; Rubin, 1987) which suggested similar ideas.

As Oxford and Nyikos (1989) pointed out, it was the use of strategies appropriate to the students’ stage of learning, personality, age, purpose for learning the language, and type of language which enabled them to take responsibility for their own

learning by enhancing learner autonomy, independence, and self-directing. They listed a number of strategies including cognitive strategies for associating new information with existing information in the long-term memory; metacognitive strategies for planning, arranging, focusing, and evaluating their own learning process; social strategies for interacting with others, managing others and managing discourse; affective strategies for directing feelings, motivations, and attitudes related to learning; and compensation strategies for overcoming deficiencies in knowledge of the language.

2.4.3. Taxonomies of language learning strategies

As the previous section has shown, researchers have attempted to classify LLSs in terms of common features. In this section the taxonomies which have had a crucial role in the LLS domain will be explained. These taxonomies have affected and helped the scholars in their studies about LLS. The three most influential taxonomies are from O'Malley & Chamot (1990), Rubin (1987), and Oxford (1990).

O'Malley & Chamot's classification of language learning strategies

O'Malley and Chamot (1990) classified LLS under three headings: Metacognitive, Cognitive, and Social/Affective Strategies. The first class is Metacognitive Strategies which are higher order executive skills that plan for, monitor, or evaluate the success of a learning activity. The subgroups of metacognitive strategies are: selective attention for special aspects of a learning task, planning the organization of written or spoken discourse, monitoring and reviewing attention to a task, monitoring comprehension or production while it is occurring, evaluating or checking comprehension after completion of a receptive language activity, or evaluating language activity after it has taken place.

The second class includes Cognitive Strategies. They operate directly on upcoming information, manipulating it in ways that enhance learning. Cognitive strategies have three basic subgroups as rehearsal, organization and elaboration process. Elaboration may also involve some other techniques like inferencing, summarizing,

deduction, transfer and imagery. In application, cognitive strategies are generally limited to specific types of tasks.

The third class is Social / Affective Strategies. It represents a board grouping that involves interaction with another person or control over affect. Similar to metacognitive strategies, they are applicable to an idea variety of tasks. Cooperation (working with others), questioning for clarification and self-talk are subgroups of this final category. O'Malley and Chamot's classification of LLSs is presented in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1. O'Malley & Chamot's classification of language learning strategies

General Strategy Classification	Representative Strategies	Definitions
Metacognitive Strategies	Selective Attention	Focusing on special aspects of learning tasks, as in planning to listen for key words or phrases.
	Plannig Monitoring	Planing for the organization of either written or spoken discourse. Reviewing attention to a task, comprehension of information that should be remembered, or production while it is occurring.
	Evaluation	Checking comprehension after completion of a receptive language activity, or evaluating language production after it has taken place.
Cognitive Strategies	Rehearsal Organization	Repeating the naes of items or subjects to be remembered. Grouping and classifying words, terminology, or concepts according to their semantic or syntactic attributes.
	Inferencing	Using information in text to guess meanings of new linguistic items, predict outcomes, or complete missing parts.
	Summarizing	Intermittently synthesizing what one has heard to ensure the information has been retained.
	Deducing Imagery	Applying rules to the understanding of language. Using visual images (either generated or actual) to understand and remember new verbal information.
	Transfer Elaboration	Using known linguistic information to facilitate a new learning task. Linking ideas contained in new information, or integrating new ideas with known information.
Social / Affective Strategies	Cooperation	Working with peers to solve a problem, pool information, check notes, or get feedback on a learning activity.
	Questioning for Clarification	Eliciting from a teacher or peer additional explanation, rephrasing, or examples.
	Self-talk	Using mental redirection of thinking to assure oneself that a learning activity will be successful or to reduce anxiety about a task.

(O'Malley & Chamot, 1990:46)

Rubin's classification of language learning strategies

Rubin (1981) has a classification of language learning strategies. These strategies are categorized in three. These are learning strategies which affect learning directly (including two subcategories, cognitive and metacognitive strategies), communication strategies and social strategies which affect the process indirectly constitutes these three kinds. Below the classification of Rubin and Wenden, (1987: 23, 27) is given.

Direct learning strategies

Rubin (1981) defines the first subcategory of strategies that affect learning directly, that is cognitive strategies. Cognitive strategies are steps of operations used in learning or problem solving which require direct analysis, processes or strategies through which an individual obtains knowledge or conceptual understanding. Cognitive strategies can be grouped into six types.

1. Clarification / Verification:
2. Guessing / Inductive Inferencing:
3. Deductive reasoning
4. Practice
5. Memorization
6. Monitoring

Above are the steps of operations used in learning or problem solving that require direct analysis, transformation, or synthesis of learning materials.

The second subcategory of learning strategies is the Metacognitive strategies. These strategies are used to oversee, regulate or self-direct language learning. They involve various processes as planning, prioritizing, setting goals, and self-management.

Communication strategies

Communication Strategies are less directly related to language learning since their focus is on the process of participating in a conversation and getting meaning

across of clarifying what the speaker intended. Communication strategies are used by speakers when faced with some difficulty due to the fact that their communication ends outrun their communication means or when confronted with misunderstanding by a co-speaker.

Social strategies

Social Strategies are those activities learners engage in which afford them opportunities to be exposed to and practice their knowledge. Although these strategies provide exposure to the target language, they contribute indirectly to learning since they do not lead directly to the obtaining, storing, retrieving, and using of language.

Oxford's (1990) language learning strategies

According to Oxford (1990) learning strategies are steps taken by students to enhance their own learning. Strategies are especially important for language learning because they are tools for active, self-directed involvement, which is essential for developing communicative competence. Appropriate language learning strategies result in improved proficiency and greater self-confidence. Oxford also indicated that despite the fact that LLSs had only recently come to the formal attention of researchers, they had actually been in use for thousands of years, such as the mnemonic or memory devices used by storytellers. A major advantage of the recognition of the role of LLSs, in Oxford's opinion, was that language learners began to realize the power of their own strategies to influence their own learning.

Oxford (1990) gave the features of language learning strategies. She mentioned twelve features that commonly overlaps the language learning strategies. The table 2 below explains these features.

Figure 2. Features of language learning strategies

Language learning strategies:	
1.	Contribute to the main goal, communicative competence.
2.	Allow learners to become more self-directed.
3.	Expand the role of teachers.
4.	Are problem-oriented.
5.	Are specific actions taken by the learner.
6.	Involve many aspects of the learner, not just the cognitive.
7.	Support learning both directly and indirectly.
8.	Are not always observable.
9.	Are often conscious.
10.	Can be taught.
11.	Are flexible.
12.	Are influenced by a variety of factors.

(Oxford, 1990)

In Oxford's (1990) classification, strategies are divided into two major classes: direct and indirect. These two classes are subdivided into a total six groups (memory, cognitive, and compensation under the direct class; metacognitive, affective, and social strategies under the indirect class.

The first major class, direct strategies for dealing with the new language, is like the performer in a stage play, working with the language itself in a variety of specific tasks and situations. The direct class is composed of memory strategies for remembering and retrieving new information, cognitive strategies for understanding and producing the language, and compensation strategies for using the language despite knowledge gaps. The performer works closely with the director for the possible outcome.

The second major class – indirect strategies for general management of learning – can be likened to the director of the play. This class is made up of metacognitive strategies for coordinating the learning process, affective strategies for regulating emotions, and social strategies for learning with others. The director serves a host of functions, like focusing, organizing, guiding, checking, correcting, coaching, encouraging, and cheering the performer, as well as ensuring that the performer works cooperatively with other actors in the play. The director is an internal guide and support to the performer. The functions of both the director and performer become part of the learner, as he or she accepts increased responsibility for learning.

The teacher allows and encourages the learner to take on more of the director functions that might have earlier been reserved, at least overtly, for the teacher. In the past, teachers might have been the ones to correct learner errors and tell the learner exactly what to do when. Now learners do more of these for themselves, while teachers' functions become somewhat less directive and facilitating (Oxford, 1990). The table form of Oxford's Classification can be seen in Appendix A.

With the emerging taxonomies of LLSs, it was possible to design instruments in order to research LLS use in learners. The following section will cover different research methods in LLS.

2.5. Research Instruments for measuring LLS

Reviewing the research methods used in investigate LLS use, White, Scramm and Chamot (2007) include oral interviews, questionnaires, observation, verbal reports, diaries and journals, and recollection studies. Similarly, Anderson (2005) summarizes the tools to measure LLS of learners as standardized inventories, think-aloud protocols, and reflective journals. Also, Hsiao and Oxford (2002) assert that exactly how many strategies are available to learners to assist them in L2 learning and how these strategies should be classified are open to debate. Different classification systems based on contrasting criteria have been proposed. In this current thesis Oxford's Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) has been used to discover the students' LLS use. This instrument is mentioned in the following section.

