



T.C.

BURSA ULUDAĞ UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

DIVISION OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

**LEARNING STRATEGIES OF FOURTH GRADE STUDENTS IN A PRIMARY
SCHOOL IN KOCAELI (PANDEMIC TIME)**

M.A THESIS

Feyza Havva MANDIRALI

0000-0003-0064-3818

BURSA 2022



T.C.

BURSA ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI

İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ BİLİM DALI

**KOCAELİ'DE BİR İLKOKULDA ÖĞRENİM GÖREN DÖRDÜNCÜ SINIF
ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN DİL ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ (PANDEMİ DÖNEMİ)**

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

Feyza Havva MANDIRALI

0000-0003-0064-3818

Danışman

Prof. Dr. İlknur SAVAŞKAN

BURSA 2022

BİLİMSEL ETİĞE UYGUNLUK

Bu çalışmadaki tüm bilgilerin akademik ve etik kurallara uygun bir şekilde elde edildiğini beyan ederim.

Feyza Havva MANDIRALI

10/01/2022



EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ
YÜKSEK LİSANS/DOKTORA İNTİHAL YAZILIM RAPORU

BURSA ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞI'NA

Tarih: 04/02/2022

Tez Başlığı / Konusu: KOCAELİ'DE BİR İLKOKULDA ÖĞRENİM GÖREN DÖRDÜNCÜ SINIF ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN DİL ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ (PANDEMİ DÖNEMİ)/Bu araştırma, Kocaeli ilinde 2020-2021 eğitim öğretim yılında bir devlet ilköğretim okulunda öğrenim görmekte olan 110 dördüncü sınıf öğrencisi ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu araştırma açıklayıcı sıralı karma bir yöntem olarak tasarlanmıştır, bu nedenle nicel veriler bir envanter aracılığıyla toplanmış ve öğrencilerden nitel verilerin toplanması için yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Nicel veriler SPSS v.23 üzerinde parametrik olmayan testler ile nitel veriler içerik analizi ile analiz edilmiştir.

Yukarıda başlığı gösterilen tez çalışmamın a) Kapak sayfası, b) Giriş, c) Ana bölümler ve d) Sonuç kısımlarından oluşan toplam 72 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 10/01/2022 tarihinde şahsım tarafından *Turnitin* adlı intihal tespit programından aşağıda belirtilen filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan özgünlük raporuna göre, tezimin benzerlik oranı % 11'dir.

Uygulanan filtrelemeler:

- 1- Kaynakça hariç
- 2- Alıntılar hariç/dahil
- 3- 5 kelimedenden daha az örtüşme içeren metin kısımları hariç

Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Çalışması Özgünlük Raporu Alınması ve Kullanılması Uygulama Esasları'nı inceledim ve bu Uygulama Esasları'nda belirtilen azami benzerlik oranlarına göre tez çalışmamın herhangi bir intihal içermediğini; aksinin tespit edileceği muhtemel durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

Gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.

Tarih ve İmza

Adı Soyadı: Feyza Havva MANDIRALI
Öğrenci No: 801610028
Anabilim Dalı: Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
Programı: İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
Statüsü: Y.Lisans Doktora

Danışman
Prof Dr. İlknur SAVAŞKAN

YÖNERGEYE UYGUNLUK ONAYI

“Kocaeli’de Bir İlkokulda Öğrenim Gören Dördüncü Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri (Pandemi Dönemi)” adlı Yüksek Lisans tezi, Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü tez yazım kurallarına uygun olarak hazırlanmıştır.

Tezi Hazırlayan

Feyza Havva MANDIRALI

Danışman

Prof. Dr. İlknur SAVAŞKAN

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi ABD Başkanı

Prof. Dr. Zübeyde Sinem GENÇ

T.C.
BURSA ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE,

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı'nda 801610028 numara ile kayıtlı Feyza Havva MANDIRALI' nın hazırladığı “Kocaeli’de Bir İlkokulda Öğrenim Gören Dördüncü Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri (Pandemi Dönemi)” konulu Yüksek Lisans çalışması ile ilgili tez savunma sınavı, .../.../... günü ...-... saatleri arasında yapılmış, sorulan sorulara alınan cevaplar sonunda adayın tezinin/ çalışmasının (başarılı/ başarısız) olduğuna (oybirliği/ oyçokluğu) ile karar verilmiştir.

Üye (Tez Danışmanı ve Sınav Komisyonu Başkanı)

Prof. Dr. İlknur SAVAŞKAN

Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi

Özet

Yazar: Feyza Havva MANDIRALI

Üniversite: Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi

Anabilim Dalı: Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Bilim Dalı: İngiliz Dili Eğitimi

Tezin Niteliği: Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Sayfa Sayısı: xx+

Mezuniyet Tarihi: --/--/2022

Tez: Kocaelide’de Bir İlkokulda Öğrenim Gören Dördüncü Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri (Pandemi Dönemi)

Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. İlknur SAVAŞKAN

KOCAELİ’DE BİR İLKOKULDA ÖĞRENİM GÖREN DÖRDÜNCÜ SINIF ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN DİL ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ (PANDEMİ DÖNEMİ)

Coronavirüs 2019 pandemisinin dünya çapındaki krizi nedeniyle Türkiye 2020-2021 eğitim-öğretim yılının ikinci döneminde, üç aylık bir süre için okulların kapanmasına tanık oldu ve okulların kapanması acil uzaktan eğitim yoluyla telafi edildi. İlköğretim okullarında yüz yüze öğretim durdurulurken, derslerin işleme biçimi geçici bir süre için çevrimiçi öğretime kaydırıldı. Bu çalışma, ilkokul dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerinin yüz yüze öğretim sırasında ve üç aylık çevrimiçi öğretim sonrasında tercih ettikleri yabancı dil öğrenme stratejilerini incelemeyi ve karşılaştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma ayrıca öğrencilerin yaş, cinsiyet, destekleyici kurslar ve kardeş sayısı gibi demografik özelliklerine göre dil öğrenme

stratejisi farklılıklarını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. İlkokul öğrencilerinin yabancı dil becerilerinin nasıl geliştirilebileceğine ilişkin fikir ve görüşleri de ele alınmaktadır.

Bu araştırma, Kocaeli ilinde 2020-2021 eğitim öğretim yılında bir devlet ilköğretim okulunda öğrenim görmekte olan 110 dördüncü sınıf öğrencisi ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu araştırma açıklayıcı sıralı karma bir yöntem olarak tasarlanmıştır, bu nedenle nicel veriler bir envanter aracılığıyla toplanmış ve öğrencilerden nitel verilerin toplanması için yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Nicel veriler SPSS v.23 üzerinde parametrik olmayan testler ile nitel veriler içerik analizi ile analiz edilmiştir.

Bu araştırma, dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerinin üç aylık çevrimiçi eğitimden önce ve sonra genel olarak dil öğrenme stratejilerini yüksek düzeyde kullandıklarını ortaya koymaktadır. Buna bağlı olarak yaş, cinsiyet, destekleyici kurslar ve kardeş sayısı gibi demografik özellikler incelenmiştir. Çalışma, çevrimiçi eğitim öncesi ve sonrasında farklı demografik öğrenci grupları arasında bazı önemli farklılıklar ortaya koymaktadır. Son olarak öğrencilerin görüşleri, talepleri ve demografik engeller sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Sözcükler: çevrimiçi eğitim, dil öğrenme stratejileri, ilkokul, küçük yaş grubu öğrencileri.

Abstract

Author: Feyza Havva MANDIRALI

University: Bursa Uludag University

Field: Foreign Language Education

Branch: English Language Education

Degree Awarded: Master's Thesis

Page Number:

Degree Date: --/--/2022

Thesis: Language Learning Strategies of Fourth Grade Students in a Primary School in Kocaeli (Pandemic Time)

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. İlknur SAVAŞKAN

LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES OF FOURTH GRADE STUDENTS IN A PRIMARY SCHOOL IN KOCAELI (PANDEMIC TIME)

In Turkey, the second semester of the academic year of 2020-2021, due to the worldwide crisis of the Coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic, witnessed a closure of schools for a period of three months and this school-closure was compensated through emergency remote teaching. In primary schools while the mode of face-to-face teaching was brought to a halt, the deliverance of lessons temporarily shifted to online teaching. Based on this situation, the present study aims to investigate and compare the foreign language learning strategies preferred by fourth grade primary school students during face-to-face teaching and after the three months of online teaching. The study also aims to examine language learning strategy differences according to students' demographical features such as age, gender, supportive

courses and number of siblings. The primary school students' opinions and views on how to improve their foreign language skills are also addressed.

The present study was carried out with 110 fourth grade students who were registered at a state primary school during the 2020-2021 academic year in Kocaeli, Turkey. This study was designed as an explanatory sequential mixed method, hence, quantitative data was gathered via an inventory, and semi-structured interviews were performed to collect qualitative data from the students. The quantitative data were analysed by non-parametric tests on SPSS v.23, and the qualitative data were analysed by content analysis.

The present research put forth that fourth grade students have high level use of language learning strategies in general, both before and after the emergency remote teaching which was three months of online education. The study also presents various significant differences between the changing demographical groups of students. Finally, the students' opinions, their demands and demographical hindrances are explained.

Keywords: language learning strategies, online education, primary school, young learners.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the first instance, I would like to present my deepest gratitude to Prof. Dr. İlknur SAVAŞKAN, who gave full support not only during my thesis process, but during my graduate time as well, who believed in me and more importantly she has become more than just a supervisor for me. I always admired her teaching skills, and I always will.

I owe my regards and thanks to Prof. Dr. Esim GÜRSOY, the designer of Childrens' Language Learning Strategy Inventory for giving me permission to use her inventory and for encouraging me to work with my own students.

I would like to thank my dearest friend Hüseyin KORKMAZ for his support, who was completely a guiding person during my thesis period. I could not have done most of the things without his help and his feedback. I hope there will come a day for me to pay him back.

I am very grateful to all my friends, my students, and more importantly my family who were always there for me.

I owe my special thanks to Selim GENÇ, who provided me, supported me, and believed in me during this difficult process by making everything easy for me and being there for me at all times.

Lastly, I would like to thank all my friends and my instructors at Uludag University, who played very important roles for the person who I have become today.

Feyza Havva MANDIRALI

Table of Contents

	Page
BİLİMSEL ETİĞE UYGUNLUK SAYFASI.....	i
YÖNERGEYE UYGUNLUK SAYFASI.....	ii
JÜRİ ÜYELERİNİN İMZA SAYFASI	iii
ÖZET.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	2
1.3. Purpose of the Study	3
1.4. Significance of the Study.....	3
1.5. Research Questions	3
1.6. Limitations of Study.....	4
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1. Language Learning Strategies.....	5
2.2. Research on Language Learning Strategies.....	6
2.3. Language Learning Strategies Research in Turkey.....	8
2.4. Language Learning and Young Learners.....	13

2.4.1. Language Learning Strategies and Young Learners.....	16
2.5. Research on Language Learning Strategies and Online Education.....	17
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY.....	22
3.1. Research Design and the Research Context.....	22
3.2. Participants.....	22
3.3. Data Collection Tools	23
3.3.1. Quantitative data collection instrument.....	23
3.3.2. Qualitative data collection instrument.....	23
3.4. Data Collection.....	24
3.4.1. Quantitative data collection procedure.....	24
3.4.2. Qualitative data collection procedure.....	24
3.5. Data Analysis.....	25
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	26
4.1. Quantitative Data Analysis.....	26
4.1.1. The overall strategy use of fourth grade students.....	27
4.1.2. Gender and preference for language learning strategy use.....	29
4.1.3. The effect of supportive courses on strategy use.....	32
4.1.4. The effect of age on strategy use.....	33
4.1.5. The effect of number of siblings on strategy use.....	33
4.1.6. The overall language learning strategy use of fourth grade students in separate parts.....	35
4.2. Qualitative Data Analysis.....	36
4.2.1.1. Qualitative Data Results.....	36
4.2.1.2. What do you do to improve your English?.....	36
4.2.1.3. What are the reasons that make you feel unsuccessful in English ?.....	38

4.2.1.4. What are the things that you want to do to learn English?.....	40
4.2.1.5. What are the obstacles that hinder learning English?.....	41
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	44
5.1.The Overall Language Learning Strategy Use of Fourth Grade Students.....	44
5.2.The Relationship between Strategy Use and Gender.....	46
5.3. The Effect of Age on Strategy Use.....	47
5.4. The Effect of Supportive Courses on Strategy Use.....	48
5.5. The Effect of Number of Siblings on Strategy Use.....	48
5.6. Parts of the Inventory.....	48
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION.....	50
6.1. Summary.....	50
6.2. What is the Overall Language Learning Strategy Use of Fourth Grade Students.....	50
6.3. What is the Relationship between Students' Demographic Information and Language Learning Strategy Use.....	50
6.4. Overall View of the Results Based on Parts of the Inventory	52
6.5. What Do Students Do to Improve their English?.....	52
6.6. Implications.....	53
6.7. Suggestions for Further Research.....	54
REFERENCES.....	56
APPENDICES.....	62
APPENDIX A.....	63
APPENDIX B.....	66
APPENDIX C.....	69
APPENDIX D.....	70

CURRICILUM VITAE.....	72
ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ TEZ ÇOĞALTMA VE ELEKTRONİK YAYIMLAMA İZİN FORMU.....	73



List of Tables

<i>Table</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. The interval scale of the children’s language learning strategy inventory.....	25
2. The overall language learning strategy use of fourth grade students before online education (part 1)...	27
3. The overall language learning strategy use of fourth grade students before online education (part 2)...	28
4. The overall strategy use differences between the two genders.....	29
5. The comparison of the two genders in terms of their strategy use for pre-online education.....	30
6. The comparison of the two genders in terms of their strategy use for post-online education	31
7. The effect of supportive courses on strategy use.....	32
8. The effect of age on strategy use.....	33
9. The effect of number of siblings on strategy use.....	34
10. The overall strategy use category means.....	35
11. Interview question 1.....	36
12. Interview question 2.....	38
13. Interview question 3.....	41
14. Interview question 4.....	42

List of Abbreviations

CHILLS: Children’s Inventory for Language Learning Strategies

COVID-19: Coronavirus disease 2019

ERT: Emergency Remote Teaching

SILL: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning

EMI: English medim instruction



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The present chapter gives background information about the study on the language learning strategies of fourth grade students. The researcher also provides information regarding statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study and the limitations.