2.5.1. Strategy inventory for language learning

Many researchers (see, e.g. Chamot, 2005; Dornyei, 2005; Park, 2011) have remarked that most descriptive studies on LLSs have relied on Oxford's (1990) SILL. This instrument has been used extensively to collect data from large numbers of language learners. SILL is a standardized measure (see Hsiao & Oxford, 2002) with versions for English as a second language (ESL) students and students of a variety of

other languages, and as such can be used to collect and analyze information about large numbers of students. It is a self –scoring paper survey that consists of fifty 5-point Likert-type items subsumed under the six categories of LLS of Oxford's (1990) taxonomy. There have been a number of works investigating the reliability and validity of SILL in a variety of contexts. Hsiao and Oxford (2002) conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on SILL to test a number of theories of language learners' strategy use. They found that the six-factor model was the most consistent with their data, although the model did not produce a fully adequate fit to the data. More recently in a study with Korean university EFL students, Park (2011) reported that although Cronbah alpha values suggested internal consistency of the items within each construct, CFA did not validate Hsiao and Oxford's (2002) 6-factor model. As a result, Park emphasized the necessity to reinvestigate the classification system of SILL. Hence, one of the aims of this thesis is to determine the construct validity of SILL with the current data set.

SILL has been translated into a number of languages other than English, including Turkish (Cesur, 2008; Demirel, 2009). Cesur (2008) administered a Turkish version of SILL to 768 university students who were studying EFL at a university preparatory school. As a result of Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), 3 items were taken out from the SILL, leaving 47 items subsumed under 6 factors. Demirel (2009) used both EFA and CFA to test the validity of her Turkish translation of SILL, and she found that Oxford's original six factor model was confirmed. Demirel's translation is used in the current study.

With the development of SILL, it has been possible to investigate the relationship between LLS use and other learner variables such as learning styles, gender, proficiency level, culture, and task. The current study is interested in the relationship between LLS use and language achievement. Studies on LLS and language achievement carried out internationally and in Turkey are dealt with in the following sections.

2.6. International Studies on Language Learning Strategies and Language Achievement

In Griffith and Parrs (2001) study, students reported using memory strategies least. Most frequently used are social strategies, followed by metacognitive strategies. Students ranks compensation and cognitive strategies in the middle-frequency range, while affective strategies come only one rank higher than memory strategies. The study which Griffiths (2003) conducted to search the relationship between the LLS use and proficiency of students showed that the frequent use of a large number of language learning strategies is reported by the most proficient learners. O'Malley (1985) discovered that, although students at all levels reported the use of an extensive variety of learning strategies, defined as "any set of operations or steps used by a learner that will facilitate the acquisition, storage, retrieval or use of information" (1985, p.23), higher level students reported greater use of metacognitive strategies (that is strategies used by students to manage their own learning), leading the researchers to conclude that the more successful students are probably able to exercise greater metacognitive control over their learning. Moreover, Ehrman and Oxford (1995) investigated the relationship between end-of-course proficiency and a number of variables including language learning strategies. The results of this study indicated that cognitive strategies such as looking for patterns and reading for pleasure in the target language were the only kinds of strategies which had a significant positive relationship with success in learning language.

Wharton (2000) also conducted a study with 678 university students learning Japanese and French in Singapore. He concludes that students with good and fair proficiency used SILL strategies more often than those with poor proficiency. More recently, Gerami and Baighlou (2011) reported that according to their study using a wider range of learning strategies and different from those often preferred by their unsuccessful peers. The former often used metacognitive strategies while the latter tended to use surface level cognitive strategies. The successful students used overall strategies significantly more frequently than the unsuccessful students.

Wang & Nunan (2011) assert that given the fact that styles are derived from

strategy preferences, there were differences between the most preferred strategies of the effective and ineffective learners. The specific strategy preferences favored by the more effective students reflected their ‘communicative’ orientation. Similarly, the authority-orientation of less effective students is reflected in their apparent dependence on the teacher and the textbook. Looking at the data from the study as a whole, one would see the main difference between the more effective and less effective learners as being attitudinal. The more effective learners in this study were more active and more prepared to take control of their own learning. They spent significantly more time out of class practicing their English, and displayed a greater degree of autonomy than the less effective learners. This is consistent with results obtained from qualitative research. All of the strategies deployed by more effective learners that emerged as statistically significant carried with them an active learning aspect regardless of the style to which they correspond.

Murray (2010) summarizes his study by explaining that the use of LLS in and of themselves may not be significant drivers for enhancing classroom achievement. While their influence appears to be positive, it is not always robust in nature. The more important consideration may be the quality or effectiveness of their use rather than the quantity. LLS are but one component in the overall process of L2 learning, and any model for such learning must include other student individual variables, such as differences in learning styles, aptitude, and student affective dispositions such as motivation, classroom anxiety, and attitude. The social context and cultural differences in understanding and deriving meaning from foreign language texts also have a significant role to play.

2.7. Turkish Studies on Language Learning Strategies and Language Achievement

LLS use has been commonly studied in Turkey and various studies reported a correlation between the LLS use and academic achievement. For example, Sarıçoban and Sarıcaoğlu (2008) looked at the relationship between learning and teaching strategies on academic achievement. According to Sarıçoban and Sarıcaoğlu, the

students using compensation strategies have higher grades, while students who benefit from affective strategies are less successful than the others. The other strategies did not have a significant relation with academic achievement.

On the other hand, Cesur (2008) in his study found out that using LLS more frequently was related to a higher level of achievement among university students. Aydın (2003) also studied the relationship between LLS use and academic achievement. He found a positive correlation between strategy use and achievement. Also, in her study, Yılmaz (2001) states that there was a positive correlation between the participants' level of English and their LLS use. Similarly, Yalçın (2006) indicates that more successful students used more language learning strategies.

Yılmaz (2010) conducted a study among the student studying at Onsekiz Mart University in Turkey. He found out that language learning strategies were widely used among more proficient learners than less proficient learners. However, the results of the current research showed some differences regarding Turkish students' preferences for the frequency of usage of learning strategies.

Cephe and Yeşilbursa (2006) report their study the that overall reported language strategy use of Turkish university EFL students at two different proficiency levels. Those results showed that while students in the more advanced group reported to use compensation strategies the most frequently the elementary students reported more frequent use of metacognitive strategies. There were also significant differences between the reported uses of metacognitive and memory strategies in favor of the elementary students; and of compensation strategies in favor of the more advanced students.

2.8. Recent Developments

To emphasize the importance of the LLS in English language learning environment in recent years, Grenfell (2009) states that; language learner strategies

should not be seen as simply just another list of things to teach. Teaching strategies is no easier than teaching grammar, it that both rely on a metalanguage which learners may, or may not, be assimilate. Presently, as well as broadening out the field of enquiry to include much more skill-specific research, researchers are looking at the symbolic relationships between strategies. There is also a move to concentrate less on quantity of strategy uptake than the quality. A different way of looking at a strategically informed pedagogy, for example, might not be to introduce 'strategy instruction' per se at all, but to create the conditions of the strategic classroom.

Chamot (2005) addresses the importance of LLS training. She states that numerous descriptive studies have addressed the goal of understanding the range and type of learning strategies used by good language learners and the differences in learning strategy use between more and less effective learners. However, until relatively recently there have been fewer studies focusing on the second goal of trying to teach language learning strategies in classroom settings. Oxford (2002) also states the importance of LLS training in recent years. In her article, she indicates that LLS training is frequently successful. Strategy training succeeds best when it is woven regular class activities on a normal basis.

Chamot (2004) states that a number of models for teaching learning strategies in both first and second language contexts have been developed. These instructional models share many features. All agree on the importance of developing students' metacognitive understanding of the value of learning strategies and suggest that this is facilitated through teacher demonstration and modeling. All emphasize the importance of providing multiple practice opportunities with the strategies so that students can use them autonomously. All suggest that students should evaluate how well a strategy has worked, choose strategies for a task, and actively transfer strategies to new tasks.

Cohen and Macaro (2007) gives the systematic understanding of the recent developments in LLS. Recently, the LLS use is identified according to different skills in ELT like listening, speaking, reading, writing, and vocabulary. It is also concluded that establishing principles for strategy elicitation in qualitative research has come a long

way. However, it is emphasized that there is still work to be done in validating those principles. Moreover, they assert that there is still much work to be done on strategy instruction in order to prove to learners, teachers, and wider ELT research community that such an undertaking in the classroom is worthwhile.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3. Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the language learning strategy use and academic achievement. This chapter first focuses on the overall design of the thesis study. Then, it describes the research questions and gives the necessary information about the participants in the study. Subsequently, the data collection instruments and the procedures are described. Finally, the data analysis procedures are explained.

3.1. Research Design

This study is based on the survey method, which aims at describing the characteristics of a population by examining a sample of that group. Although survey data can be collected by means of structured interviews (for example, in market research or opinion polls), the main data collection method in surveys is the use of questionnaires. The results of a questionnaire survey are typically quantitative, although the instrument may also contain some open-ended questions that will require a qualitative analysis. The main methodological issues concerning surveys are (a) how to sample the participants, and (b) how to design and administer the research tools, the ‘self-report questionnaire (Dornyei, 2007). This study was conducted to determine the LLS use profile of a group of the students of the Foreign Language Preparatory School at Abant İzzet Baysal University, to determine whether or not there were any significant

differences in the LLS profiles of successful and unsuccessful students, and to investigate the correlation between LLS use and English language achievement. Specifically, this thesis deals with the students' English language learning process from A1 level to the end of B2 level in the 2011-2012 academic year.