1.1. Background of the Study

Every learner is unique and every learner has their own journey. Learning is a process which at times the even the learner her/himself may not be able to figure out how it occurs. This may just be the case, especially for young learners. Studies have revealed that there might be numerous ways to help children in their learning processes whether it is done consciously or not. Educational researchers have carefully analysed the processes which are linked to successful performance and have discovered that the development of learners' internal procedures help students in their language performances. One of these procedures are known as "strategies" or in other words, as Rubin (1975) defines them "the techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge" (p.43).

Language learning strategies has been one of the most crucial issues in foreign language learning and teaching. For many decades, especially after the 1980's there have been many studies related to this specific topic (Oxford 1989, O'Malley and Chamot 1990, Wenden 1991, Wenden and Rubin 1987). Learning strategies, in a foreign language learning process, have always been an interesting issue for many researchers. According to Harya (2017), language learning strategies are very crucial indicators for teachers because they show teachers how their students approach problems and tasks during the language learning process. Gunning and Oxford (2014), in their research on language learning strategies revealed that an increased level of language learning strategy made a contribution to oral and interactive competence. In addition, research on language learning strategies have displayed that strategies assist learners to gain independency of their own learning (Razak, Ismail, Aziz & Babikkoi, 2012).

There have been many attempts to define their roles in the learning process and there have been many attempts to define strategies in various categories and frameworks. Rebecca Oxford (1990) is one of the prominent researchers in the area of language learning strategies. Oxford (1990) provided a list of strategies which was divided into six categories: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social. Oxford (1990) also designed the

most popular inventory for depicting language learning strategies known as Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL).

In the arena of language education, teaching foreign languages to young learners is another critical issue. While the world is changing and globalizing day by day, the need for learning foreign languages has increased and children have also been affected by these changes happening around the world. Unfortunately, in the year 2020 the crisis of the Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic resulted in major changes in the whole world. All around the world, the outbreak and spread of the COVID-19 pandemic affected people's lives in many ways and the COVID-19 pandemic entered the lives of Turkish people in March 2020 resulting in strict lockdowns which also meant the closure of schools. With immediate government measures, one of them being school-closures and the switch to emergency remote teaching (ERT) the Turkish educational system became one of the most arguable topics in the whole country for people of all statuses (e.g. Politicians, health authorities, parents, students and instructors).

The research timeline on strategies for learning a second or foreign language has classified themes and ideas according to various major titles such as; effectiveness, models and theories, instruction, assessment, language-area strategies, factors, technology and caveats. In addition, the point that the COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in a learning environment which was totally unexpected sets the background of the present study.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

It is possible to say that although both language learning strategies and online education in Turkey has been studied for years from different perspectives, it is an indisputable fact that with the compulsory closure of schools the switch to ERT was a new way of schooling for many children. Children of all ages, parents and teachers were exposed to something unfamiliar for perhaps even the first time in their lives. Considering the point that children due to their age and experience are less familiar with technology, they have less self-efficacy skills compared to adults. Therefore, children's online education adventure which started with ERT became a new but crucial issue in the Turkish educational system. In Turkey, online education had never been more important till this period of the COVID-19 pandemic. As a result, the current study attempts to address the gap in the research of children's preferences of language learning strategies before and after the (ERT) online period of education for grade four students.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The present study aims to examine the foreign language learning strategies of fourth grade primary school students. Here the main aim is to investigate whether there has been a change or not in the language learning strategies of these students after a period of four months of online education which was conducted due to school closure, one of the COVID-19 pandemic strict lockdown procedures of the Turkish government. The data which was collected before the COVID-19 pandemic, the period when school was conducted in a face-to-face manner and the data collected after three months of school closure when the lessons were conducted through online education are compared. Students will also be compared according to their demographical information such as gender, age, supportive courses and number of siblings. In addition, through one-to-one interviews with the students, the researcher attempts to investigate how the students try to enhance their learning and what hinders their learning of English as a foreign language.

1.4. Significance of the Study

There are many studies found in the literature relating to language learning strategies of adults, adolescents and children. However, to the researcher's knowledge there are few studies on the language learning strategies of children in Turkey (Gürsoy, 2010; Gürsoy, 2014; Deneme & Ada, 2010) and these studies were conducted long before the COVID-19 pandemic. The current study is significant as it is perhaps one of the first to investigate Turkish children preferences of language learning strategies straight after the school closure resulting in emergency remote teaching (ERT), in other words the on-line period during the academic year of 2020-2021.

1.5. Research Questions

Foreign language learning strategies still continue to be a popular topic for investigation. However, there is still a gap in the literature based on the language learning strategies of young learners and the number of studies which have been conducted within the Turkish context.

The current study aims to find answers to the questions that follow:

1. Which language learning strategies do primary school fourth grade students employ?

- a. Which language learning strategies do primary school fourth grade students employ during face-to-face education?
- b. Is there a significant difference between the language learning strategies employed by the fourth-grade students during the first semester of face-to-face education and the second semester (4 months) of on-line education period?
2. Is there a relationship between students' demographic information and language learning strategy use?
 - a. Does gender make a significant difference in language learning strategy use?
 - b. Does age make a significant difference in language learning strategy use?
 - c. Do supportive language courses make a significant difference in language learning strategy use?
 - d. Does number of siblings affect students' language learning strategy use?
3. What are the students' views for enhancing their own foreign language learning?

1.6. Limitations of the Study

The present research was conducted with 110 fourth grade students who are registered at Solventaş Primary School, located in Kocaeli, Turkey. To increase the validity of the study, the number of participants could be enlarged in future studies. Additionally, the study is limited with only one school located in the western part of Turkey, and most of the students have similar cultural backgrounds considering the point that they are all located in a small town.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter the definition and importance of language learning strategies are stated so as to comprehend its various points clearly. This chapter also focuses on prominent research conducted in language learning strategies.

2.1. Language Learning Strategies

It has been so many years since English has become lingua franca all over the world. Teaching and learning it as well, has always been a considerable issue for many teachers, learners and researchers. For years, many techniques, strategies and activities have been investigated so as to help people learn and teach English as a foreign language in a more effective manner. There have also been many debates on how teaching or learning English should be performed, which approach or method is more effective than the other. For years, researchers have come up with many views relating to information on how to assist the way teachers teach English as a foreign language more effectively for learners. However, in time it has been realized that despite what teachers do, create or apply, students themselves need to be involved in the language learning process. Therefore, one way of involving students in this process is helping them to become aware of their own language learning strategies.

Learning strategies, especially in a foreign language learning process, have always been an interesting issue for many researchers and there is consensus on the point that “L2 learning strategies are the learner’s goal-directed actions for improving language proficiency or achievement, completing a task or making learning more efficient, more effective and easier” (Oxford, 2011). There have been many attempts to define their roles in the learning process and there have been many attempts to divide them into categories. One of the most known way for depicting strategies is that through Oxford’s (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), in which Oxford divides them into six categories: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social.

However, as quoted by Liu (2010) “Oxford herself concedes, there is no agreement on the basic definitions of the terms ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’, nor on exactly what strategies are; how many strategies exist; how they should be defined, demarcated, and categorized (p,100).” But nevertheless, direct strategies, are divided into three groups: memory strategies, cognitive

strategies and compensation strategies; Indirect language learning strategies, are divided into three groups: meta-cognitive strategies, affective strategies and social strategies.

According to Oxford (1990), creating mental linkages, employing actions are memory strategies and these help in entering information to the long-term memory which is also used for getting information when it is needed for communication. Analyzing and reasoning are categorized as cognitive strategies and they are used for forming and revising internal mental modes. It is necessary for target language in the receiving and producing of messages. Another category are compensation strategies. These involve guessing unknown words while listening and reading and are employed by learners when a language task is beyond their level. According to Oxford (1990), meta-cognitive strategies are used by learners in order to regulate their learning by making use of planning, arranging and focusing. According to Wenden (1998) (as cited in Alanen 2003), metacognitive skills bring self-regulation i.e. monitoring, planning, and evaluation, thus playing a significant role for connecting knowledge and learning. Another category is based on controlling feelings and is called affective strategies. This language learning strategy is about the learners' confidence, motivations, and attitudes. Finally, there are social strategies. Here, asking questions and cooperation with others, in the language learning process are important.

2.2. Research on Language Learning Strategies

Learning strategies play a crucial role in both ESL and EFL contexts by assisting learners to gain independency of their own learning, (Razak, Ismail, Aziz, Babikkoi, 2012). While from another perspective, Harya (2017) states that language learning strategies are very crucial indicators for teachers to observe students how they approach problems and tasks during language learning process. As can be seen, so far learning strategies have been a noteworthy subject for researchers and they have been related to many issues; gender, culture, region, age, motivation and so on. The following are examples of studies based on the learning strategies of university students.

Learning strategies and their significant roles have been studied in many research projects. So far, learning strategies have been a noteworthy subject for researchers and they have been related to many issues such as gender, culture, region, age, and motivation.

More than two decades ago, a study conducted by Park (1997) aimed to examine language learning strategies of Korean university students and the relationship between strategies and L2 proficiency. The study used the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by

Oxford (1990) to collect data for strategy use, and Test of English as a foreign language (TOEFL) for finding the L2 proficiency of 332 students. The findings of the study showed that the link between language learning strategies and L2 proficiency was linear, and all six categories (cognitive, metacognitive, social, affective, memory, and compensation strategies) were significantly correlated with the TOEFL scores of students. The findings also showed that among all strategies, cognitive and social strategies were more predictive of the proficiency results. Additionally, the study indicated that to facilitate L2 acquisition, L2 learners need language learning strategies, correspondingly, effective strategy use and strategy training may improve language learning process in classrooms.

In a similar research, in Taiwan, Wu, (2008) aimed to investigate the language learning strategies of EFL students and whether there was an impact of strategy use on L2 proficiency. The results of the study indicated that EFL students preferred compensation strategies at most among all categories. In terms of relationship between language learning strategies and proficiency, cognitive strategies had the strongest influence. The results also stated that students who had higher proficiency had higher level use of language learning strategy use than lower proficiency students, especially regarding cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies. Correspondingly, no statistically significant difference was found between two proficiency group of EFL learners in terms of using memory strategies.

In the early 1990's Dong (1992) conducted a research to investigate language learning strategies of college EFL students in Taiwan. The study was conducted with 505 students by gathering the data through Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (Oxford,1989) and Horwit's inventory called 'Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory' to examine students' beliefs and their relationship between strategy use. The results of the study stated that oral-practice and compensation strategies were reported as the most frequently performed ones, while cognitive and memory strategies were found to be the least used ones by students. As for the gender difference in terms of strategy use, a significant difference was found only in use of social strategies, naming female students outperform male students in using social strategies. The study results also provide implications that learners' beliefs are likely to affect using learning strategies, and the use of language learning strategies might influence learners' self-efficacy, and the relationship between them might not be unidirectional.

Peacock and Ho (2003) conducted a study to investigate students' language learning strategies across different disciplines in a university in Hong Kong. The students who participated in the study were studying for EAP (English for Academic Purposes). The study

also aimed at finding out the relationships among strategy use and gender, age, proficiency by means of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford (1990). The results of the study showed that there was a positive link between 27 strategies and language proficiency. The results also indicated that students who were older were more strong in use of affective and social strategies. Additionally, gender difference was found in use of strategies, indicating that female students had higher level use of memory and metacognitive strategies than males.

In a research carried out by Nhem (2019), the language learning strategies used by young and adolescent learners of English in Cambodia were investigated. The quantitative data was collected through by a questionnaire from 152 students in total. The findings of the study revealed that cognitive and metacognitive strategies were most frequently performed by younger students. As for age differences, a significant difference was found in terms of using two categories. The results showed that young learners had higher level of use of cognitive strategies than adolescents. Additionally, young learners used compensation strategies more frequently than adolescents. The study also emphasizes the importance of language learning strategies indicating that “Language learners should be aware of how to learn a language to be a successful language learner (Nhem, 2019).”

2.3. Language Learning Strategies Research in Turkey

Among the research on language learner strategy conducted in Turkey, Cesur (2011) carried out an experiment to explain the relation between the use of language learning strategies and achievement in reading comprehension in foreign language. The study is conducted with 368 university preparatory class students from different universities in Istanbul. The instructor uses Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory of Language Learning and the English Language Placement Test. The results show us that cognitive, memory and compensation strategies have influence on the achievement in reading comprehension significantly.

In another research, Yeşilyurt (2013) aimed to discover the level of metacognitive learning strategies that are used by teacher candidates. 291 teacher candidates participated in this study from the Faculty of Education within the body of a western Anatolian university. The metacognitive learning strategies scale results showed that teacher candidates used metacognitive learning strategies at approximately medium level.

A comparative study was carried out by Ünal et al. (2011) whom had conducted a study in Hacettepe University with the students who are learning different languages from different departments at the language preparatory course of the School of Foreign Languages. Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory Language Learning (SILL) was applied to examine the correlation between the use of direct and indirect strategies. ANOVA test results revealed that except for only one strategy type, significant statistical difference occurs between the uses of other strategy types. However, the research comes up with a strong suggestion by recommending especially use of memory and cognitive strategies should be trained to Turkish students.

Gürata (2008) conducted a research to examine grammar learning strategies used by preparatory school EFL learners. Additionally, the study reveals some results related with other variables such as proficiency, gender that have influence on the use of learning strategies. The study was carried out with 176 students from three different proficiency levels at Middle East Technical University by using a questionnaire regarding grammar learning strategies. The findings indicated that learning strategy use differs from different proficiency levels by also finding out that grammar learning strategies have influence on grammar achievement.

Again with university students, in a study by Bekleyen (2006), 142 teacher candidates at Dicle University ELT department revealed the level of use of language learning strategies. The study was carried out by using Oxford's (1990) SILL, and the results indicated that the overall use of learning strategy is medium. However, metacognitive and compensation strategies have been found to be the most common strategies used by the teacher candidates. Additionally, the study also revealed that as the grade of students rises, the use of strategy use increases as well.

Karamanoğlu (2005), conducts an experiment to predict language learning strategies of German teacher candidates from 3rd grade students. The study is carried out with 126 students from four universities in Turkey by using Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning. The results show that a significant difference occurs in the frequency of high use of cognitive strategies with the students who learned their former language in European countries. Furthermore, the students who have a background of learning strategies show that they temp to use affective strategies in higher level.

In a similar study with teacher candidates, Razi (2012) conducted a study with 189 students from the English Language Teaching Department at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University. This study aims to investigate the preferences of students' in terms of

strategy use and the impact of other features that may affect strategy use such as gender, class etc. The descriptive statistics results show that compensation and metacognitive strategies are preferred most by participants, meanwhile affective and social strategies are preferred at least. Additionally, the study claims there is a significant difference between classes in which students study in terms of strategy use.

Çetin (2019), carries out a research to examine language learning strategy use of preparatory students at a university by also classifying the strategies to highlight the possible problems related with the use of learning strategy. Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) is applied to 208 preparatory students at Selçuk University. The findings conclude that students tend to use metacognitive strategies at most, meanwhile they prefer the affective strategies at least. The study also examined that the students who have compulsory language education prefer to use cognitive and compensation strategies in higher level than the students who are not compulsory

The research of Altunay (2014) was carried out to predict Turkish distance learners' of English preferences of strategy use. The study was conducted by collecting data from 63 students by implementing Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), also interviews were conducted. The quantitative data results indicate that affective learning strategies are used the least by students. Furthermore, the interview results explain the possible reasons behind it, for instance lack of interest to learn English or physical anxiety.

A study conducted by Gömleksiz (2013) aims to investigate prospective Turkish language teachers' perceptions of language learning strategies. 112 students participate in the research by answering the Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). The statistical results conclude that prospective Turkish Language teachers tend to be inadequate in terms of using memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social strategies in English learning process. In the lights of this research, the researcher has suggestions and possible solutions to increase overall usage of language learning strategies among prospective teachers.

An investigation conducted by Yilmaz (2010), showed that English majors at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University have a tendency on using compensation strategies at highest level. The study was conducted by using SILL (Oxford,1990) to identify the differences and between different genders, proficiency levels and self-efficacy beliefs. The study identified an important result that lowest strategy use was for affective

strategies. Finally, this study highlights that strategy use is an important issue to be considered as strategy training might turn a lot of learners into good language learners.

Aydoğan and Akbarov (2014) carried out a study to investigate language learning strategy use and their frequencies and the effects of proficiency level and gender on strategy use by students who study at a Turkish University Preparatory class at tertiary level in Turkey. In the study SILL (Oxford,1990) was implemented to identify the types and frequencies of strategies. Additionally, Spearman's correlation coefficient was used on the data gathered from the students. The results showed that female and male students use same language strategies at same frequency level. The study also showed that there are other factors that can affect students' preference of language learning strategies and performance. In the light of those results, they claim that measuring only strategy use might not be sufficient enough to point reliable results considering socio-cultural and personal elements are natural parts of the foreign language learning process.

Again, with the implementation of SILL, a research conducted by Erarslan and Höl (2014) aimed to identify self-perceptions of adult EFL learners at a state university in Turkey. The study was conducted by implementing SILL (Oxford, 1990) to 185 students studying at language preparatory classes at Pamukkale University by also investigating the relationship between variables such as their age, level, and type of their high schools that they graduated from. Their findings indicated that EFL learners have a tendency to use language learning strategies at medium level. Additionally, the lowest strategy use is affective strategies therewithal highest strategy use is metacognitive strategies. Another important finding is that as the students' proficiency level rises, the strategy use rises as well. Nevertheless, no kind of relationship between strategy use and students' gender or other factors including their high school types.

In another research based on language learning strategies and university students, Deneme (2008) carried out a study with fifty ELT students at Gazi University in Turkey. The aim here was to investigate the use and preferences of language learning strategies and cultural impact on learning strategies of students from different cultures. In the light of the overall evaluation, the study claims that participants use compensation strategies and metacognitive strategies more than they use memory, cognitive and affective strategies. The study also points out that language teachers ought to detect students' language learning strategy use and preferences. In addition, language learning strategies should be taught to learners for the purpose of exploiting themselves within the language learning process.

In a study conducted by Ayırır, Arıoğul and Ünal (2012), a total of 343 participants were students who were students at Hacettepe University preparatory year, but registered in departments of different faculties. The study aimed to investigate the preferences of strategy use, differences between genders, and students' departments. The findings of the study claim that female students outperform the male students in using language learning strategies. Additionally, the most commonly used strategies for female students is metacognitive strategies while for male students is compensation strategies. Affective strategies are found to be the least commonly used for both female and male students. Lastly, the difference between different departments is found that students who are in foreign-language related departments use language learning strategies more commonly than the students who are registered in other departments and Faculties.

A research intending to find out the language learning strategies of learners of English as a foreign language was carried out by Aslan (2009). This study aimed to investigate the domain differences of strategies, and relationships between language learning strategies, success, gender, and the influence of strategy use on the achievement in English. The study was conducted with 153 male and 104 female students from a university preparatory school in Turkey. As in most of studies, SILL (Oxford, 1999) was used to collect data. The results of the study showed that language learning strategy use is positively effective in achievement in English. When it comes to gender, female students gained higher results in the tests correspondingly showing that they were using language learning strategies at higher level compared to male students. Consequently, a significant connection between gender and language learning strategy use, and achievement in English was discovered.

Karahan conducted a study to figure out the language learning strategies of English medium instruction (EMI) students' and gender differences. 255 Turkish EMI students participated in the study and the data was collected through Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford (1990). The qualitative data were also gathered through an open-ended questionnaire. The findings indicated that students used a medium range of language learning strategy, while the metacognitive strategies were found to be the most frequently used category of strategies, the affective strategies were the least frequently used by the students. The study also showed that gender does not have any significant effect on overall language learning strategy use, or other six categories of language learning strategies separately.

A study was conducted to reveal the relationship between the language learning strategies of high school students and their self-efficacy beliefs and gender differences by Tuyan in 2018. Randomly selected 156 high school students participated in the study in Turkey. The collected data through the questionnaires indicated that high and positive correlation occurs between language learning strategy use and their beliefs about English. Regarding the gender difference, no statistically significant difference was found in overall strategy use. However, the highest difference was found in metacognitive strategies between two genders, indicating that female students prefer metacognitive language learning strategies more than male students. Similar to the metacognitive, memory, compensation and social strategies were found to be more frequently used by female students compared to males.

An experimental study was conducted by Çaliskan and Sunbul (2011) to investigate the effects of learning strategies on metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive skills. The study was conducted with 42 students in the 6th grade at a primary school in Turkey. The experimental group was given strategy instruction for 15 weeks through a direct instruction approach. At the end of the study, the results showed that learning strategies instruction increased metacognitive knowledge and awareness, correspondingly, metacognitive skills increased the student's achievement.

2.4. Language Learning and Young Learners

Teaching a foreign language to young learners brings many challenges for teachers. The first step ought to be understanding the characteristics of young learners. Basic characteristics of young learners can be specified as; they search for meaning, they tend to get bored easily, they keen on discovering things, they are egocentric, imaginative, imitative and they prefer concrete things. There have been many research on children as language learners indicating their characteristic features play a significant role for choosing many methods to teach them. For example, Arıkan and Taraf (2010) indicated in their research that children who were exposed to implicit grammar and vocabulary instead of traditional methods outperformed their peers in target grammar and vocabulary items.

According to Cameron (2001), "teaching languages to children needs all the skills of the good primary teacher in managing children and keeping them on task (as cited in İşpınar, 2005)." Singleton (1989) and Brumfit et al. (2001) summarized the basic reasons for needs to teach young learners at a globalization world; the need for discovering children and exploring

foreign cultures, the need for linking interaction to new concepts, the idea of the earlier the better.

For centuries, there have been many physiologists and language researchers who have studied how children learn, think, and speak. Jean Piaget, as such, was one of the most significant ones who played an important role for teachers to comprehend the characteristics of children. According to Piaget, every child has same stages when learning and any child cannot skip one stage before completing the other. Meece (2002) summarizes Piage's theory in teaching as: "Piaget's theory has inspired major curriculum reforms, and it continues to have an important influence on education practice today. Among Piaget's major contributions to education are the ideas that:

- (a) knowledge must be actively constructed by the child;
- (b) educators should help children learn how to learn;
- (c) learning activities should be matched to the child's level of conceptual development;
- (d) peer interactions play an important role in the child's cognitive development.

Piaget's theory also emphasizes the role of teachers in the learning process as organizers, collaborators, stimulators, and guides (p.169)."

However, Vygotsky criticizes Piaget for his work ends at a precise point, by implying that learning continues as life lives long. He also argues that egocentric stage turns into inner speech (Vygotsky, 1962, p. 18). He added one of the most important terms "zone of proximal development". He indicated this definition to imply every child can can do and learn with skilled help. He suggested that children gradually shift away from reliance on others' help to independent thinking and action (Cameron, 2001).

Bruner, who were inspired by Vygotsky, suggested ideas for teaching language to children by adapting routines. He indicated that routines allow them a space for achievement and growth of a language, and helping from their familiar experiences. According to Piaget's theory, 4th grade students are accepted in in the stages of concrete operations, Foley and Thompson (2003) summarizes the stage as, operational thinking develops, egocentric ideas and speech gradually diminishes, symbols reflecting concrete objects demonstrate intelligence.

According to Scott and Ytreberg (1990), children who are at the age of 10, show basic habits similar to both adults and childish, naming; they tend to ask questions all the time, they

can distinguish fact and fiction, they are aware of what they like and what they do not like, they are capable of learning from others and they own a decided view of the world.

Brewster et al (2003), defines young learners “emotionally excitable”, having emotional needs and tend to outburst emotionally suddenly. He also points out that teachers of young learners should always take into children’s physical energy needs and need for being active all the time.

Specifically, children were investigated as foreign language learners by many researchers. Brumfit, Moon and Tongue (1991), indicate that children have many advantages as second language learners by some points. The most important feature might be the possibility of second language acquisition without interference. Correspondingly, they mostly have positive attitudes to a foreign language compared to adults, thus being more motivated learners, their language learning is more integrated with real communication, and they spare more time for learning a foreign language compared to adults.

Halliwell (1992) indicated that children are not empty-handed when they come to classroom for language learning, they already have imaginations, they take pleasure in what they do, they tend to learn indirectly, they already can interpret meaning and they take pleasure in talking even they use limited language.

When considered, above all the characteristics of young learners as second language learners, most researchers come to a common basis that “being a good teacher” is necessary. Vale and Feunteun (1995) claim that for teachers establishing priorities plays a significant role for language learning. They suggest some points and these include; building confidence, providing motivation to learn English, encouraging ownership of language, encouraging children to communicate with whatever language they have at their disposal (mime, gesture, key word, drawings etc.), Encouraging children to treat English as a communication tool, not as an end product, showing children that English is fun, establishing a trusting relationship with the children, and encouraging them to do the same with their classmates, giving children an experience of a wide range of English language in a non-threatening environment (p.33).

“If foreign language teaching is to be coherent across phases, a number of fairly complex considerations need to be borne in mind (Bolster, Brown & Dickins, 2004, p.35).” Vickery (1999) recommends teachers of young learners to be positive, patient and to relax by indicating that children reflect the teachers’ attitude. Similarly, Krashen (1992) also suggests that learning is maximized when students feel confident and relaxed.

Moon (2005) discusses the hypothesis “younger is better” as children for language learners at early ages. She explains this by referring to a critical period that language learning occurs. She describes the features of making children different from older learner; naming, the longer is better meaning starting in primary school increases the time for English exposure, and children do not seek radical reasons to learn English like older learners.

Teaching young learners requires implementation of teachers’ beliefs, knowledge and philosophy, in that case that depends on teachers or trainees understanding of the concepts, and ability to implement their educational beliefs as long as the education programs allow (Gursoy and Korkmaz, 2012).

2.4.1. Language Learning Strategies and Young Learners:

Gursoy and Eken conducted a study with 1116 Turkish 4th and 5th grade students to reveal language learning strategy use of young learners by means of Children’s Strategy Inventory for Language Learning Strategies (CHILLS). The study findings showed that there is a significant difference between female and male students in terms of strategy use. According to results, female students outperform males in strategy use, correspondingly, 5th grade students showed higher use of strategy more than 4th grades. The findings of the study also revealed that part A strategies of the inventory (general study habits) was found to be the most preferred one. Part B (strategies for improving language learning) and part C (strategies to facilitate reception and production) were second and third most frequently used ones respectively. Lastly, part D (strategies to consolidate the knowledge in the target language) were found as the least preferred group of strategies. The least frequently used strategy item was “I use the words I learnt recently when speaking with tourists and native speakers to pronounce them correctly.”. Correspondingly, the most frequently used item was “I do tests to improve my English”. Additionally, a significant difference was found in use of strategies between more successful and less successful students, indicating that the difference was in favour of more successful students.

Another research was carried out in Hungary 275 fifth and sixth graders to find out overall language learning strategy use of elementary school students (Doro and Habok,2013). The data was gathered by means of SILL (Oxford,1990) and the results revealed that metacognitive strategies were the most frequently used category, while compensation strategies were found as the least frequently used one. No significant effect of students’ grades was found in the study, however, the data related to gender difference showed that

female students engaged in language learning strategy use more frequently than males, also the biggest difference was found in use of metacognitive strategies in favour of females.