3.2 The Context of the Study

The programme of the preparatory school involved in the current study takes the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR; Council of Europe, 2001) as a basis. CEFR is intended to provide a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc. across Europe. It comprises (a) a descriptive scheme for analyzing what is involved in language use and language learning and (b) a definition of communicative proficiency at six levels arranged in three bands - A1 and A2 (Basic User), B1 and B2 (Independent User), C1 and C2 (Proficient User).

According to Little (2007) the CEFR is not language specific. It describes, for example, the communicative functions that learners should be able to perform at different proficiency levels, but does not specify how those functions might be realized in a particular language. It thus assumes that any communicative task requires a comparable level of proficiency from language to language.

CEFR provides a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc. across Europe. It describes in a comprehensive way what language learners have to learn to do in order to use a language for communication and what knowledge and skills they have to develop so as to be able to act effectively. The description also covers the cultural context in which language is set. The Framework also defines levels of proficiency which allow learners' progress to be measured at each stage of learning and on a life-long basis (Council of Europe, 2001:1).

3.3. Participants

A total of 445 EFL students (168 males, 277 females) aged between 18-21 years from Abant İzzet Baysal University, Foreign Language Preparatory School in Bolu, Turkey, completed the Turkish version of SILL (Demirel, 2009). After completing their foreign language preparatory year, they would go on to study in different faculties of the university: Science and Letters ($n=340$), Engineering and Architecture ($n=37$), and Economics and Administration ($n=68$). The participants ranged in proficiency from elementary (A2) to upper-intermediate (B2). They came from different parts of Turkey, and expressed a wide variety of reasons for wanting to study English. These reasons were “professional development” ($n=357$), “work abroad” ($n=57$), “to follow the media and the internet” ($n=3$), and because learning English was compulsory for their studies ($n=28$). Totally there were 445 students took the B2 level achievement examination and 181 of them were unsuccessful and 264 were successful.

3.4. Data Collection Instruments

The data in this study consisted of Demirel’s (2009) Turkish version of the SILL and the achievement scores of the participants. 50 item SILL questionnaire conducted when those 445 students were at A2 level. Then, those students took 14 weeks of English education at the preparatory school and then students took the B2 level achievement examination. In B2 level achievement examination consisted of listening, reading, writing, speaking, and use of English examinations.

3.4.1. Strategy inventory for language learning questionnaire (SILL)

The Turkish version of Oxford’s (1990) SILL which was translated by Demirel (2009) was used to investigate the LLS use of the participants. This instrument consists of 50 items which participants respond to via a five point Likert type scale. These items are grouped into the two main categories of direct and indirect strategies. These categories are further divided into three subcategories: memory strategies,

compensation strategies, and cognitive strategies; and metacognitive strategies, affective strategies and social strategies. Thus, the instrument has an overall 6 factor structure, which was validated using confirmatory factor analysis in Demirel's adaptation study (2009).

This inventory was referred to in more than 40 studies, of which 12 were doctoral dissertations. The mentioned studies involved approximately 8000 students all over the world. The reliability of the inventory (Cronbach Alpha) in these studies varies between .93 and .98 (Demirel, 2009). Despite the wide reports of the reliability of SILL, the validity of the instrument has been less well-reported (see, e.g. Hisao & Oxford, 2002; Cesur, 2008; Demirel, 2009; Park, 2011). Park (2011) suggested that it would be beneficial to reinvestigate the factor structure of SILL with different samples.

The participants were also required to answer questions about demographic information, such as age, gender, department, high school type, attitudes towards the English language, and their aims to learn English. These questions were asked to obtain some necessary background information to make the interpretation of the findings more meaningful.

3.4.2. Achievement scores

Achievement scores are evaluated by examining at the achievement examination, which affects the fifty percent of students' total score. In the examination, there are five sections; reading, writing, listening, speaking, and use of English. Each has a portion of twenty percent. After students take the achievement test and get their scores of one hundred, the total score is divided into two, as fifty percent of the achievement examination is taken into account to see the students' total achievement score. The other factors affecting students total achievement score are; portfolio assignment (%20), quizzes (%20), and attendance to the classes (%10). Fifty percent of the students' achievement scores are counted with their grades taken from portfolio, quizzes, and attendance, and their total achievement score is obtained out of 100. If the total achievement score is under sixty, it is assumed that student is unsuccessful, and

they study that level again for five weeks. If the student is able to get a higher score than sixty, then the student is accepted as successful, and continues to the next level.

3.5. Data Collection Procedures

SILL was administered to the participants in the sixth week in the fall semester of the 2011-2012 academic year while the students were studying at A2 level with permission from the Preparatory School administration (see Appendix B). The rationale behind waiting until the participants had reached A2 level before administering the data collection instrument was to ensure that each student had had sufficient time to develop an idea about learning English at the Preparatory School. The instrument was administered with the assistance of the instructors teaching the different groups. Participation in the study was voluntary, and the participants were reassured that their responses would remain anonymous and be used for research purposes only.

Second, after administering SILL to the students at A2 level, the achievement scores were taken into account to compare the results of the SILL questionnaire and the students' scores from the achievement test. B2 level achievement examination scores were accepted as the achievement test. Students took this exam in the spring semester. In other words, in order to take the B2 level exit exam, the students must succeed A1, A2, B1 levels and they must do the requirements that B2 level requires. Until the B2 level achievement examination, which we assume as the achievement test, the students took 20 weeks of English language education that each week consists of 30 hours of classes which makes 600 hours of English language teaching.

3.6. Data Analysis Procedures

This section will describe the rationale and procedures used to analyse the data collected in the current study. All statistical tests were run with SPSS 16.0 and AMOS 16.0.

3.6.1. Data analysis procedures for research question 1

The first research question aimed to investigate the construct validity of SILL with the current data sample. The usual procedure to test the construct validity of an instrument which has been adapted to a new context is confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). CFA is a theory driven, confirmatory technique in which the researcher can determine how well a set of data fits to a hypothetical model (Schreiber, Stage, King, Nora, & Barlow, 2006). Variables are fixed *a priori* to load on specific factors (Bandalos, 1996). However, the current data set proved problematic during the *a priori* loading. Hence, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with maximum likelihood factor extraction (MLFE) and promax rotation (cut off .40) (Costello & Osborne, 2005) was conducted initially to determine the latent factor structure of the data. The goodness of fit of the emerging model was then assessed with CFA. A number of indices are generally used when assessing model fit. In the current study, the most commonly preferred normed χ^2 statistic, Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) were calculated (see, e.g. Schreiber, et al., 2006). The minimum cut off point for model validation is ≤ 3 for the normed χ^2 statistic, and $\geq .90$, $\geq .90$ and $<.06$ to $.08$ for CFI, TLI and RMSEA respectively (Kline, 2005).

3.6.2 Data analysis procedures for research question 2

The second research question was posed in order to investigate the LLS use profiles of the participants in the current study. In order to answer this question, the descriptive statistics were calculated for each factor emerging from the CFA for the total sample, the participants who had been successful in the achievement test, and those who had been unsuccessful.

3.6.3 Data analysis procedures for research question 3

The third research question aimed to determine whether or not there were any significant differences in the LLS use profiles of the successful and unsuccessful

students. In order to do so, independent samples t-tests were run on the mean scores for each factor for each group of students.

3.6.4 Data analysis procedures for research question 4

The final research question asked whether or not there was a relationship between LLS use and success in the achievement examination. Because it was not possible to access the exact achievement scores of many of the unsuccessful students, the successful students were coded as “1” and the unsuccessful students as “2”. With achievement now a categorical variable, the non-parametric Spearman’s correlation coefficient was calculated (Field, 2009) to reveal any correlations between the factors of LLS and achievement.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

4. Introduction

In this section the results of the applied study will be given in details. To succeed this aim, first the research questions will be mentioned, and then the results of each research questions will be discussed. After examining the results of the study, in the discussion part, the results of the current study and the similar studies will be compared and discussed. The discussion part will reveal the similarities and differences of the studies conducted in the different parts of the world and also in Turkey.

4.1. Results

As it has been mentioned both in the introduction and the methodology parts of the thesis, research questions will be given in the results and discussion section again. The results will be examined by looking at each research question one by one to give a clear and understandable explanation.

4.1.1. Results relating to research question 1

“What is the construct validity of SILL with the current sample?”

In order to answer the first research question, EFA with MLF extraction and promax rotation was conducted to discover the latent factor structure of the data set, followed by CFA to assess the goodness of fit of the emerging model. This section will

present the results of both analyses.

Results of the exploratory factor analysis

As Field (2009) points out, in order to investigate whether it is possible to factorise a set of data, it is necessary to perform EFA. An initial EFA (MLFE with promax rotation) with the 50 items of SILL showed that the data set was factorable (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy = .90; Bartlett's test of sphericity, $p=.000$).

Table 4 - 1. Pattern matrix

Item	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
D36	.68			
D30	.67			
D35	.64			
B17	.62			
B16	.60			
D34	.59			
F49	.53			
D37	.49			
F47	.49			
E40	.48			
D31	.45			
A2				
B13				
F45		.67		
F46		.56		
F48		.52		
D38		.48		
D32		.42		
C24				
A3			.71	
A4			.68	
A5			.55	
A6			.55	
C26				.85
C29				.75
C25				.41
C28				

In order to ensure the hygiene of the data set, items with communalities of below .30 were deleted. As a result, items 1, 7-12, 14, 15, 18-23, 27, 33, 39, 41-44, and 50 were not included in the ensuing EFA. In other words, 27 items survived the hygiene process. A second EFA of these surviving items revealed that items 2, 13, 24 and 28

failed to load on any of the factors. This left a 23-item model of four factors with initial eigenvalues of greater than 1.00 which accounted for 48.13% of the variance. The pattern matrix of this model is given in Table 3.

As the results in Table 3 shows, items 2, 13, 24 and 28 failed to load on any of the four factors, leaving 23 items.

Results of the confirmatory factor analysis

The model elicited from the EFA stage underwent CFA in order to assess the goodness of fit. During this stage, items 11, 14-17, 32, and 38 were deleted to improve the fit, leaving a total of 16 items under the 4 factors named Metacognitive strategies (items 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37), Social strategies (items 45, 46, 48), Memory strategies (items 3, 4, 5, 6) and Compensation strategies (items 25, 26, 29). The results of the indices indicated that the model had good fit to the data ($\chi^2/df=2.22 (\leq 3)$; CFI=.94, TLI=.93, RMSEA=.052). Standard β coefficients ranged from .42 to .81, and standard errors ranged from .03 to .10. The Cronbach alpha values for each of the factors were .83 (Metacognitive strategies), .64 (Social strategies), .72 (Memory strategies), .73 (Compensation strategies) and .84 for the whole scale, which indicated that the 4-factor model had good internal reliability, although the reliability of the Social strategies factor was borderline.

4.1.2. Results relating to research question 2

“ What is the LLS use profile of the current sample?

In answer to the first research question, the descriptive statistics are presented in Table 4-2 for the whole group (n=445), the students who were successful at B2 level (n=264) and those who were unsuccessful (n= 181). According to the mean for each category of LLS for the whole group, the most frequently used LLS was social strategies ($M=4.32$) followed by metacognitive strategies ($M=3.77$), compensation strategies ($M=3.65$) and finally memory strategies ($M=2.93$).

Table 4 – 2. LLS use profiles of the current sample (N=445)

LLS type	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Memory	1. Successful	181	2.92	.87	.06
	2. Unsuccessful	264	2.94	.83	.05
	3. Total	445	2.93		
Compensation	1. Successful	181	3.78	.81	.06
	2. Unsuccessful	264	3.56	.88	.05
	3. Total	445	3.65		
Metacognitive	1. Successful	181	3.90	.72	.05
	2. Unsuccessful	264	3.68	.72	.05
	3. Total	445	3.77		
Social	1. Successful	181	4.38	.58	.04
	2. Unsuccessful	264	4.28	.67	.04
	3. Total	445	4.32		

The results for the successful and unsuccessful groups showed a similar pattern, with the respective means of LLS category for each group given as follows: social strategies ($M=4.38$; 4.28), metacognitive strategies ($M=3.90$; 3.68), compensation strategies ($M=3.78$; 3.56), and memory strategies ($M=2.92$; 2.94).

4.1.3. Results Relating to research question 3

“What significant differences are there in the frequency of strategy use between successful and unsuccessful students?”

Table 4 - 3. Paired samples t-tests of the students’ performance on achievement test (N=445)

LLS Category	Group	M	SD	df	t
Memory	1. Successful	2.92	.87	443	-.18
	2. Unsuccessful	2.94	.83		
Compensation	1. Successful	3.78	.81	443	2.65*
	2. Unsuccessful	3.56	.88		
Metacognitive	1. Successful	3.90	.72	443	3.14*
	2. Unsuccessful	3.68	.72		
Social	1. Successful	4.38	.58	443	1.61
	2. Unsuccessful	4.28	.67		

* $p < .05$

In order to answer the second research question, we have carried out an independent-samples t-test to compare the difference between successful and unsuccessful students in B2 level achievement test according to their LLS use. The results are given in Table 4-3. As these findings indicate, there was no significant difference between the successful and unsuccessful students for memory strategies or social strategies. On the other hand there was a significant difference between successful and unsuccessful students for compensation strategies and metacognitive strategies. This suggests that the successful students used both these categories of LLS to a significantly greater degree than did the unsuccessful students.

4.1.4. Results relating to research question 4

“Is there a relationship between strategy use and success in the B2 level achievement examination?”

It is necessary to look over the two correlations to have an explicit answer to the research question 4. One is the correlation between the factors and the achievement scores, and the other one is the correlation between each of the factors. Table 4-4 gives the results of the Spearman Rho correlative coefficients.

Table 4 – 4. Correlations between strategy use and success in B2 level achievement test

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1 Achievement	1.000	-	-	-	-
2 A	.02	1.000	-	-	-
3 B	-.12**	.27**	1.000	-	-
4 C	-.15**	.33**	.40**	1.000	-
5 D	-.06	.28**	.36**	.41**	1.000

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

There is no significant correlation between students' achievement, memory or social strategies, suggesting that there is no relationship between the use of these strategies and students' success in the achievement test, although the students used social strategies the most frequently. On the other hand there was a correlation of small magnitude but high significance between the achievement scores, compensation and

metacognitive strategies.

Regarding the correlations between the LLS categories, it can be inferred from the table that, using memory strategies have a positive correlation with using compensatory strategies to low to moderate level. This level can be assumed to have a low to moderate significance (.27). Also, using memory strategies have a positive correlation with using metacognitive strategies. The magnitude is at moderate level (.33). Finally, using memory strategies have a positive correlation with using Social strategies. This level can be said to have a moderate magnitude (.28).

The correlation between the use of compensation strategies and metacognitive strategies is also positive. The magnitude is moderate (.40). Moreover, the correlation between the use of compensation strategies and social strategies is also of amoderate magnitude (.36). The correlation between metacognitive strategies and social strategies are the greatest positive relationship between each other, with a moderate magnitude of .41.

4.2. Discussion

In this part of the current thesis, the results will be discussed by looking at the similar studies or researches done both in Turkey and in different countries. The results will be compared by looking at how similar or different those studies from each other. The research questions will be handled one by one to provide a clear understanding.

4.2.1. Discussion relating to research question 1

“What is the construct validity of SILL with the current sample?”

In the current study there were 445 students and SILL questionnaire had been used to provide the required data. After applying the questionnaire, the necessity to validate the SILL questionnaire aroused. To provide a valid data, both EFA and CFA

was conducted. After conducting the factor analysis, 50 item SILL questionnaire was reduced to 16 item. Those 50 items had originally been grouped into six; however, in the current thesis 16 items were grouped into four factors.

Park (2011) conducted a study to found out whether or not the two-construct or six-construct classification system represents the SILL. In the study three models were assumed and the analysis was done according to these three models. In Model 3, the 50 items of the SILL consist of six constructs. In the study, the alpha coefficient of the compensation and affective strategies were below and acceptable level of .60, the other strategies were above the cut-off point. In Model 3, the CFA values were smaller than cut-off point of .90. This finding indicated that the six-construct classification is not sufficient to account for the structures of the SILL. Similarly, Hsiao and Oxford (2002) studied a more detailed CFA for the SILL. In the study mainly eight models were tested, but Model 6 was the model studied in the current thesis. In Model 6, Six-Factor Oblique, was tested with CFI. Although CFI measures showed that Oxford's six factor model (Model 6) strategy classification was better than other models in explaining learners' reported use of the 50 strategies, this model has not produced a fully adequate fit to the data. Also, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .94 for the whole questionnaire, and .75, .84, .69, .86, .68, and .78, respectively, for the six learning strategy categories. These reliability findings were consistent with the values reported in most other investigations using the ESL/EFL SILL. Both Hsiao and Oxford (2002) and Park (2011) support the findings of the current thesis. These three studies shows that Six-Factor Oblique is not sufficient to measure the students' use of LLS.

On the other hand, Demirel (2009) tested the construct validity of SILL, which was adapted into Turkish through CFA. In the study, two models were examined. In the first model, the six –factor strategy classification model was taken as a model, a six-factor oblique model was constructed and was tested through CFA. In the study, it was evident that its goodness indices for both models are high enough, but it can also be said that Model 1 is a better model, and explains the students use of LLS. Moreover the internal consistency reliability coefficient for the whole scale was found as .92.

4.2.2. Discussion relating to research question 2

“What is the LLS use profile of the current sample?”

As mentioned in the results section, the groups were memory ($M=2.92$), compensation ($M=3.65$), metacognitive ($M=3.77$), and social ($M=4.32$). As it can be implied from the data, students use social strategies most. Then it is metacognitive strategies, which is commonly used. Compensation strategies were coming right after the metacognitive strategies. And lastly, the least commonly used strategies by the current sample were memory strategies. Similar results were taken by Griffiths and Parr (2001). They stated that students reported using memory strategies least. Most frequently used were social strategies, followed by metacognitive strategies. Students ranked compensation and cognitive strategies in the middle frequency range, while affective strategies came only one rank higher than memory strategies.

On the other hand, there are several studies that have various findings in looking at the average LLS use profiles. Cephe and Yeşilbursa (2006), Yılmaz (2009), Gerami and Baighlou (2011), Murray's (2010), Magogwe and Oliver (2007), Sarıçoban and Sarıcaoğlu (2008) and Grossman (2011) found out similar results in their studies, but they are different from the results obtained from the current thesis.