Another study was carried out by Habok and Magyar in 2018 to examine the effect of language learning strategies on language proficiency, school achievement and attitudes. The study consisted of 868 students who were studying as lower secondaries in Hungary. The findings of the study showed that metacognitive strategies were the most frequently used one by Hungarian students among other strategies also they concluded that metacognitive strategies had an impact on school achievement and foreign language marks. The study also found significant age differences in memory, compensation and affective strategies. According to results, the use of affective strategies was high in year 5, however, they were the least frequently preferred ones in year 8. Students who were in year 5, showed the highest use of indirect strategies (metacognitive, affective and social strategies), while cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies were the most frequently used one in year 8. Also the study stated that affective strategies play an important role in lower age, while cognitive strategies become more dominant at older age.

Chesterfield & Chesterfield (2016) investigated in their research if there was a natural order in children's use of second language learning strategies. The study results claim that there is a natural order in development of language learning strategies even though there were individual differences in the rates and time periods in which strategies were used. In addition, children having greater proficiency were reported to employ a wider range of strategies.

Platsidou and Kantaridou (2014) carried out a research to examine the role of attitudes and language learning strategy use to perceive L2 competence. 9-17 years old school-aged learners showed moderately high level of strategy use. The study also pointed out that attitudes can predict cognitive, memory, compensation strategies, additionally, strategy training to school-aged learners may provide positive attitudes to language learning.

2.5. Research on Language Learning Strategies and Online Education

There are also various studies on investigating the language learning strategies of e-learners.

Zhan and Cui conducted a survey study to reveal learning beliefs of distance language education in China (2009). Their study results claimed that lack of communication with teachers and peers was one of the main difficulties perceived by learners. The study also indicated that even though traditional classroom teaching was easier, the more distance language learning learners received, the more benefits of autonomy they gained.

According to a research conducted by Alexander, Truell and Zhao (2012) college students estimated the possible advantages and disadvantages of online learning even before they take a single online course. The college students at a state university in USA perceived that the possible advantages might be convenience, flexibility, lower costs, less stress, ability to review lecture. The possible disadvantages were estimated as well, naming computer-related distractions, misunderstood instruction, increased use of e-mail, requirement of more self-discipline.

A research carried out in France by Dietrich et al. (2020), presented feedback from students and teachers who experienced the lockdown semester. The study highlighted the points that can be helpful for another such period that takes distance-education period. The lessons that should be taken from the feedback were; assisting students who do not have reliable internet access, helping international students who were more isolated, collecting a variety of supportive materials and equipment, and most importantly, breaking the monotony of such kind of learning by restoring the motivation. The study also pointed out that teachers who experienced this period; “they admit that they have learned more about distance education in two months than in the last ten years.”

A study conducted by Alshamrani (2019) identified the advantages and disadvantages of online education in New Zealand from students’ perspectives. The study mainly pointed out that the role of technical issues and internet connectivity is crucial and it was one of the most significant disadvantages of online education. However, a very important advantage was highlighted that related to shy and non-English speakers. These students had a chance to contribute the lessons with the help of ease of communication.

Bergdahl and Nouri carried out a research during pandemic (COVID-19) period in Sweden to gain insights into teachers and schools readiness the early stages of this transition to online education. The findings revealed that both teachers and school faced many challenges, naming; school and teacher preparedness was not sufficient, some students who do not have technical tool access permanently. The study highlighted a significant point that can be seen a very disadvantage; naming extended hours of online education in front of a screen might lead to demotivation, isolation and impatience for students.

Research conducted by Pınar (2020) aimed to reveal the opinions of secondary school students about distance education and online lessons. Students stated that they were satisfied with the chance of repetition and reinforce such as science subjects. However, they indicated

that they prefer school education for not only lessons requiring lab practices, but also better understanding in one to one, having fun, socializing and being motivated.

Commerce, College and India (2018) highlighted the advantages and disadvantages of e-education and e-learning. They indicated in their study that e-learning provides storehouses of information and accessibility of materials to students and flexibility of learning. When mentioning the disadvantages of e-learning, students who do not have higher motivation and autonomy may not achieve the outcomes most of the time. Additionally, the time-consuming challenges such as poor internet connection and machine malfunction, reliability of the content and compatibility issues can be taken into account.

Dumford and Miller (2018) aimed to explore advantages and disadvantages of online education for engagement. The findings of the study indicated that the students who had taken greater number of online lessons were better at quantitative reasoning, however, less likely to engage in collaborative learning, discussions and interactions. They basically claimed that online education may provide certain types of benefits, but it can be also deterrent to others.

The study conducted by Adnan and Anwar (2020) reported students' perspectives of online learning during the pandemic (COVID-19) in Pakistan. The study findings were from a different angle since Pakistan was one of the underdeveloped countries. Their findings stated that a vast majority of students were unable to access internet related to monetary and technical problems. In this case, the online learning period was unlikely to provide desired results that face to face interaction did.

Lassoued, Alhendawi and Bashitialshaaer (2020) did an exploratory study about challenges for achieving quality in distance learning during the corona various pandemic. The study was based on a large sample of teachers and students in Arabic countries. The findings of the mainly study highlighted that the obstacles that teachers and students faced were due to self-imposed issues, as well as technical, financial, pedagogical and organizational issues.

A study conducted by Bagapova, Kobilova and Yuldasheva (2020) shed a light to role of distance education and computer Technologies in in teaching foreign languages. Their study revealed both advantages and disadvantages of teaching English by using multimedia and distance education. They highlighted that distance learning may save time, energy and money, and it is flexible due to no limitation of location. However, they do not recommend such teaching during the primary years of young learners since it is difficult to do practical experience and listen lectures on only certain topics.

Another study conducted by Hebebcı, Bertiz and Alan (2020) was to investigate views of students and teachers on distance education practices during COVID-19 pandemic period. Their study revealed that students and teachers had both positive and negative opinions about distance education in terms of different issues. The ability of carrying education in a planned and scheduled manner was one of the main positive sides. Correspondingly, limited interaction, lack of equipment and infrastructure problems were reported as the negative sides.

There are also examples of research was carried out to investigate the use of language learning strategies of e-learners in Turkey.

In the study of Solak and Çakır (2015), 132 male and 142 female participants took part in the study, and they were taking an English course through e-learning program in Turkey. The Turkish version of SILL (Oxford, 1990) was used to collect data. According to results of study, metacognitive and memory strategies were preferred by learners at most, while cognitive and affective strategies were preferred at least. Additionally, a significant difference between two genders was found, indicating that female students use cognitive strategies more frequently, while male students prefer metacognitive strategies more than female students.

Ekmekçi (2014) carried out research about distance-education in foreign language teaching gathering information and evaluations from freshman students in Turkey. The findings of the study indicated that the majority of the students were satisfied with distance language learning naming; format, reading, content and grammar sections. However, the courses need scyhnorism such as listening, writing, speaking were not sufficient to them.

İnce, Kabul and Diler (2020) carried out research to explore knowledge and views of students about distance learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. It was determined that distance education was satisfactory in terms of its accessibility, comprehensibility and repeatability. However, when students were requested to compare traditional education and distance education, they indicated they prefer formal education. Additionally, it was reported that students' accessibility to internet, computer and telephones affect their opinions of distance education.

A study conducted by Sari and Nayır (2020) was about challenges in distance education during the (COVID-19) pandemic period. Their study reported results about the perceptions of teachers, administrators and academics and the problems they experienced. According to the data they collected, there were challenges for both teachers and students in internet access

and human resources. Overall results of the study claimed that the participants were not ready for the distance education period and the lack of experience in technology was one of the main problems.



CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, information about the procedure, research design and context, participants, data collection tools, data collection and analysis will be presented.

3.1. Research Design and Research Context

The study was designed as an explanatory sequential mixed method research design (Crresswell & Plano-Clark, 2011) since the research questions of the study seemed to be needed both quantitative and qualitative data according to the researcher. Caracelli (1994) points out that sequential mixed method design compounding quantitative and qualitative results give more detailed comprehension and reliance of the evaluation. Considering these definitions, it can be identified that a mixed method research design provides more reliable and clear results in a study. According to Johnson, Onwuegbuzie and Turner (2007) this type of research design gives different perspective and outlooks on a study. Considering these ideas and definitions, the researcher aimed to provide a good quality of the study analysis by using a mixed method research design since they are more appropriate with the research questions of this study.

The present study was carried out in Solventaş Primary School in Dilovası, Kocaeli, Turkey. The school was located in almost centre of the area. The neighbourhood is made up of families who had immigrated from many different cities all over the country. Most of the families of students' have lower economic status, however, the school is counted as one of the most successful primary schools in the neighbourhood even though in can be only counted as an academic success. The school has limited capacity for both teachers and students to accomplish social activities, even though the classes are not too crowded. Additionally, lack of smart boards, projectors, or internet are some of the factors that limit the opportunities for variety of activities.

3.2. Participants

The research was carried out with 110 students (female=57 and male=53) during the 2020-2021 academic year including the pandemic and online education period. The study included four classes of the fourth grade of a state primary school. The classes had average 27 students. The ages of participants were varied from 8 to 10 as follows; 11 of them were 8 years old, 52 students were 9 years old and 47 students were 10 years old. All of the students

were registered at Solventaş Primary school and their English teacher was the researcher herself. The researcher used the convenience sampling method while selecting the participants. According to Robinson (2014), it is a way to select participants according to accessibility in proximity, and willingness to participate in the study. Considering the ages of the students, the researcher not only explained how to fill in the questionnaire, but also demonstrated how to do it on the screen. In addition, the students were informed about the aim and topic of the study, and they were given information about the interview.

3.3. Data Collection Tools

In this study, two different procedures were applied. Considering the study needed both quantitative and qualitative techniques, for quantitative data, a scale was utilised, and for the qualitative investigation, a semi-structured interview was set up to gather the required data.

3.3.1. Quantitative data collection instrument:

For the present study, quantitative data collection instrument was the inventory called Language Learning Strategies of Children (CHILL'S), and it was the original version from Gürsoy (2013). As a first step, the reliability was piloted and it was found quite satisfactory with a score of 89. It was administrated in Turkish (see Appendix B). The quantitative data was collected from 110 participants via three-point Likert scale involving three options changing from "Yes" (3) to "No" (1) (see Appendix A). The scale consisted of 30 items categorised into four parts. First part is mostly composed of cognitive and metacognitive strategies and two social strategies (Gürsoy, 2013). Second part consists of mostly cognitive strategies meanwhile there are also metacognitive, social and compensation strategies that are used mostly to improve language learning. Third part is mostly composed of compensation, but also two memory and to cognitive strategies that are used for the facilitation and production of the target language. Lastly, fourth part consists of strategies that are used for the consolidation of the target language (Gürsoy, 2013). For reliable results, the piloting study was conducted with 30 students and the reliability value was calculated as .84 which can be accepted as a reliable Cronbach alpha coefficient. Furthermore, the reliability coefficient of the main study was found .89 which is also reliable.

3.3.2. Qualitative data collection instrument:

The researcher gathered qualitative data from 11 students by means of semi-structured interview questions (see Appendix A). As a first step, questions were prepared by the

researcher and were examined by four experts. Before the interview, the permission of the participants about recording was obtained and privacy were guaranteed and also the recordings would not be shared with a third person. The interview questions were mostly about information of what kind ways students select to learn English, the reasons behind choosing them, and how they feel about the current situation in the process of learning English in their both educational and social lives. All of the questions were asked in the mother tongue (Turkish), however, they were translated into English in order to add them into the study (see Appendix C). The questions mentioned below are:

1. What are the things that you do to improve your English?
2. Are there any reasons that make you feel unsuccessful in learning English?
 - 2.1. If yes, what are they?
3. What do you do to improve your English?
4. What are the obstacles that make you unable to do the things related to English?

3.4. Data Collection

3.4.1. Quantitative data collection procedure:

Quantitative data collection instrument CHILL'S, was administered to the participants in two different times with an interval of four months in 2020/2021 academic year. The first one was administered in November and the second time was in March. There was a three months of online education period because of the pandemic situation ERT. The aim was to find out if there were any significant changes in the students' language learning strategies. While the administration of the inventory, it was explained and demonstrated to participants how to fill the inventory, and what the answers (3 to 1) meant. Correspondingly, it was guaranteed to students that their responses would only be seen by the researcher.

3.4.2. Qualitative Data Collection Procedure:

Quantitative and qualitative data were gathered in a sequential linear process. First, quantitative data was collected from students in two different periods, then, qualitative data was formed by the interviews. The interviews were carried out with 11 students who were selected by random sampling of the researcher. Interviews with students were administered in school with the permission of their parents and the school principal. All the interviews were

recorded by a smart phone, they were transferred to a private computer and then transcribed by the researcher.

3.5. Data Analysis

The quantitative data of the research were analysed via IBM SPSS Statistics 23. As a first step, the normality test (Shapiro Wilk) was performed, then, since the data was not normally distributed, non-parametric tests were used during the analysis. By means of descriptive statistics, demographic information was checked according to students' answers. Items having mean score higher than 2.0 were accepted as high level of strategy use, items with a mean between 1.5 and 2.0 were accepted as medium level, and items having mean score under 1.5 were accepted as low level of strategy use (see Table 1).

Table 1

Interval scale of the children's language learning strategy inventory

Language Learning Strategy Use	Mean
Low level of strategy use	1.00 – 1.50
Medium level of strategy use	1.51 – 2.00
High level of strategy use	2.01 – 3.00

For dual comparisons such as gender, Mann-Whitney U test was performed, while Kruskal-Wallis test was used for multiple comparisons like age, additional language courses. Since the inventory was administered to students in two different periods, all the analysis and comparisons were done twice for each period, and the findings were compared between each other.

For the qualitative data, content analysis was done by the researcher by coding and categorizing students' words. For analysing the qualitative data, the coding technique of similarity of words is used as a common strategy (DeCuir-Gunby, Marshall & McCulloch, 2011).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter of the study, the gathered quantitative and qualitative findings will be presented, then, the results will be indicated through the tables. Findings of quantitative and qualitative data will be explained under separate titles. Quantitative data were analysed through SPSS 23.0, while qualitative data were interpreted via content analysis by the researcher. According to Shapiro-Wilk normality test, the data obtained by the scale were not distributed normally, hence, non-parametric tests were used to analyse the data. The quantitative data findings were indicated respectively according to the research questions of the study. Finally, the qualitative data were categorized as codes and themes.

4.1. Quantitative Data Analysis

4.1.1. The overall language learning strategy use of fourth grade students:

Considering the fact that students answered the inventory twice, one of them was before the online education period, and the other one was at the end of the online education period, the amount of overall language learning strategy use of all the students was analysed twice. At the beginning of the online education period, the overall language learning strategy use was found to be 2.20, at the end of the online education period, the language learning strategy use was found to be 2.18 indicating that fourth grade students have a high level of strategy use in both periods.

As can be seen in Table 2, means of the items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 17, 19, 22, 25, 26, 29, 30 decreased after the online education period. Items with the highest decreased were 2, 22, 3, 19, 25. Item 2 consisted of students' sharing knowledge, notes and getting help from their peers. Item 22 consisted of drawing of an unknown word while writing or speaking. Item 3 consisted of asking someone's help to correct their mistakes. Item 19 consisted of keeping the words in mind with association. Lastly, the item which showed highest decrease was 25 which consisted of facilitating writing and reading skills by using cognates.

Table 2

The overall language learning strategy use of fourth grade students before online education (part 1)

Items	Period	N	Mean	SD
1.I try to speak in English with my teacher, friends and parents.	Pre	110	2.50	0.55
	Post	110	2.43	0.55
2.In an activity I work with a peer, I share my notes and/or ask her/him the points I don't understand.	Pre	110	2.55	0.55
	Post	110	2.25	0.49
3.After writing or saying something in English I ask my teacher, friend, or someone who is knowledgeable to correct my errors.	Pre	110	2.44	0.57
	Post	110	2.24	0.55
4.I use a new vocabulary in sentence to pronounce it correctly.	Pre	110	1.99	0.62
	Post	110	2.04	0.45
5.Before I say something in English I check my book, notebook, etc. to see what we learned about the topic.	Pre	110	2.51	0.57
	Post	110	2.48	0.53
6.I test myself to improve my English.	Pre	110	2.58	0.53
	Post	110	2.50	0.52
7.I revise the lesson, the notes I take at school, my old books and notebooks, unknown or newly learnt vocabulary by reading or writing.	Pre	110	2.50	0.60
	Post	110	2.43	0.56
8.I practice with my parents or someone else before speaking activities.	Pre	110	1.85	0.68
	Post	110	1.88	0.58
9.I study my errors after speaking activities.	Pre	110	1.99	0.58
	Post	110	1.86	0.54
10.When I think that I cannot learn I tell my parents I need help. Ex: Taking private lessons.	Pre	110	2.20	0.84
	Post	110	2.36	0.76
11.I read the books I read before to improve my English.	Pre	110	2.18	0.79
	Post	110	2.38	0.62
12.I use the words I learnt recently when speaking with tourists and native speakers to pronounce them correctly.	Pre	110	1.66	0.83
	Post	110	1.53	0.63
13.I like to use English in fun ways. For example; I try to make jokes in English.	Pre	110	2.15	0.75
	Post	110	2.38	0.60
14.To improve my English I work with supporting materials such as books, CDs that teach English.	Pre	110	2.49	0.55
	Post	110	2.50	0.55
15.I do tests to improve my English.	Pre	110	2.48	0.58
	Post	110	2.54	0.51
16.While reading I try to guess the unknown structure by comparing it with the one that I know.	Pre	110	1.75	0.63
	Post	110	1.77	0.58
17.Before I write or listen in English I read about that topic, revise the unit, read a similar paragraph, try to find an example, prepare a draft or make sentences with the topic.	Pre	110	1.97	0.61
	Post	110	1.89	0.56
18.While speaking I coin words that might have a similar meaning instead of the one that I do not know.	Pre	110	2.21	0.68
	Post	110	2.30	0.55

Table 3

The overall language learning strategy use of fourth grade students before online education (part 2)

Items	Period	N	Mean	SD
19.I try to keep the words in my mind by associating their pronunciation. For example, snake and sinek (a fly).	Pre	110	2.54	0.56
	Post	110	2.31	0.52
20.I take notes of unknown words, my peers questions and/or things that I remember after drama activities.	Pre	110	1.56	0.65
	Post	110	1.57	0.68
21.I use gestures when I have trouble in explaining meanings of things in English.	Pre	110	1.80	0.77
	Post	110	2.10	0.62
22.While writing or speaking I draw the picture of an unknown word.	Pre	110	2.01	0.78
	Post	110	1.72	0.66
23.While speaking if I do not know the meaning of a word I say its Turkish and keep on talking.	Pre	110	2.42	0.66
	Post	110	2.62	0.53
24.I repeatedly write the new word to be able to say it correctly.	Pre	110	1.82	0.67
	Post	110	1.83	0.61
25.While writing or reading I benefit from cognates to facilitate my writing and reading comprehension. For example; radio, television, leopard, chimpanzee.	Pre	110	2.55	0.55
	Post	110	2.32	0.49
26.To facilitate my reading and listening comprehension, writing and speaking I use dictionaries, my course book, notebook or language teaching CDs.	Pre	110	2.54	0.61
	Post	110	2.46	0.56
27.I remember a word by thinking its location on a page.	Pre	110	1.90	0.60
	Post	110	2.00	0.47
28.I read or listen to an English text again after reading or listening to it once.	Pre	110	2.30	0.58
	Post	110	2.42	0.49
29.Before writing something I identify the words and structures from my bok and notebook.	Pre	110	1.99	0.61
	Post	110	1.83	0.53
30.I revise the new information with regular intervals.	Pre	110	2.58	0.49
	Post	110	2.50	0.50

The items 4, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 28 showed increase after the online education period. Items with the highest increase were 21, 13, 11, and 23. Item 21 consisted of using gestures when explaining meanings of things in English. Item 13 consisted of using English in fun ways, such as in jokes. Item 11 consisted of reading the books repeatedly to improve English. Lastly, the item which showed the highest increase was 23 which consisted of keeping on talking by using Turkish if necessary.

Considering the scale has four separate parts, the means of the parts were calculated separately for each period as well. First part of the scale consisted of 10 items which were cognitive and metacognitive language learning strategies.

As for part A, the overall mean level was found to be 2.39, indicating a high-level use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies.

4.1.2. Gender and preference for language learning strategy use:

For the second research question, two different genders were compared to each other by means of Mann-Whitney U Test. The data were analysed separately for the 1st and 2nd period. When looked at the table 2. there is a significant difference between two genders in terms strategy use in both periods. According to Mann-Whitney U Test results, female students have higher level of strategy use than male students. However, in terms of some items, male students outperform female students. Table 3 shows detailed analysis of items which make significant differences for the 1st period.

According to the findings, there were 19 items making a difference between two genders (1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18, 21, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30). Correspondingly, male students outperform female students in terms of only 1 item (13). They show more tendency to use English in fun ways, such as making jokes than female students. (MR=64.51).

Table 4

The overall strategy use differences between the two genders

	Period	Gender	Number	Mean Rank	Sig.
The overall strategy use	1	M	53	43.22	0.000
		F	57	66.92	
	2	M	53	43.07	0.000
		F	57	67.93	

When looked at the analysis of the 2nd period, the items making a difference between two genders were almost similar. However, there were new clear differences in items 5, 23 and 27. Correspondingly, female students check their notes about the former topic before they say something in English (MR=66.29). They use Turkish words to keep on talking in English if they do not know the meaning of a word (MR=61.85). Lastly, female students remember a word by thinking its location on a page. Male students are more keen

on using English in fun ways than female students as in the 1st period findings (MR=62.80).

Table 5

The comparison of the two genders in terms of their strategy use for pre-online education

Item	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sig.
1.I try to speak in English with my teacher, friends and parents.	M	53	42.50	0.005
	F	57	68.50	
2.In an activity I work with a peer, I share my notes and/or ask her/him the points I don't understand.	M	53	48.69	0.001
	F	57	62.31	
3.After writing or saying something in English I ask my teacher, friend, or someone who is knowledgeable to correct my errors.	M	53	49.12	0.019
	F	57	61.88	
4.I use a new vocabulary in sentence to pronounce it correctly.	M	53	49.56	0.010
	F	57	61.44	
6.I test myself to improve my English.	M	53	44.85	0.019
	F	57	66.15	
7.I revise the lesson, the notes I take at school, my old books and notebooks, unknown or newly learnt vocabulary by reading or writing.	M	53	44.90	0.000
	F	57	66.10	
9.I study my errors after speaking activities.	M	53	47.83	0.010
	F	57	62.63	
10.When I think that I cannot learn I tell my parents I need help. Ex: Taking private lessons.	M	53	46.93	0.003
	F	57	63.46	
11.I read the books I read before to improve my English.	M	53	49.12	0.030
	F	57	61.43	
13.I like to use English in fun ways. For example; I try to make jokes in English.	M	53	64.51	0.002
	F	57	47.12	
14.To improve my English I work with supporting materials such as books, CDs that teach English.	M	53	48.70	0.014
	F	57	61.82	
15.I do tests to improve my English.	M	53	46.84	0.002
	F	57	63.55	
18.While speaking I coin words that might have a similar meaning instead of the one that I do not know.	M	53	49.54	0.038
	F	57	61.04	
21.I use gestures when I have trouble in explaining meanings of things in English.	M	53	48.41	0.016
	F	57	62.10	
25.While writing or reading I benefit from cognates to facilitate my writing and reading comprehension. For example; radio, television, leopard, chimpanzee.	M	53	48.93	0.016
	F	57	61.61	
26.To facilitate my reading and listening comprehension, writing and speaking I use dictionaries, my course book, notebook or language teaching CDs.	M	53	45.82	0.000
	F	57	64.50	
28.I read or listen to an English text again after reading or listening to it once.	M	53	49.30	0.025
	F	57	61.26	
29.Before writing something I identify the words and	M	53	48.31	0.008

structures from my book and notebook.	F	57	62.18	
30. I revise the new information with regular intervals.	M	53	45.29	0.000
	F	57	64.99	

Table 6

The comparison of the two genders in terms of their strategy use for post-online education

Item	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sig.
1.I try to speak in English with my teacher, friends and parents.	M	53	42.50	0.000
	F	57	68.50	
2.In an activity I work with a peer, I share my notes and/or ask her/him the points I don't understand.	M	53	48.69	0.002
	F	57	68.31	
3.After writing or saying something in English I ask my teacher, friend, or someone who is knowledgeable to correct my errors.	M	53	49.12	0.004
	F	57	61.88	
4.I use a new vocabulary in sentence to pronounce it correctly.	M	53	49.56	0.000
	F	57	61.44	
5.Before I say something in English I check my book, notebook, etc. to see what we learned about the topic.	M	53	44.71	0.000
	F	57	66.29	
6.I test myself to improve my English.	M	53	44.48	0.000
	F	57	65.75	
7.I revise the lesson, the notes I take at school, my old books and notebooks, unknown or newly learnt vocabulary by reading or writing.	M	53	44.90	0.000
	F	57	66.10	
11.I read the books I read before to improve my English.	M	53	46.39	0.001
	F	57	64.61	
13.I like to use English in fun ways. For example; I try to make jokes in English.	M	53	62.80	0.022
	F	57	48.20	
14.To improve my English I work with supporting materials such as books, CDs that teach English.	M	53	42.14	0.000
	F	57	68.86	
15.I do tests to improve my English.	M	53	45.86	0.000
	F	57	65.14	
23.While speaking if I do not know the meaning of a word I say its Turkish and keep on talking	M	53	49.15	0.001
	F	57	61.85	
26.To facilitate my reading and listening comprehension, writing and speaking I use dictionaries, my course book, notebook or language teaching CDs.	M	53	42.45	0.000
	F	57	68.55	
27.I remember a word by thinking its location on a page.	M	53	47.97	0.001
	F	57	63.03	
28.I read or listen to an English text again after reading or listening to it once.	M	53	44.62	0.004
	F	57	65.19	
29.Before writing something I identify the words and structures from my book and notebook.	M	53	47.32	0.002
	F	57	63.68	
30. I revise the new information with regular intervals.	M	53	42.53	0.000
	F	57	67.56	

4.1.3. The Effect of Supportive Courses on Strategy Use:

Do supportive courses effect students' strategy use? To identify this question, Mann-Whitney U Test was done with two choices of students as can be seen in table 7. Accordingly, no statistically significant difference was found among students who take supportive courses provided by city hall and students who do not take any kinds of English course ($p < 0.065$). However, when analysed item by item, statistically significant differences were found in item 2, 9, and 28. Apparently, students who take supportive courses are more keen on working with their peers, sharing notes or asking the things they do not understand. Also students who take supportive courses have a more tendency to work on their mistakes after speaking activities. As for the last item which makes also a clear difference, students who take supportive courses seem to read or listen to an English text repeatedly at higher level than the students who do not take English courses. Table 7 shows a detailed analysis of items making a clear difference between two groups of students.