The findings of the study done by Cephe and Yeşilbursa (2006) reports that a high proficiency use of metacognitive ($M=3.13$) and compensation strategies ($M=3.22$) and a low occurrence of affective strategies ($M=2.6$). Memory ($M=2.68$), cognitive ($M=2.82$), and social strategies ($M=2.9$) were in moderate use. According to the study done by Yılmaz (2009), six strategy groups were identified. In his study, it is stated that learners were high strategy users ($M=3.54$). He found out that compensation ($M=3.97$) and metacognitive ($M=3.80$) have the highest percentages. They are followed by cognitive ($M=3.50$), social ($M=3.41$), memory ($M=3.30$), and affective ($M=3.19$) strategies. In his study, it can be understood that while compensation and metacognitive strategies are preferred by the students mostly, memory and affective strategies were preferred least. The study conducted by Gerami and Baighlou (2011) on 388 university

students in Iran showed that, compensation ($M=3.29$) and metacognitive ($M=3.25$) strategies are used highly by the students. Whereas, memory ($M=2.80$) and cognitive ($M=2.83$) strategies are used in medium frequency. Social ($M=2.66$) and affective ($M=2.1$) strategies were used in low frequency. In Murray's (2010) study the mean for total strategy use for these students to be at the upper medium level at 3.37 out of a possible 5. With regard to the subscales, compensation ($M=3.60$) and social ($M=3.57$) strategies were considered to be high in use, with each of the other categories falling in the medium to low use category. Cognitive ($M=3.48$), metacognitive ($M=3.40$), and memory ($M=3.15$) strategies were in the medium to high frequency level. However, affective ($M=2.92$) strategies were in the low to medium frequency level. Magogwe and Oliver (2007) found out that for the group whilst again the metacognitive strategies ($M=3.26$) have the highest mean, they are followed by cognitive ($M=2.93$), social ($M=2.83$), affective ($M=2.73$), memory ($M=2.69$), and compensation strategies (2.54). Sarıçoban and Sarıcaoğlu (2008) states that students use metacognitive ($M= 3.70$) and compensation strategies ($M=3.47$) most. Cognitive strategies ($M=3.11$) and social strategies ($M=3.28$) follows the first two mostly used strategies. The least commonly used strategies were indicated as memory ($M=3.03$) and affective strategies ($M=2.98$). Grossman (2011) found out that students use compensation ($M=3.56$) and metacognitive ($M=3.42$) strategies mostly. Social ($M=3.38$) and memory strategies ($M=2.67$) are not as commonly used as the other strategies.

Yang on the other hand (1999) found out that the order of the usage of the factors among the students he studied as formal oral-practice strategies ($M=3.56$) which is explained as formal practice for speaking English, such as practicing the sounds of English, trying to imitate native English speakers, repeating saying new English words, and paying attention when someone is speaking English. Compensation strategies ($M=3.26$), social strategies ($M=3.07$), metacognitive ($M=3.06$) came after formal practice strategies. Functional practice strategies ($M=2.82$) is in the fifth rank and described as involving actively seeking or creating opportunities to use or practice English functionally. These strategies enable learners to increase their exposure to the second language outside the formal classroom, and the least used strategy was cognitive-memory strategies ($M=2.80$).

4.2.3. Discussion relating to research question 3

“What significant differences are there in the frequency of strategy use between successful and unsuccessful students?”

The results of the current study indicates that there was not a significant or meaningful difference between the successful and unsuccessful students for A (memory) strategies ($t=-.18$). On the other hand there was a significant difference between successful and unsuccessful students for B (compensation) strategies ($t=2.65$). This significant difference was also meaningful because the magnitude of the difference is big. Moreover, there was a significant difference between successful and unsuccessful students for C (metacognitive) strategies ($t=3.14$). The difference was also meaningful because the magnitude of the difference is very big. Also, there was a difference between successful and unsuccessful students for D (social) strategies ($t=1.61$); however, the difference is not meaningful as the magnitude is small. Similar results were obtained from the studies mentioned below.

Gerami and Baighlou (2011) state that successful students use metacognitive, compensation, social, memory, cognitive, and affective strategies respectively. The mean of the most frequently used strategy, metacognitive, is 4.16. And, the mean of the least frequently used strategy, affective, is 2.4. The successful EFL students reported medium use of strategy categories, as the mean of overall strategy use is 3.29. On the other hand unsuccessful students used cognitive, compensation, memory, metacognitive, social, and affective strategies respectively. The unsuccessful EFL students reported low use of strategy categories as, the overall mean is 2.34. The mean of the most frequently used strategy, cognitive, is 2.82. And, the mean of the least frequently used strategy, affective, is 1.73, lower than all other strategy groups. Similarly, Wharton (2000) studied the frequency level of strategy use and students self rating proficiency. In the study it is found out that good students use social strategies mostly. Metacognitive strategies are used in the second rank and in the third rank metacognitive strategies were used. A similar finding was obtained by Magogwe and Oiver (2007). It was stated that all students indicated a greater preference for

metacognitive ($M=3.28$), cognitive ($M=2.88$) and social strategies ($M=2.86$) than they did for other strategies. However, more good and fair students recorded preference for metacognitive strategies than did the poor proficiency students. Aslo, Yılmaz (2009) studied the relationships between LLS use and proficiency of the students. The students were classified into three groups according to their University general point averages; those whose averages were between 3.5-4.0 (good) and those whose averages were between 2.5-3.4 (fair) and those whose averages were lower than 2.5 (poor). All these values and strategy means displayed indicate that there are no significant differences ($p=.05$) in strategy use due to the students' university average. According to the study, good students use compensation ($M=4.13$) and metacognitive ($M=4.04$) strategies mostly. There was no significant difference between the cognitive ($M=3.72$) and social ($M=3.56$) strategies which have a rank of three and four. Memory ($M=3.51$) and affective ($M=3.51$) strategies have the same average and shared the fifth rank by good students. As cited in Akahon (2008), O'Malley (1985) investigated learning strategies used by 70 high school students who were classified as beginning and intermediate students. The findings showed that intermediate students tended to use more metacognitive strategies than those with beginning level proficiency; whereas, beginning level students used cognitive strategies more than intermediate level students. Generally, both beginning and intermediate level students used more cognitive than metacognitive strategies. Finally, the study by Grossman (2011) tells us that, successful students use metacognitive strategies most, and the difference between the mean of successful and unsuccessful students is both significant and meaningful ($M=3.63$). On the other hand, the difference between successful and unsuccessful students relating to LLS use for the other strategies neither significant nor meaningful.

4.2.4. Discussion relating to research question 4

“Is there a relationship between strategy use and success in the B2 level achievement examination?”

In the current study the the correlation rates of the strategies were given in the results section. It will be useful to remember the rates to compare the results of this

thesis and similar studies done earlier. The correlation between students' achievement and A (memory) is neither significant nor meaningful (.02). It means that using memory strategies does not support students' success in the achievement test. On the other hand the correlation between the achievement scores and B (compensation) is significant (-.12). This level, which indicates that using compensation strategies increases students' scores in achievement test, is also meaningful. Similarly, the correlation between the achievement scores and C (metacognitive) is the most significant and meaningful of all the other factors. (-.15). It can be said stated that using metacognitive strategies are by far the most supportive strategies that affects students success. However, the correlation between D (social) and achievement scores is not significant or meaningful (-.06). It can be understood that using social strategies does not have any positive or negative correlation with the language achievement. Also, Sariçoban and Sarıcaoğlu (2008) asserts that the use of which has a significant correlation with academic success, are compensation and affective strategies. While compensation strategies have a positive relation with academic achievement, the relation of affective strategies with academic success is negative. In other words, the students using compensation strategies have higher grades, while students who benefit from affective strategies are less successful than the others. The other strategies do not have a significant relation with academic achievement.

On the other hand, Murray (2010) indicates that the strongest relationship, at .30, was between cognitive strategy use, which includes techniques such as practicing, analyzing, and reasoning; monitoring; and creating structure for input and output, and their classroom achievement. The second strongest relationship was between memory strategy use at .24. The rest was not that much significant; social, at .13, metacognitive, at .08, compensation and affective strategies were at .01.

It can be inferred from the table that, using memory strategies have a positive correlation with using compensation strategies to low to moderate level. This level can be assumed to have a low to moderate significance (.27). Also, using memory strategies have a positive correlation with using metacognitive strategies. The significance is to moderate level (.33). Finally, using memory strategies have a positive correlation with

using social strategies. This level can be said to have a moderate significance (.28). The correlation between the use of compensation strategies and metacognitive strategies is also positive. The level is highly significant (.40). Moreover, the correlation between the use of compensatory strategies and social strategies has a high significance (.36). The correlation between metacognitive strategies and social strategies has the greatest positive affect among each other. The level of significance is high (.41).