Table 7

The effect of supportive courses on strategy use

Items	Do you take supportive courses ?	N	Mean Rank	Sig
2. In an activity I work with a peer, I share my notes and/or ask her/him the points I don't understand.	Yes	23	53.56	0.023
	No	87	43.94	
9. I study my errors after speaking activities.	Yes	23	58.98	0.018
	No	87	42.35	
28. I read or listen to an English text again after reading or listening to it once.	Yes	23	57.51	0.012
	No	87	44.61	

4.1.4. The Effect of Age on Strategy Use:

There were three groups of ages according to students' choices in the inventory. The main of this research question was to identify if there is a significant difference between three age groups, consequently the researcher administered Kruskal-Wallis test to the findings. Since the students answered the scale in two different times, the analysis was implemented separately. According to the results, no statistically significant difference was found in general strategy use between three age groups in both periods (see Table 8). However, when all items were compared to each other, statistically significant difference was found in two items ($p=.002$). When looked at the table 8, 10 years old students have higher rank in using gestures when they try to explain things in English than 8 and 9 years old ones. Correspondingly, 10 years old students have more tendency to use cognates to facilitates their writing and reading compared to other age groups.

Table 8

The effect of age on strategy use

Items	Age	N	Mean Rank	Sig.
21. I use gestures when I have trouble in explaining meanings of things in English.	8	11	45.95	0.002
	9	52	46.83	
	10	47	67.33	
25. While writing or reading I benefit from cognates to facilitate my writing and reading comprehension. For example; radio, television, leopard, chimpanzee.	8	11	32.64	0.002
	9	52	52.92	
	10	47	63.70	

4.1.5. Does number of siblings affect language learning strategy use?

Based on the fifth research question, students were also asked about their number of siblings. The main aim here was to see if online learning, due to the point that the children were mainly at home with their siblings, had an impact on the students' cooperative and social language learning strategies.

There were five types of answers: none, 1, 2, 3 and more than 3 siblings. Since the students answered the scale in two different periods, the data analysis of this question was analysed separately as well. In both periods, no statistically significant difference was found between number of siblings and general language learning strategy use (see Table 9). However, when looked at the data item by item, only one item seemed to make a difference between number of siblings in both periods ($p=0.015$) and ($p=0.010$). According to results of Kruskal-Wallis test, students who have more than three siblings, have more tendency to test themselves to improve their English in both periods.

Table 9

The effect of number of siblings on strategy use

Items	Period	Number of Siblings	N	Mean Rank	Sig.
6.I test myself to improve my English.	pre	0	3	59.50	0.015
		1	14	54.36	
		2	29	46.95	
		3	32	49.81	
		3<	32	69.06	
	post	0	3	63.83	0.010
		1	14	50.86	
		2	29	61.56	
		3	32	42.00	
		3<	32	65.09	

4.1.6. The Overall Language Learning Strategy Use of Fourth Grade Students in Separate Parts:

The CHILLS inventory consisted of 30 items, however, the inventory had four separate parts. Part A consisted of items that reflect cognitive and metacognitive learning strategies (1., 2., 3., 4., 5., 6., 7., 8., 9., 10.). Part B consisted of cognitive, metacognitive, social and compensation learning strategies (11., 12., 13., 14., 15., 16., 17., 18.). Part C consisted of mostly compensation, two memory and two cognitive strategies (19., 20., 21., 22., 23., 24., 25.). Lastly, part D consisted of learning strategies that consolidate the target language (26., 27., 28., 29., 30.). The researcher analysed the strategy use of these four different parts in both different periods.

Table 10

Overall strategy use category means

Parts	Online education	Mean
Part A	Pre	2.31
	Post	2.25
Part B	Pre	2.11
	Post	2.16
Part C	Pre	2.10
	Post	2.04
Part D	Pre	2.26
	Post	2.24

When looked at the table 10, both before and after the online education period, part A has the highest use in the inventory, showing that students preferred mostly cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Correspondingly, before the online education period, part C was the

least preferred by fourth grade students. Lastly, part B was seen to be the only part that showed increased after the online education period, while the other three parts decreased.

4.2. Qualitative Data Analysis

The researcher applied content analysis on the qualitative data gathered from students. According to students' answers given in the interviews, there were different strategies and ways about how they study English in their own styles besides the strategies from the inventory (see Table 11, 12, 13, and 14).

4.2.1. Qualitative Data Results:

4.2.1.2. What do you do to improve your English?

The first interview question aimed to dwell on what the students themselves do to improve their English and that is why they were asked what are the things that they do to achieve this goal (see Table 11).

Table 11

Interview question 1

Interview Question 1	Theme	Code
What do you do to improve your English ?	Direct Strategies	I watch English cartoons and videos. I try to memorize the words in the dictionary. I listen to English songs. I I translate the words that I don't know. I play games in English. I try to speak English at home.

As can be seen from Table 11, according to students' answers, some of them ask about English words to their parents or relatives when they think they have trouble in understanding (3 of 12). For example, S1 stated:

"If I don't know the meaning of words in English, I ask for help from my family, if they can't help either, we look at the dictionary."

Correspondingly, some students indicated they try to listen to music in English and watch English cartoons and videos (8 of 12). Also, S5 stated:

"I always play games and I learn English words at the game".

S8 indicated:

"When I listened to an English song, I try to memorize the words and I check their meanings in Google Translate."

Almost half of the students who were interviewed seemed to believe the power of a dictionary and memorizing the Turkish meanings of the words (5 of 12). For example, S3 said:

"I try to read an English dictionary and memorize the Turkish meanings of the words because if I know all the words in English, I can speak English."

Some of the students pointed out that they rewrite the English words and sentences that were formerly written in English lessons at school (2 of 12). S4 stated:

"I have an extra notebook at home and I rewrite the English words and sentences to study for English exams at school."

Some of the students also indicated that they try to speak English at school but they can't because of the fact that their classmates make fun of them when they can't make correct pronunciation of the words and some of them indicated that they get shy from the teacher when try to use English words. S5 explained:

"Sometimes I want to speak English with my friends and sing English songs at break times but they don't want to participate."

Some students talked about a similar situation happens at their home when they want to speak English but they can't since their parents or siblings don't know English enough to speak with each other (2 of 12). For example, S8 stated:

“I try to say “good morning, good night”, at home but I can’t speak anything else in English since there is no one who can speak English with me at home.”.

4.2.1.3. What are the reasons that make you feel unsuccessful in English?

In the interviews, students were asked about how they feel about English language and what are the reasons behind their feeling unsuccessful (See Table 12).

According to students’ answers, there are some reasons that cause them to feel failure.

Table 12

Interview question 2

Interview Question 2	Theme	Code
What are the reasons that make you feel unsuccessful in English?	The reasons related to students themselves	<p>I can’t study English because I can’t read in English.</p> <p>I don’t study enough.</p> <p>I can’t keep English words in my mind.</p> <p>I can’t understand English words.</p> <p>I don’t know how to study English.</p>

Some students believed memorizing English words are necessary but they can’t, and that is why they sometimes feel unsuccessful (3 of 12). For example, S6 indicated:

“Sometimes I can’t find the Turkish meanings of words that I don’t understand and I can’t keep those words in my mind.”.

A few number of students think that they can't read English words and sentences and that is the reason why they can't study English (4 of 12). S7 stated:

“The teacher tells us to study our English notebook every day but I don't know how to read English, that's why I can't study.”

Two students also indicated that they don't exactly the reason why they are unsuccessful in English and they pointed out that this feeling sometimes occur to them. Three students stated that sometime they don't understand the questions in English and because of that they can't give correct answers (3 of 12). For example, S8 said:

“In our school books or worksheets, the sentence tells us about what to do in the activity below but I can't understand those sentences. In the classroom, our teacher shows us how to do the activities but at when I do my homework at home, sometime I forget how to do the activity.”

Correspondingly, some students indicated that they are aware of the fact that they ought to study harder and spend more time in doing activities related to English, but they complained about sometimes they can't find enough time because of school assignments (3 of 12). S1 explained:

“If I study harder, I can be successful, but sometimes our teacher gives a lot of homework.”

According to two the students' answers, they seemed to believe they are not as successful as their friends who take an English course outside of the school (2 of 12). Lastly, half of the students explained they don't know how to study English and how to be successful that's why feel like they are unsuccessful (7 of 12). S2 pointed out:

“Our teacher always tells me to study harder but I don't know how to study English because I can't read English words and I don't understand English video or songs.”

4.2.1.4. What are the things that you want to do to learn English?

Students were asked about the things that they demand for improving their English (see in Table 13). According to students' answers, there were some demands that can be counted as direct strategies and social strategies. Additionally, there were some demographic opportunities from their points of view. For example, S2 stated:

“I want to talk to foreign people but I don’t know where to find them.”.

In addition, S7 said:

“I wish there were more English lessons at school so that we could do fun activities more.”.

And, S9 explained:

“I want to read English books and I want to understand them. I also want to speak English at school but I can’t remember all the words.”

Correspondingly, few students preferred schools to be open on a full-time basis. For e.g., S4 said:

“I like our English lessons at school more than online English lessons because they were more fun.”

Table 13*Interview question 3*

Interview Question 3	Theme	Code
What are the things that you want to do to learn English?	Demand for social strategies	I want to go abroad. I want to talk to foreign people.
	Demand for direct strategies	I want to be able to read English books.
	Demand for opportunities to practice language	I want to go to an English course. I want schools to be open all the time.
		I want more English lessons.

4.2.1.5. What are the obstacles that hinder learning English?

The researcher aimed to find out the reasons why students demand for those strategies and demographic opportunities. They were asked about their thought and feelings in a deeper manner (See Table 14).

Table 14*Interview question 4*

Interview Question 4	Theme	Code
What are the obstacles that make you unable to do things related to English?	Obstacles from students themselves	I can't speak in English because of getting shy.
	Obstacles based on lack of opportunities	<p>I can't watch English videos because of lack of internet.</p> <p>I can't go to an English course because of lack of money.</p> <p>I can't talk to foreign people because of lack of tourists.</p>

According to students' statements, there were some obstacles from themselves such as feeling shy while trying to speak English. However, most of the explanations were related to obstacles that are not in the students' own control. For example, S12 stated:

"I want to take English courses because I like English very much, but my parents do not allow it since they do not have time take me there because it is far from our house."

Similarly, S5 said:

“I want to talk to foreign people but they do not come near our neighbourhood, and I want to go abroad, maybe to England, my teachers and my parents tell me to wait for growing up to go there on my own.”

There were also some statements of students related to economic issues. For example, S10 explained:

“I do not want schools to be closed because I can’t always connect to online English lessons, sometimes there is no internet and sometimes my sister has to connect to her lessons, so I have to wait.”

Related to financial issues, S6 said: “I want to read English books, watch English videos, listen to English music, but we can’t afford it.”

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This section of the study gives the results of the research by connecting each of the RQ's, and similar and contrast results are highlighted with past studies. A general perspective of the outcomes will be introduced by the researcher and potential reasons are discussed related to this topic. Teaching second or foreign language to young learners is one of the most arguable issues around the world. Additionally, there have been many studies related to language learning studies with a variety of learning groups. This research aimed to investigate language learning strategies of fourth grade students during online education period in the light of research questions.

5.1. The Overall Language Learning Strategy Use of Fourth Grade Students

As a first step in the section of findings, the answer to “What is the level of language learning strategy use of fourth grade students?” was aimed to be examined by the researcher. The overall strategy use was calculated in two different times; before the online education period and after a three-month online education period. According to the results, the general strategy use level for the first period was found 2.20, and the second one was found 2.18. It can be inferred from these calculations; fourth grade students show high use level of language learning strategy use in both periods. Even though there is a slight decrease after a four-month online education period, that difference cannot be counted as significant. Nonetheless, when the results were looked item by item, there were some changes that can be seen as significant. Naming, items 2, 3, 19, 22, 25 presented the highest decrease in second results. It can be inferred from these results children decreased sharing notes and knowledge, getting help from peers, asking someone help, keeping words in mind, drawing an unknown word, and using cognates. The obvious reasons behind decreasing activities related to their peers and classroom are no school environment existed during four months.

The results of the study found high level use of strategy use of fourth grade students. These results of the study do not correlate with some studies in the literature. Bekleyen (2006) investigated language learning strategies of 142 teacher candidates and the participants showed medium level of strategy use. However, the age difference should be taken into account. Next, Gömleksiz (2013) carried out a research with 112 prospective Turkish Language teachers. The participants presented inadequacy of using language

learning strategies. In the study conducted by Erarslan and Höl (2014), 185 students showed medium level strategy use.

When all items of the inventory were examined separately in both terms, some results correlate with other studies as well. In this study, fourth grade students showed cognitive and metacognitive strategies (part A) at highest among other sections of the inventory. When it is reviewed in other studies, Çetin (2019) found that predatory students at a university prefer cognitive and compensation strategies at higher level among other learning strategies. Razi (2012) conducted a study with 189 students from English Language Teaching Department to examine learning strategies from different points. The study showed that students prefer metacognitive and compensation strategies at most. Another research carried out by Yılmaz (2010) at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University with English majors investigated language learning strategies and the findings presented that participants use compensation strategies at highest among other strategies. Next, Deneme (2008) aimed to investigate language learning strategies of ELT students. The results of the study pointed out that learners prefer using metacognitive and compensation strategies more than they prefer others.

Another study conducted by Karahan (2015) with EMI (English medium instruction) students claimed that students use metacognitive strategies at most. Next, a conducted study with e-learners in Turkey to investigate language learning strategies of 174 participants. The study highlighted that metacognitive and memory strategies were found to be the most preferred groups by participants.

The studies in the literature have some differences with this study, considering the age difference and other demographic features. However, Gürsoy and Eken (2018) carried out a research with children by using the same inventory with this study. Their findings also showed that students use part A (general habits) at most, which correlates with this study. Another study conducted by Doro and Habok (2013) revealed that fifth and sixth grade students show more tendency to prefer metacognitive strategies at higher level. Another study which found metacognitive strategies as most preferred by students was done by Habok and Magyar (2018) with lower secondary school Hungarian students.

Nhem (2019) experimented a study with young learners and adolescents to examine their strategy use with different perspectives. The findings of the study are in line with this study, naming young learners use cognitive and metacognitive strategies at higher level

than other strategy parts. The study also indicated that young learners use cognitive and compensation strategies more than adolescents do. The findings of this study are not completely line with the study conducted by Dong (1992), as they indicated that oral-practice and compensation strategies are preferred at most by students, and cognitive and memory strategies are preferred at least. Research carried out by Wu (2008) with Taiwan students pointed out that learners prefer to use compensation strategies at higher level.