While the highest correlation is between social and metacognitive strategies in the current thesis, Park (2011) found out different results. He studied the correlations among the constructs of the SILL. All the correlations among the constructs of the SILL were significant ($p < .01$), with the relatively low correlations of compensation and affective strategies with other strategy categories. The significant correlations among the six constructs indicate that six strategy constructs were unique as well as interrelated to each other. According to Park's study, correlation between cognitive and metacognitive strategies is the highest (.64). The correlation between memory and cognitive strategies is also high but not as high as the former one (.62). The correlation between memory and metacognitive is in the third rank (.58) while the correlation between metacognitive and affective is in the fourth rank (.45). Correlation between cognitive and affective strategies (.38) is in the fifth rank, and memory and affective strategies correlation (.35) is in the sixth. Correlation between cognitive and compensation strategies (.32) is in the seventh rank. The correlations between compensation and metacognitive and correlation between memory and compensation strategies has the same rate (.28) and shares the eighth rate. The least correlation was between compensation and affective strategies (.16). Murray (2010) also found out that the correlation between the constructs were highest between social and metacognitive (.59). The second highest was between memory and cognitive. The third highest rate was between memory and metacognitive (.35). The correlations between the other constructs of SILL were neither significant nor meaningful.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5. Overview of the Study

Language learning strategies of the students at Preparatory School of Abant İzzet Baysal University were investigated in this study. Additionally, the related literature on language learning strategies was reviewed and answers to four research questions were provided. Four research questions were as follows:

1. What is the construct validity of SILL with the current sample?
2. What is the LLS use profile of the current sample?
3. What significant differences are there in the frequency of strategy use between successful and unsuccessful students?
4. Is there a relationship between strategy use and success in the B2 level achievement examination?

In order to answer these questions, SILL questionnaire was administered to 445 students studying at English preparatory classes of Abant İzzet Baysal University Language Education and Research Center. 445 questionnaires were returned as valid. First of all, descriptive data (means, standard deviations, and frequencies) were portrayed. Then, by using SPSS 16.0 and AMOS 16.0, the statistical data was obtained. According to the EFA and CFA, 34 items of the questionnaires were deleted and six categories were reduced to four categories in order to enable the validity issue. To reach at the required answers for the research questions, B2 level achievement examination results of 445 students were asked from the administration of the language center, and then these two data, the scores and the data obtained from the questionnaire was studied. The summary of the findings is given below.

5.1. Summary of the Findings

The first question that was investigated in the current thesis was about the validity issue of the current sample. In the current study, after 445 students filled the SILL questionnaire, the required factor analysis both exploratory (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was done. After EFA, the inventory seemed to have some problematic items, and 27 items were failed to explain the current sample. After EFA and CFA conducted, it was realized that the problem continued and 7 items were taken out and then 16 items left in the inventory. Then, it was realized that 16 item four factors SILL was appropriate for our students. It was understood that 16 items of four factors SILL explains the perception of our current sample better than 50 item 6 factor SILL questionnaire.

Second the LLS use profiles of the current sample was investigated, and it is understood from the results that students studying at Abant İzzet Baysal University preparatory school mostly used social strategies ($M=4.32$). This means that if the students do not understand something in English, they ask the other person to slow down or say it again, or they ask English speakers to correct them when they talk. Moreover, it can be concluded that they practice English with other students and ask for help from English speakers. They also ask questions in English and try to learn about culture of English speakers. The second most commonly used strategy type was metacognitive strategies ($M=3.77$). This means that they try to find out as many ways as they can to use their English, and they notice their English mistakes and use that information to help them do better. Moreover, they pay attention when someone is speaking English, and they try to find out how to be a better learner of English. Also, they plan their schedule so they will have enough time to study English, and they look for people they can talk to in English. Besides, they look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English. Additionally, they have clear goals for improving their English skills, and they think about their progress in learning English. The third mostly used strategy type was compensation strategies ($M=3.65$). This can be concluded as students make guess to understand unfamiliar English words, and when they cannot think of a word during a conversation in English, they use gestures. Moreover, they

make up new word without looking up every new word, and they read English without looking up every new word. Finally, they try to guess what other person will say next in English, and if they cannot think of an English word, they use a word, a phrase that means the same thing. The least commonly used strategy type was memory strategies ($M=2.92$), such as thinking of relationships between what is already known and new things they learn in English, and using new English words in a sentence to remember them. Also, they remember a new English word by meaning a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used. The students also use flashcards, and they physically act out new word. They also review lessons often.

As the third question, the significant differences in the frequency of strategy use between successful and unsuccessful students were examined and we have carried out an independent-samples t-test to compare the difference between successful and unsuccessful students in B2 level achievement test according to their LLS use. According to the results of the research question three, the highest significance and meaningfulness between successful and unsuccessful students was in metacognitive strategies ($t=3.14$). This means that successful students in Abant İzzet Baysal University preparatory school used metacognitive strategies. The second highest correlation of significance between successful and unsuccessful students was in compensation strategies ($t=2.65$). This means that successful students used compensation strategies more than unsuccessful students. There was not a significant difference between the successful and unsuccessful students for A (Memory) strategies ($t=-.18$). Also, there was a difference between successful and unsuccessful students for D (Social) strategies ($t=1.61$); however, the difference is not significant. These data imply us that using memory or social strategies does not have any effect on student success.

Lastly, the correlations between strategy use and success in the B2 level achievement examination were studied. According to the data understood from the results of this thesis, using memory and social strategies was not related to student achievement in Abant İzzet Baysal University preparatory school. However, using metacognitive and compensation strategies were positively related to students' success. While the correlations between the factors are investigated, it can be understood that the

highest correlation was between compensation and social strategies. This means that, students using social strategies use compensation strategies, and students using compensation strategies use social strategies mostly (.41) The second highest correlation was between the compensation and metacognitive strategies (.40). This means that, students using compensation strategies use metacognitive strategies, or students using compensatory strategies use metacognitive strategies mostly. The least frequent correlation occurred between compensation and memory strategies (.27). This data implies that there is so little significance on students using memory and compensation strategies.

5.2. Implications for Teaching

The current study showed us that students use different strategies and these strategies affect their language learning success. It is understood from their answers to the instrument that, most of the students are not aware of LLS and their use. The students use LLS unconsciously, but those who use compensation and metacognitive strategies were more successful than the other students using social and memory strategies. It can be concluded that students need strategy instruction and teaching to make them aware what they are doing while studying themselves and during the class time. If the students can understand their own learning processes and attain some control over these processes, they will take more responsibility for their own learning; and those students who have that self-knowledge and skill in regulating their own learning are usually successful learners.

Second, it can be said that not only the students, but also the instructors may be given several sessions of LLS instructions. By doing this, instructors will be more attentive and careful about LLS use and teaching.

Finally, strategy instruction could be integrated in the curriculum as foreign language instruction at Preparatory School of Abant İzzet Baysal University. By doing this, the amount in the use of language learning strategies can be increased, and it will

certainly affect the quality of foreign language education in the institution.

5.3. Directions for Further Research and Limitations of the Current Study

There are a number of limitations to the current study. To start with, this thesis was conducted to the students' use of language learning strategies at Preparatory School Abant İzzet Baysal University. Therefore, a further research is needed for preparatory class students of other universities in Turkey, or a greater number of samples from different universities may be included to a study to find out the general LLS use of Turkish students studying at Turkish universities.

Secondly, other learner variables, such as motivation, learning styles, and attitudes and specific purposes (ESP) of preparatory class students could be explored. By looking at these in interrelated way, a more comprehensive and common data can be obtained.

Moreover, starting strategy instruction in language schools in Turkey is also recommended. It will be great use to become aware of the learning strategies through strategy instruction. Attempts to teach students to use learning strategies have produced good results (Rubin and Thompson, 1994). The main purpose of LLS instruction is to enable students become more aware of their learning strategy use and to help them become more responsible for their own learning. By doing this, students will be helped to become more autonomous learners. Such objectives can be only reached when students are trained in strategy use so that they become more independent and effective.

To sum up, these studies may give a clearer portrait of preparatory class students at universities. Accordingly, more appropriate programs and curricula can be prepared in the light of the research.

REFERENCES

- Adamson, B. (2004). 'Fashions in language teaching methodology' in A. Davies and C. Elder (eds.). *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Maldon, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Abkahon, J. (2008). The implications of learner strategies for second or foreign language teaching. *ARECLS*, Vol.5. 185-198.
- Arkan, A. (2006). Postmethod Condition and Its Implications for English Language Teacher Education. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, Vol.2, No.1. 1-11.
- Aslan, O. (2003). *The role of gender and language learning strategies in learning English*. M.A. Thesis. Ankara: Middle East Technical University The Graduate School of Socail Sciences.
- Aydın, T. (2003) *Language Learning Strategies Used By Turkish High School Students Learning English*. M.A. Thesis. İstanbul: İstanbul University institute of Social Sciences.
- Baruque, L.B., Melo, R., (2003). *Learning theory and instructional design using learning object*. World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia & Telecommunications: AACE.
- Bax and J.-W. Zwart (eds.). *Reflections on Language and Language Learning: In Honour of Arthur van Essen*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bell, D.M. (2005). *Do Teachers think that methods are dead*. (Retrieved December 7, 2011 from <http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/content/61/2/135.full.pdf+html>)
- Block, D. (2001). 'An exploration of the art and science debate in language education. *Modern language journal*. 28-35.

- Boghossian, Peter. (2006). Behaviorism, constructivism, and Socratic pedagogy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, Vol. 38. 716-735
- Brown, H.D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. NY: Longman.
- Brown, D. (2006). Forty years of Language teaching: The Nineteen Sixties. *Language Teaching*, 40/1. Cambridge University Press. 1-2.
- Cephe, P.T., Yeşilbursa, A.A. (2006) Language learning strategies of Turkish EFL students. *Education and Science*. Vol.31. No.39. 80-85.
- Cesur, O. (2008), Üniversite hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin yabancı dil öğrenme stratejileri, öğrenme stili tercihi ve yabancı dil akademik başarısı arasındaki açıklayıcı ve yordayıcı ilişkiler oruntusu. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Chamot, A.U. & Kupper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22.13-24.
- Chamot, A.U., Keatley, C.W. (2004). *Learning strategies of students of less commonly taught languages*. Paper presented at the 2004 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Chamot, A.U. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: current issues and resarch *Annual. Review of Applied Linguistic.*, 25, USA. 112-130.
- Cohen, A.D. & Macaro E. (2007). *Language learner strategies: 30 years of research and practice*. Oxford. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, V. (1991) *Second Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Costello A.B., Osborne, J. W. (2007) Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four Recommendations for Getting the Most From Your Analysis. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, Vol 10, No 7.35-37.

- Council of Europe, (2001) *Principles of CEF* (Retrieved November 11, 2011 from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_en.pdf)
- Crookes, G., and Gass, S.M. (1992) Tasks in a pedagogical context: Integrating Theory and Practice. *Multilingual Matters*. Clevedon. 42-45.
- Cummings, A. (1989). 'Student teachers' conceptions of curriculum: towards an understanding of language teacher development'. *TESL Canada Journal* 7/1.33-51.
- Demirel, M. (2009). The validity and reliability study of Turkish version of strategy Inventory for language learners. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 7 (6). 708-713.
- Dickinson, L. (1989). *Self instruction in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, Orientations, and Motivations in Language Learning: *Advances in Theory, Research, and Applications*. Volume 53. Issue 1. 5-13.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). Language Learners' Motivational Profiles and Their Motivated Learning Behavior. *Language Learning*, Volume 55. Issue 4. 8-19.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics : quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ehrman, M. E., Oxford, R. L. (1995). Cognition plus: Correlates of language learning success. *Modern Language Journal* 79(1). 67-89.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics in SPSS*. Sage publications, London.
- Gardner, R.C. (1997). Towards a Full Model of Second Language Learning: An Empirical Investigation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, iii. 35-43.
- Gerami, M.H., Baighlou, S.M.G. (2011). Language Learning Strategies Used by Successful and Unsuccessful Iranian EFL Students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 1567-1576.

- Good, T. L., Brophy, J. E. (1990). *Educational psychology: A realistic approach. (4th ed.)*. White Plains, NY: Longman
- Grenfell, M., & Harris, V. (1999). *Modern languages and learning strategies: In theory and practice*. London: Routledge
- Grenfell, G. (2007): Language learner strategy research and modern foreign language teaching and learning. *The Language Learning Journal*, 35:1, 9-22
- Griffiths, C., & Parr, J. M. (2001). Language learning strategies, nationality, independence and proficiency. *Independence*, 28. 7-10.
- Grossman, D. (2011) *A study of cognitive styles and strategy use by successful and unsuccessful adult learners in Switzerland*. School of Humanities of the University of Birmingham: Birmingham. 2011.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Pearson Education Limited
- Hsiao, T-Y., Oxford, R.L. (2002). Comparing Theories of Language Learning Strategies: A Confirmatory Factor Analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*. 368-383.
- Karn, S. K. 2007. Current Trends in ELT around the Globe. *Journal of NELTA*, Vol. 1 2 No. 1 & 2. 13-19.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The Postmethod Condition: (E)merging Strategies for Second Language Teaching. *Tesol Quarterly*. Volume 28. No. 1. 27-45.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(4). 537-560.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1987) *From Unity to Diversity: Twenty Five Years of Language Teaching Methodology* (Retrieved February 22, 2012 from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09571739585200491>)

- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2004). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. New Delhi:OUP.
- Lightbrown, P., Spada, N. (2006) *How languages are learned 3rd eds*. Oxford University Press.
- Little, D. (2007) Language Learner Autonomy: Some Fundamental Considerations Revisited. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* Volume 1, Issue 1. 35-46.
- LoCastro, V. (1994). Learning strategies and learning environments *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 2. 409-414.
- Long, M. (1991). SLA: Breaking the siege. *Univerisity of Hawaii Working Papers in ESL*, 17. 79-129.
- Magogwe, J.M., Oliver, R. (2007). The relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age and self-efficacy beliefs: A study of language learners in Botswana. *Science Direct. System* 35. 83-95.
- McLoad, G. (2003). *Learning Matters: Learning Theory and Instructional Design*.
- Mergel, B. (1998). *Learning theories of instructional design*. (Retrieved March 20, 2012 from <http://www.usask.ca/education/coursework/802papers/mergel/brenda.htm>)
- Montgomery, S., Groat, L. N. (1998). Student learning styles and their implications for teaching. *The Center for Research on Learning and Teaching*, the University of Michigan, 10. 1-8.
- Murray, B. (2010). Students' language learning strategy use and achievement in the Korean as a foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals_* Vol. 43, No. 4. 624-635.

- Nacera, A. (2010). Languages learning strategies and the vocabulary size *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2. 4021-4025.
- O'Malley, J. M. (1985). Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(3). 557-584.
- O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (1986). *Development of a new survey and taxonomy for second language learning*. Paper presented at the Learning Strategy Symposium, New York.
- Oxford, R. L., Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73/3, 291-300.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies. What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Oxford, R. (2006). Forty years of language Teaching. *Language Teaching*. 40. Cambridge University Press.
- Park, G. (2011). The Validation Process of the SILL: A Confirmatory Factor Analysis English *Language Teaching* Vol. 4, No. 4. 21-28.
- Pica, L. (2000) Tradition and transition in English language teaching methodology. *Elsevier System* 28. 137-148.
- Prabhu, N.S. (1990). "There Is No Best Method - Why?" *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 24, No. 2. 161-176.
- Ramaprasad, A. (1983). On the definition of feedback. *Behavioural Science*. 28. 87-111.
- Reid, J.M. (1987) The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly* 21.1. 87-95.

- Richards, Jack C. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press. (p.1,23)
- Rodgers, T.S. (2001). Language teaching methodology. *ERIC Issue Paper*, 1-13.
- Rossi-Le, L. (1989). *Perceptual learning style preferences and their relationship to language learning strategies in adult students of English as a second language*. Doctoral thesis, Drake University, Des Moines, IA.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the 'good language learner' can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9.
- Rubin, J. (1987). Learner Strategies: Theoretical Assumptions, Research History and Typology. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin, (Ed.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Prentice Hall International.
- Sarıçoban, A., Sarıcaoğlu, A. (2008). The effect of the relationship between learning and teaching strategies on academic achievement. *Novitas-Royal*, 2008, Vol.: 2 (2). 162-175.
- Seedhouse, P. (1996). "ELT classroom interaction: Possibilities and impossibilities." *ELT Journal*, Vol. 50, No. 1. 16-24.
- Vance, S. J. (1999). *Language Learning Strategies: Is There a Best Way to Teach Them?* (Retrieved January 14, 2012 from <http://www.epnet.com/.ebSCO>.)
- Varela Mendez, R. (2003) All about Teaching English. A Course for Teachers of English (pre-school through secondary). *Centro de Estudios Ramón Areces*, S.A. 10-18.
- Wong. A., Nunan, D. (2011). The learning styles and strategies of effective language Learners. *Elsevier*. System 39. 144-145.
- Woodrow, L. (2006) A model of adaptive language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 90, No. 3. 297-319

- Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning*, 50(2). 203-244.
- Williams, M., Burdem, R.L. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach*. Cambridge: CUP. (Retrieved March 27, 2012 from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Hismanoglu-Strategies.html>)
- Yalçın, M. (2006). *Differences in the perceptions on language learning strategies of English preparatory class students studying at Gazi University*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Ankara: Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences
- Yang, N. D. (1996). Effective Awareness-Raising in Language Learning Strategy Instruction. In R. L. Oxford, (Ed.), *Language Learning Strategies around the World: The Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. USA: University of Hawaii.
- Yu, M.C. (2006). The Effect of age on starting to learn, English. *Modern English Teacher*. 15. 52-61.
- Yule, G. (1985). *The study of language*. Cambridge university press. Great Britain.

APPENDECIES

APPENDIX A: THE DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT: THE STRATEGY INVENTORY OF LANGUAGE LEARNING

BİRİNCİ BÖLÜM

KİŞİSEL BİLGİLER

1) Ad: _____ Soyad: _____ Öğrenci No: _____

2) Fakülte/Yüksekokul: _____

3) Bölüm: _____

4) Cinsiyet: Kız Erkek

5) Yaş: _____

6) ÖSS sınavına hangi puan türünden girdiniz?

sayısal sözel eşit ağırlıklı

7) Ne tür liseden mezun oldunuz?

Düz lise	Meslek ve Teknik Liseleri
Anadolu lisesi	Anadolu Meslek ve Teknik Liseleri
Süper Lise	Fen Lisesi
Özel Lise	Diğer _____

8) Daha önceden hazırlık sınıfı okudunuz mu?

a) Evet b) Hayır

9) Kaç yıldır İngilizce eğitim alıyorsunuz?

a) 0-1 b) 2-3 c) 4-5 d) 6 ve üzeri

10) İngilizce’de yeterli düzeye gelmek sizin için ne kadar önemli?