5.2. The Relationship Between Strategy Use and Gender

The researcher aimed to examine whether there is a relationship between the two genders in terms of strategy use. The two genders were compared in two different times for both periods by using Mann-Whitney U test. According to the results of the comparisons, a significant difference was found between two genders in both terms; female fourth grade students outperform males in using language learning strategies. However, even female students have more tendency to use strategies, male students showed higher results on some items. When it is reviewed in the literature, in terms of gender difference on strategy use, correlated studies were found. Ayırır, Arıoğul and Ünal (2012) conducted a study with 343 university students and they investigated the gender difference. Another research that correlates with this study was carried out by Aslan in 2009 with university students. The study findings claimed that female students have higher level of strategy use compared to male students. Next, a research conducted with e-learners in Turkey revealed that a significant difference exists between two gender, naming; female students use cognitive strategies than male students, while males prefer metacognitive strategies at higher level than females.

There were studies that are not in line with the results of this study. Erarslan and Höl (2014) claimed that there was no significant difference between two genders in terms of overall strategy use; naming female students use strategies more than male students do. Additionally, the study revealed that metacognitive strategies are preferred at most by female students, while male students prefer to use compensation strategies at most. Karahan (2015) also claimed in their study that gender does not have any significant effect on strategy overall strategy use or for ix categories either. Next, Tuyan (2018) revealed in their study that no significant difference was found between female and male high school students on overall strategy use. In addition, the study also pointed out that when examined separately, female students outperform male students in using metacognitive, memory, compensation and social strategies. According to another study conducted with

e-learners in Turkey by Solak and Çakır in 2015, it was claimed that female learners have more tendency to use cognitive strategies, while males prefer metacognitive strategies at higher level. Gürsoy and Eken (2018) conducted a study with young learners in Turkey and the findings pointed out that female students have higher level of strategy use compared to male students. Another study correlates with this study results in terms of gender effect conducted by Doro and Habok in 2013. They investigated gender difference on strategy use and it was found that female students outperform male students in using language learning strategies.

Female students were also found as higher users of strategies in a study reported by Peacock and Ho (2003), indicating that females have higher level use of memory and metacognitive strategies. However, Dong (1992) carried out a research with Taiwan students and the study highlighted that gender difference was only found in terms of using social strategies in behaviour of female students.

5.3. The Effect of Age on Strategy Use

In this study, students from a fourth grade at a state school participated and their ages ranged from 8 to 10. Most of the students were 9 (52), 47 of them were 10 and 11 of them were 8 eight years old. This various range is due to the changings implemented years ago about the ages of starting school for kids by the government. Age effect on strategy use were examined via Kruskal-Wallis tests and the results showed that no statistically significant difference was found between three age groups in terms of overall strategy use. However, when examined item by item in terms of age difference, a significant difference was found in two items. The results of the study claim that 10 years old students have higher rank in using gestures and using cognates to facilitate their learning.

These results of the study do not show much parallelism with a study conducted by Peacock and Ho (2003) who found the students who were younger were stronger in use of affective and social strategies. According to another study to examine age effect on strategy use was carried out by Nhem in 2019 with young and adolescents English learners in Cambodia. Their results claimed that age difference in strategy use exists between two categories; young learners had higher level use of cognitive and compensation strategies than adolescents.

5.4. The Effect of Supportive Courses on Strategy Use

To provide opportunity primary school students for equalise and extra support who wants to attend courses, there are English and other courses provided by city halls by the government. The attendance is not obligatory, it is mostly up to families and students. The students who take supportive courses besides school lessons go to city halls' supportive courses two or three times a week. This study aimed to investigate if taking supportive English lessons effect students' strategy use in any way. This also should be indicated that supportive courses of city halls paused their education for a couple of months during pandemic period. According to the findings of the study, no significant effect was found between students who take supportive courses and the ones who do not take in terms of general strategy use. Nevertheless, when the researcher compared the results item by item, significant differences were found between some items on the inventory (2,9,28). Accordingly, students who take supportive courses are more keen on sharing notes, working with peers, and they read or listen to an English text. These findings might indicate that students who take supportive courses spend much more time with their peers in a small classroom environment, and the lessons they take there might impose them peer-related activities, tasks or projects which might also require read or listen to English texts as well.

5.5. The Effect of Number of Siblings on Strategy Use

As for the fourth research question, it was aimed to investigate whether or not there are significant differences between students according to their number of siblings on strategy use. The results showed that there is no statistically significant difference between three groups of students not only before online education but after three months of online education period as well. Correspondingly, no studies on this specific subject were found in the literature to compare the results of this research.

3.6. Parts of the Inventory

In this study inventory data was examined in two different periods (pre and post), the inventory results were analysed under four sub-headings. The quantitative data results presented that cognitive and metacognitive strategies (part A) have higher level use than other groups of learning strategies in both times. Correspondingly compensation and

memory strategies (part C) had the least level in both times. Because the parts consist of one more than one group of strategy type, it might not be totally correct to make generalizations to indicate that fourth grade learners use prefer one strict type of strategy category.



CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

6.1. Summary

The present study aimed to investigate the language learning strategies of a total of 110 participants who were 4th grade students in a state primary school (Solventaş Primary School) in Kocaeli, Turkey. The language learning strategies of the students were examined in different aspects especially based on the impact of ERT, and whether the online education period had influenced the students' preferences of language learning strategies. In this study, the questionnaire employed was "Children's' Language Learning Strategy Inventory" (CHILLS) designed by Gürsoy (2013). The researcher used SPSS 23.0 to examine the quantitative data which was gathered by means of the scale the participants answered. After examining the quantitative data, the semi-structured interviews were administered with the participation of 11 students who were selected by random sampling. This research was conducted in the light of six research questions: The first question was:

6.2.What is the Overall Language Learning Strategy Used by the Fourth Grade Students?

To find an answer to this research question about the overall strategy use of 4th grade students, the data collection was performed twice; before the online education period and after four month of online education. For the first period the overall language learning strategy use level was found 2.20, and after online education period it was found 2.18. As a result, the numbers indicated that 4th grade students show high level use of language learning strategies in both periods. The results of two different periods of before online education and after online education, no statistically decrease or increase was detected.

For the second research question, the quantitative data was analysed for both periods separately.

6.3.What is the Relationship Between Students' Demographic Information and Language Learning Strategy Use?

For this question, the following sub-questions were also investigated:

- a. Does gender make a significant difference in language learning strategy use?
- b. Does age make a significant difference in language learning strategy use?

c. Does supportive language courses make a significant difference in language learning strategy use?

d. Does number of siblings affect students' language learning strategy use?

When it comes to gender difference for overall strategy use, Mann-Whitney U tests showed that female students have higher level of strategy use when compared to male students in both periods. Although, when the items were examined aside from the overall analysis, there was only one item that male students outperformed females. According to the results, male students happen to use English in fun ways such as making jokes etc. On the other hand, 19 out of 30 items showed more frequency used by female students more than males. When the gender difference was examined in second data, the results were quite similar except for some items. The second period data results showed that female students showed tendency to check their notes about the former topics, use Turkish words to keep talking, remember a word by thinking of its location on the page.

Age factor on strategy use was examined in this study, even though all of the participants were 4th graders, they were ranged from 8 to 10. Kruskal-Wallis Test results showed that in both periods, there were no statistically significant difference on general language learning strategy use. On the other hand, all items on the scale were examined separately and the results indicated that there were two items showing a significant difference. Accordingly, 10-year-old students show more tendency to use gestures when they try to explain things in English. The second item also indicated a difference on behalf of 10 years old that they tend to use cognates to facilitate their writing and reading skills.

Another demographic information obtained from the students was about the number of their siblings considering it might be a factor affecting use strategy level on general or specific items. Since the data was collected in two different periods, the results were examined in different times as well. However, in both periods, Kruskal Wallis test results showed that no statistically significant difference was found between the number of siblings and general strategy use. Although, when the items were examined separately, one item showed a significant difference indicating that students who have more than 3 siblings have more tendency to test themselves to improve their English.

One of the main questions of demographic information was to investigate whether supportive courses make a significant difference on 4th grade students strategy use. The students were identified as supportive course takers provided by the city hall outside of the

school and non-takers. Mann Whitney U test results showed that there was no statistically significant difference between two groups of students in both periods. However, there were three items showed significant difference; students who take supportive courses are more keen on working with peers, sharing their notes, asking the things they do not understand. Another item indicated that students who take supportive courses showed more tendency to work on their mistakes after some sort of speaking activities, and the same group of students showed more performance on reading and listening to an English text repeatedly compared to other group of students.

6.4. Overall View of the Results Based on Parts of the Inventory.

3. Were there any significant differences between the results gained from the different parts of the scale collected before the online education period and after online education period?

Since the scale had four different parts (part A, part B, part C, part D), it was aimed to investigate the mean scores for before online education and after online education period. The results indicated that part A (cognitive and metacognitive strategies) were preferred at most by students in both periods. Compensation and memory strategies (part C) had the least level in both periods; however, part B was the only part that showed a significant increase after three months of online education period. Hence, it can be indicated that students showed more willingness on using cognitive, metacognitive, social and compensation strategies. Correspondingly, part A, part C and part D showed statistically significant decrease after the online education period.

By means of fourth research question, it was aimed to collect answers from students' perspectives to gain deeper insights on the study.

6.5. What do you do to improve your English?

Accordingly, all the answers gathered from 11 students who were selected randomly for interviews were identified at only direct strategy category. Correspondingly, watching English videos and cartoons, memorizing English words with their Turkish meanings from a dictionary were the basic answers given to the related research question. As a second question at the interviews, students were asked about the reasons that can make them feel unsuccessful in English. According to the answers gathered from them, it is appearing that all reasons were related to students' themselves especially their amount of studying or how they study.

Students mostly indicated that their inability to read and understand in English, not memorizing English words, not studying enough and also not knowing exactly how to study make them feel unsuccessful. Another interview question was aimed to identify demands of students to improve their English skills. It was explored that students desire to go abroad to talk to foreign people, gain ability to understand English books, go to English courses. Another answers might have been effected by online education period during pandemic since students indicated they want schools to be open every day and also they desire English lessons more than twice a week. The last interview question aimed to shed light on the reasons behind why students do not have chance to obtain what they desire. According to the answers gathered in the interviews, there are obstacles that related to students' themselves, and there are obstacles such as not accessing internet all the time, economical obstacles related to their parents.

As a conclusion, it is possible to say that foreign language teachers who are teaching young learners need to be aware of the strategies employed by young learners in all types of learning circumstances whether it's face-to-face or on-line teaching environments. In addition, the study has shown that young learners are able to evaluate their own learning and that they to need to be aware of language learning strategies. As a result, it can be recommended that there be language learning strategy training for both the teachers and young learners.

6.6. Implications

There are a quite number of implications concluded from this study. First of all, COVID-19 pandemic affected the whole world not only our country. There are several changes and causes happened to be new in people's lives and accordingly education systems are one of the most effected places in whole world. Online education issue had been one of the most popular research topics for several years, however, it gained much more popularity since pandemic came into our lives. Turkish educational system was mostly based on pen and paper and face to face education, with specific time and specific places (schools). On the other hand, young learners as foreign learners, and language learning strategies were important topics in English language learning and teaching literature. This research aimed to examine learning strategies of young learners during pandemic online education period.

In summary, several important indications were collected during this research. Accordingly, 4th grade students have high level use of language learning strategies both before and after three months of online education period.

As for demographic indicators, female students showed higher level use of learning strategies both before and after online education in general level. When it comes to age effect, no statistically significant difference was found between the three different age groups in both periods. Another demographic indicator was related to number of siblings of students; however, no statistically significant difference was found between the students in general strategy use. Last demographic feature was about the supportive courses taken by the students and it was indicated that no statistically significant difference was found between the students who take supportive courses and others who do not.

When the inventory results were examined part by part, part A (cognitive and metacognitive strategies) was found to be the most preferred group in both periods. Part C (compensation and memory strategies) was the least preferred group, while part B (cognitive, metacognitive, social and compensation) was the only part that showed a significant increase, while part A and part C showed decrease after three months of online education.

Lastly, qualitative data results basically indicated that 4th grade students have demands to improve their English, however, there are demographic obstacles that can pull them back from doing them. Students also complained about not being able to read and speak in English and they do not know how to study English. It can be indicated that they are not fully aware if the ways they study are beneficial for them or not.

As conclusion, three months of online education period, had some effects on 4th grade students' language learning strategies during pandemic period. Language learning strategies of young learners and pandemic period are both worth studying topics. This study can contribute to the literature with the findings gained from the specific data.

6.7. Suggestions for Further Research

This study was carried out with 110 4th grade students in a primary state school, Dilovaşı Solventaş Primary School, Kocaeli, Turkey. Hence, the findings of the study cannot make wide generalization related to all young learners. It cannot be ignored that this research was conducted in only one primary state school and in one city, thus, several cultural contexts and backgrounds might be involved.