- a) Çok önemli b) Önemli c) Çok önemli değil d) Hiç önemli değil

11) İngilizce öğrenmeye ne kadar isteklisiniz?

- a) Büyük ölçüde b) Oldukça c) Kısmen d) Çok az e) Hiç

12) İngilizce’yi niçin öğreniyorsunuz?

- a) Mesleki gelişim için
b) Yurtdışında çalışmak istiyorum
c) İnternet ve medyayı takip etmek istiyorum
d) Zorunlu hazırlık sınıfı olduğu için
e) Diğer (belirtiniz)

13) İngilizce öğrenmekten zevk alıyor musunuz?

- a) Büyük ölçüde b) Oldukça c) Kısmen d) Çok az e) Hiç

14) İngilizce öğrenirken zorluk çekiyor musunuz?

- a) Büyük ölçüde b) Oldukça c) Kısmen d) Çok az e) Hiç

15) İngilizce öğrenirken en çok zorluk çektiğiniz alan aşağıdakilerden hangisidir?

- a) Konuşma b) Yazma c) Okuma d) Kelime Bilgisi
e) Dinleme f) Dil Bilgisi g) Telafuz

16) İngilizce öğrenirken kullandığınız öğrenme stratejilerini nerelerden öğrendiniz ?

Öğretmenlerimden

İngilizce ders kitaplarından

Kendi kendime

Arkadaşlarımdan

Başka(Lütfen belirtiniz) : _____

Bu soruyu anketi cevapladıktan sonra cevaplayın lütfen

17) Burada yer alan stratejiler dışında kendinizin kullandığı ve size faydası olan dil öğrenme stratejisi var mı?

a) Evet b) Hayır

Varsa nedir?

.....

İKİNCİ BÖLÜM

YABANCI DİL ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ ENVANTERİ

Bu envanter İngilizce öğrenirken kullandığınız öğrenme stratejilerini belirlemek amacıyla hazırlanmıştır. Aşağıda verilen ifadelerin her birinde yer alan görüşe katılma derecenizi belirtmek için çarpı işareti (X) koyunuz.

Önermeler	Bana tamamen uygun	Bana oldukça uygun	Bana biraz uygun	Bana pek uygun değil	Bana hiç uygun değil
1. İngilizce öğrenirken daha önceki bilgilerimle yeni öğrendiğim bilgiler arasında ilişki kurarım.					
2. Sonradan hatırlamama yardımcı olması için yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce sözcükleri cümle içinde kullanırım.					
3. Sonradan hatırlamama yardımcı olması için yeni duyduğum bir İngilizce sözcüğü görsel bir imge veya resim ile bağdaştırarak öğrenirim.					
4. Yeni öğrendiğim bir İngilizce sözcüğü, kullanılabileceği durumun resmini zihnimde canlandırarak hatırlarım.					
5. Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce sözcükleri hatırlamak için kafiyeler ve tekerlemeler kullanırım. (Ör: Make, take, lake)					
6. Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce sözcükleri hatırlayabilmek için o sözcüğü hatırlatıcı resimli ve/veya sözcüğü tanımlayan kartlar kullanırım.					
7. Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce sözcükleri beden diliyle ifade ederim/canlandırırım.					
8. İngilizce dersinde öğrendiklerimi sık sık gözden geçiririm.					

Önermeler	Bana tamamen uygun	Bana oldukça uygun	Bana biraz uygun	Bana pek uygun değil	Bana hiç uygun değil
9.İngilizce sözcük veya söz öbeklerini sayfa, tahta veya sokak işaretleri gibi ilk kez gördüğüm yerleriyle hatırlarım.					
10.Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce sözcükleri birkaç defa yazarım veya sözlü olarak tekrarlarım.					
11. Anadili İngilizce olan kişiler gibi konuşmaya çalışırım.					
12.İngilizce sesleri tekrar ederek öğrenmeye çalışırım.					
13.Bildiğim İngilizce kelimeleri farklı şekillerde kullanırım.					
14.İngilizce konuşmaları/ diyalogları başlatan ben olurum.					
15.İngilizce televizyon programlarını ve İngilizce filmleri izlerim.					
16.Zevk için İngilizce kitaplar,dergiler vs. okurum.					
17. Not, mesaj, mektup veya raporları İngilizce yazarım.					
18.Okuyacağım İngilizce metni önce hızlı bir şekilde gözden geçirir,daha sonra geri döner ve dikkatli bir şekilde okurum.					
19.Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce sözcüklere Türkçe’de söyleniş benzerliği olan sözcükler bulmaya çalışırım.					
20.İngilizce’deki kalıpları/yapıları bulmaya çalışırım.					
21. İngilizce bir sözcüğün anlamını, sözcüğü anlamlı parçalara ayırarak bulurum					

Önermeler	Bana tamamen uygun	Bana oldukça uygun	Bana biraz uygun	Bana pek uygun değil	Bana hiç uygun değil
22.Kelimesi kelimesine çeviri yapmamaya gayret ederim.					
23.İngilizce olarak duyduğum ve okuduğum bilgiyi özetlerim.					
24.Bilmediğim İngilizce sözcüklerin anlamlarını tahmin etmeye çalışırım.					
25. İngilizce konuşurken bir sözcük aklıma gelmezse, söylemek istediğim şeyi anlatmak için beden dilimi(el, kol hareketleri vs) kullanırım					
26.İngilizce kullanmam gereken doğru sözcüğü bilmiyorsa, aynı anlama gelebilecek yeni İngilizce sözcükler üretirim.					
27.Okurken karşılaştığım her yeni sözcük için sözlüğe bakmamaya gayret ederim.					
28.İngilizce konuşurken karşımdaki kişinin bir sonraki söyleyeceği şeyin ne olacağını tahmin etmeye çalışırım.					
29. Eğer kullanmam gereken İngilizce sözcük aklıma gelmezse aynı anlama gelen sözcük veya söz öbekleri kullanırım.					
30.İngilizcemi kullanmak için mümkün olan her fırsatı değerlendiririm.					
31. İngilizce hatalarımı farkedirim ve bu bilgiyi İngilizcemi ilerletmek için kullanırım.					
32.Birisi İngilizce konuşurken söylediklerini dikkatle dinlerim.					

Önermeler	Bana tamamen uygun	Bana oldukça uygun	Bana biraz uygun	Bana pek uygun değil	Bana hiç uygun değil
33.İngilizce'yi daha iyi öğrenmenin yollarını bulmaya çalışırım.					
34. Programımı, İngilizce çalışmaya yeterince zaman kalacak şekilde planlarım.					
35. İngilizce konuşabileceğim kişiler bulmaya çalışırım.					
36. Mümkün olduğunca fazla İngilizce okuyabilmek için fırsatlar bulmaya çalışırım.					
37.İngilizce dil becerilerimi geliştirebilmek için açık ve net hedeflerim vardır.					
38.İngilizce öğrenirken kaydettiğim ilerleme üzerinde düşünürüm.					
39.İngilizceyi kullanırken korktuğum zamanlarda rahatlamaya çalışırım.					
40.Hata yapmaktan korktuğum zamanlarda bile kendimi İngilizce konuşmak için cesaretlendiririm.					
41.İngilizce'de başarılı olduğum zaman kendimi ödüllendiririm veya takdir ederim.					
42.İngilizce çalışırken veya kullanırken sinirli ya da gergin olup olmadığının farkındayım.					
43.Duygularımı İngilizce olarak aktardığım bir günlük tutarım.					
44.İngilizce öğrenirken hissettiklerimle ilgili olarak başka kişilerle konuşurum.					

Önermeler	Bana tamamen uygun	Bana oldukça uygun	Bana biraz uygun	Bana pek uygun değil	Bana hiç uygun değil
45.İngilizce bir şeyi anlamadığımda, karşımdaki kişiden yavaş konuşmasını veya tekrar etmesini isterim.					
46.İngilizce konuşurken, İngilizce konuşan kişilerden hatalarımı düzeltmelerini isterim.					
47.Diğer öğrencilerle İngilizce konuşarak pratik yaparım.					
48.İngilizce bilen kişilerden yardım isterim.					
49.Sorularımı İngilizce sorarım.					
50.İngilizce konuşanların kültürleri hakkında bilgi sahibi olmaya çalışırım.					
50.İngilizce konuşanların kültürleri hakkında bilgi sahibi olmaya çalışırım.					

APPENDIX B:
PERMISSION

044
436

ABANT İZZET BAYSAL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
DİL EĞİTİMİ ARAŞTIRMA VE UYGULAMA MERKEZİ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ'NE
BOLU

"The Relationship Between the Language Learning Strategies And The Academic Achievement of Abant İzzet Baysal University Preparation School Students" konulu yüksek lisans tezimde kullanmak 2011-2012 akademik yılında hazırlık eğitimi alan öğrencilerin B2 kuru sonuna kadar olan notlarını müdürlüğünüzden almak istiyorum.

Gereğini arz ederim.

16.11.2011
Okutman Ömer Faruk İPEK

Eğilimsiz
Yf