Further research might be conducted with a larger sampling of young learners, different data collection techniques and tools can be implemented in a different environment. In addition, further studies can be conducted in interdisciplinary areas such as the investigation of online strategy training and language teaching



References

- Alanen, R. (2003). A sociocultural approach to young language learners' beliefs about language learning. In Kalaja, P. & Barcelos, A. M. F. (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA: New research approaches* (pp. 55-85). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bolster, A., Balandier-Brown, C. & Rea-Dickins, P. (2007). Young Learners of Modern Foreign Languages and Their Transition to the Secondary Phase: A Lost Opportunity? *Language Learning Journal*, 35-41.
- Alshamrani, M. S. (2019). An Investigation of the Advantages and Disadvantages of Online Education. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Auckland University of Technology.
- Altunay, D. (2014). Language Learning Strategies Used by Distance Learners of English: A Study with a Group of Turkish Distance Learners of EFL. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*. Volume: 15 Number: 3 Article 22.
- Ayirir, I. O. & Ariogul, S. & Unal, C. (2012). Effects of gender and university major on preparatory school students' use of foreign language learning strategies. *Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 42. 60-71.
- Arikan, A. & Ulaş, T. H. (2010). Contextualizing young learners' English lessons with cartoons: Focus on grammar and vocabulary. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 2. 5212-5215.
- Aslan, O. (2009). The Role of Gender and Language Learning Strategies in Learning English. MA Thesis, Kizilay: Middle East Technical University.
- Bagapova, G., Kobilova, N. & Yuldasheva N. (2020). The Role of Distance Education and Computer Technologies in Teaching Foreign Languages. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences*. Vol.8/10, 206-211.
- Bashitialshaer, R., Lassoued, Z., & Alhendawi, M. (2020). An Exploratory Study of the Obstacles for Achieving Quality in Distance Learning during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Education Sciences*, 10(9), 232-245.
- Caracelli, V. J., & Riggin, L. J. (1994). Mixed-method evaluation: Developing quality criteria through concept mapping: Mixed-Method Collaboration. *Evaluation Practice*, 15(2), 139-152.

- Çalışkan, M. & Sünbül, A. (2011). The Effects of Learning Strategies Instruction on Metacognitive Knowledge, Using Metacognitive Skills and Academic Achievement (Primary Education Sixth Grade Turkish Course Sample). *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*. 11. 148-153.
- Cesur, M. O. (2011). Can language learning strategies predict Turkish university prep class students' achievement in reading comprehension? *Science Direct*.1920-1924.
- Cetin, İ. S. (2019). Language Learning Strategies of Preparatory Students at Selçuk University School of Foreign Languages. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Temel Eğitim Anabilim Dalı, Konya.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- DeCuir-Gunby, J. T., Marshall, P. L., & McCulloch, A. W. (2011). Developing and using a codebook for the analysis of interview data: An example from a professional development research project. *Field methods*, 23(2), 136-155.
- Deneme, S. (2008). Language Learning Strategy Preferences of Turkish Students. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 4 (2), 0-93.
- Deneme, S. & Ada S. (2010) "Teaching English as a Foreign Language to Very Young Learners: A Case from Turkey" *Language in India* 10: 3. pp. 287-299.
- Doro, K. & Habok, A. (2013). Language Learning Strategies in Elementary School: The Effect of Age and Gender in an EFL Context. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*. 4(2): 25-37.
- Dumford, A. D., & Miller, A. L. (2018). Online learning in higher education: exploring advantages and disadvantages for engagement. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 30(3), 452-465.
- Ekmekçi, E. (2014). Distance-education in foreign language teaching: evaluations from the perspectives of freshman students. *Sciende Direct*, 390-397.
- Erarslan, A. & Höl, D. (2014). A study on language learning strategies of Turkish efl learners at a state university. *Journal Of Second And Multiple Language Acquisition-JSMULA*, 2(2), 1-10.

- Gomleksiz, M. N. (2013). An Investigation of Prospective Turkish Language Teachers' Perceptions of their Language Learning Strategies. *Adiyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*(11), 574.
- Gurata, A. (2008). The Grammar Learning Strategies Employed By Turkish University Preparatory School EFL Students. Unpublished MA Thesis. Bilkent University. Ankara.
- Gursoy, E. (2013). The Development of a Children's Inventory for Language Learning Strategies (CHILLS). *Journal of Educational and Social Research* , 263-272.
- Gursoy, E. & Korkmaz, Ş. Ç. (2013). Teaching young learners: The role of theory on practice. *ELT Research Journal* , 1 (2) , 109-119
- Gürsoy, E. & E. Eken, (2018). Identifying Children's Language Learning Strategies: Turkish Example. *Porta Linguarum*. 30. 43-56. 10.30827/Digibug.54037
- Habok, A. & Magyar, A. (2018). The Effect of Language Learning Strategies on Proficiency, Attitudes and School Achievement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 1-8.
- Hakan Aydoğan, A. A. (2014). The Role of Gender, Age, Academic Achievement, LLS and Learning Styles at Tertiary Level in in EFL Classes in Turkey . *Journal of Second and Multiple Acquisition* , 11-24.
- Harya, T. D. (2017). Language Learning Strategy Taxonomy Used by the Teacher in Teaching English. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 19-28.
- Ince, E. Y., Kabul, A., & Diler, İ. (2020). Distance education in higher education in the COVID-19 pandemic process: A case of Isparta Applied Sciences University. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science (IJTES)*, 4(4), 343-351.
- Ispınar, D. (2005). A Study on Teachers' Awareness of Teaching English to Young Learners. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Cukurova University.
- Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a Definition of Mixed Methods Research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2), 112–133.
- Karamanoğlu, Ş. Ş. (2005). Almanca öğretmen adaylarında yabancı dil öğrenme stratejileri kullanımı. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Uludağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

- Kineş, M. (2018). The Correlation between EFL High School Students' Language Learning Strategies and Their Self-Efficacy Beliefs about English. Unpublished MA Thesis.
- Liu, J. (2010). Language learning strategies and its training model. *Int. Educ. Stud.* 3, 100–104.
- Maria Platsidou, Z. K. (2014). The Role of Attitudes and Learning Strategy Use in Predicting Perceived Competence in School-Aged Foreign Language Learners . *Journal of Language and Literature* , 253-260.
- Matthew Peacock, B. H. (2003). Student Language Learning Strategies across Eight Disciplines . *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* , 179.
- Mehmet Ali Pınar, G. D. (2020). The Opinions of Secondary School Students About Giving Science Courses with Distance Education During the Covid-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Current Researches on Social Sciences* , 461-486.
- Melody W. Alexander, A. D. (2012). Expected Advantages and Disadvantages of Online Learning: Perceptions from College Students Who Have not Taken Online Courses. *Issues ,n Information Systems* , 193-200.
- Moon, J. (2005). Teaching English to Young Learners: the challenges and the benefits., (s. 30-34). Lisbon.
- Muhammad Adnan, K. A. (2020). Online Learning amid the Covid-19 pandemic: Students' Perspectives . *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology* , 48.
- Muhittin Çalışkan, A. M. (2011). The Effects of Learning Strategies Instruction on Metacognitive Knowledge, Using Metacognitive Skills and Academic Achievement (Primary Education Sixth Grade Turkish Course Sample). *Educational Sciences: Theoru & Practice* , 148-153.
- Muñoz, C., Cadierno, T. & Casas, I. (2018) Different starting points for early foreign language learning: A comparative study with Danish and Spanish young learners of English. *Language Learning* 68(4), 1076-1109.
- Mustafa Tevfik Hebebcı, Y. B. (2020). Investigation of Views of Students and Teachers on Distance Education Practices during the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science*, 267-282.

- Nhem, D. (2019). Language Learning Strategies: A Comparative Study of Young and Adolescent Cambodian Learners. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 34-45.
- Nicolas Dietrich, *. K. (2020). Attempts, Successes, and Failures of Distance Learning in the Time of Covid-19 . *Journal of Chemical Education* , 2448-2457.
- Nina Bergdahl, J. N. (2020). Covid-19 and Crisis-Prompted Distance Education in Sweden . *Technology, Knowledge and Learning* . doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-020-09470-6>
- O'Malley, J. M. and Chamot, A. U. 1990. Learning strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. 1989. Use of language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. *System*. Vol.11. pp. 235–241.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Strategies for learning a second or foreign language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Özkara, B. (2019, June). Investigating the Language Learning Strategies EMI Students Use to Overcome Language Barriers and Challenges They Face. Unpublished MA Thesis.
- Park, G.-P. (1997). Language Learning Strategies and Proficiency in Korean University Students . *Foreign Language Annals* , 211-221.
- Ray Chesterfield, K. B. (2016). Natural Order in Childrens' Use of Second Language Learning Strategies . *Applied Linguistics* (1), 46-58.
- Razı, S. (2012). Turkish Efl Learners' Language Learning Strategy Employment at University Level. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*.
- Robinson, O. C. (2014). Sampling in interview-based qualitative research: A theoretical and practical guide. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 11(1), 25-41.
- Sari, T., Nayir, F. (2020). Challenges in Distance Education During the (Covid-19) Pandemic Period. *Qualitative Research in Education*, 9(3), 328-360.

- Solak E. & R. Cakır (2015). Language Learning Strategies of E-learners in Turkey . *E-learning and Digital Media* , 107-120.
- Srivastava, D. P. (2018). Advantages & Disadvantages of E-Education & E-Learning. *Journal of Retail Marketing & Distribution Management* , 22-27.
- Unal, D. Ayırır, I. & Arıogul, S. (2011) The use of foreign language learning strategies by university students learning English, German and French. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education* 41: 473–484.
- Uztosun, M. S. (2014). The Impcat of Language Learnin Experience on Language Learner Strategy Use in Turkish Efl Context. *International Journal of New Trends in Education and Their Implications*(5), 157.
- Wu, Y.-L. (2008). Language Learning Strategies Used by Students at Different Proficiency Levels. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly* , 75-95.
- Zhang, X. & Cui, G. ((2010). Learning beliefs of distance foreign language learners in China: a survey study. *Science Direct*, 30-40.
- Yeşilyurt, E. (2013). An analysis of teacher candidates' usage level of metacognitive learning strategies: Sample of a university in Turkey. *Educational Research Reviews*.
- Yılmaz, C. (2010). The relationship between language learning strategies, gender, proficiency and self-efficacy beliefs: a study of ELT learners in Turkey. *Science Direct* , 682-687.



Appendices

Appendix A

Children's Inventory for Language Learning Strategies

Dear students,

We would like to learn what do you do to study your English lessons and what other things you do to improve your English. This inventory will help us to be more beneficial for you and for your English skills. It is very important to us how you learn English, thus, we will be looking at your responses to the following statements. If you do the behaviours mark "Yes", if you do them from time to time mark "Sometimes" and if you do not do it mark "No" with an "X". Please make you respond to all items. Thank you for your cooperation.

Feyza Havva MANDIRALI

Age:

Gender: M/F

Do you take any supportive course? No Yes

How many siblings do you have? None 1 2 More than 3

Part A			
1. I try to speak in English with my teacher, friends and parents.	Yes	Sometimes	No
2. In an activity I work with a peer, I share my notes and/or ask her/him the points I don't understand.	Yes	Sometimes	No
3. After writing or saying something in English I ask my teacher, friend, or someone who is knowledgeable to correct my errors.	Yes	Sometimes	No
4. I use a new vocabulary in sentence to pronounce it correctly.	Yes	Sometimes	No
5. Before I say something in English I check my book, notebook, etc. to see what we learned about the topic.	Yes	Sometimes	No
6. I test myself to improve my English.	Yes	Sometimes	No
7. I revise the lesson, the notes I take at school, my old books and notebooks, unknown or newly learnt vocabulary by reading or writing.	Yes	Sometimes	No
8. I practice with my parents or someone else before speaking activities.	Yes	Sometimes	No
9. I study my errors after speaking activities.	Yes	Sometimes	No
10. When I think that I cannot learn I tell my parents	Yes	Sometimes	No

I need help. Ex: Taking private lessons.			
Part B			
11. I read the books I read before to improve my English.	Yes	Sometimes	No
12. I use the words I learnt recently when speaking with tourists and native speakers to pronounce them correctly.	Yes	Sometimes	No
13. I like to use English in fun ways. For example; I try to make jokes in English.	Yes	Sometimes	No
14. To improve my English I work with supporting materials such as books, CDs that teach English.	Yes	Sometimes	No
15. I do tests to improve my English.	Yes	Sometimes	No
16. While reading I try to guess the unknown structure by comparing it with the one that I know.	Yes	Sometimes	No
17. Before I write or listen in English I read about that topic, revise the unit, read a similar paragraph, try to find an example, prepare a draft or make sentences with the topic.	Yes	Sometimes	No
18. While speaking I coin words that might have a similar meaning instead of the one that I do not know.	Yes	Sometimes	No
Part C			
19. I try to keep the words in my mind by associating their pronunciation. For example, snake and sinek (a fly).	Yes	Sometimes	No
20. I take notes of unknown words, my peers questions and/or things that I remember after drama activities.	Yes	Sometimes	No
21. I use gestures when I have trouble in explaining meanings of things in English.	Yes	Sometimes	No
22. While writing or speaking I draw the picture of an unknown word.	Yes	Sometimes	No
23. While speaking if I do not know the meaning of a word I say its Turkish and keep on talking..	Yes	Sometimes	No
24. I repeatedly write the new word to be able to say it correctly.	Yes	Sometimes	No
25. While writing or reading I benefit from cognates to facilitate my writing and reading comprehension. For example; radio, television, leopard, chimpanzee.	Yes	Sometimes	No
Part D			
26. To facilitate my reading and listening comprehension, writing and speaking I use dictionaries, my course book, notebook or language teaching CDs.	Yes	Sometimes	No

27. I remember a word by thinking its location on a page.	Yes	Sometimes	No
28. I read or listen to an English text again after reading or listening to it once.	Yes	Sometimes	No
29. Before writing something I identify the words and structures from my book and notebook.	Yes	Sometimes	No
30. I revise the new information with regular intervals.	Yes	Sometimes	No



Appendix B

Sevgili öğrenciler,

İngilizce derslerinizi çalışmak için neler yaptığınızı ve İngilizcenizi geliştirmek için başka neler yaptığınızı öğrenmek istiyoruz. Bu envanter, sizin ve İngilizce becerileriniz için daha faydalı olmamıza yardımcı olacaktır. İngilizceyi nasıl öğrendiğiniz bizim için çok önemli, bu nedenle aşağıdaki ifadelere verdiğiniz yanıtları inceleyeceğiz. Davranışları yapıyorsanız “Evet”i, zaman zaman yapıyorsanız “Bazen”i, yapmıyorsanız “Hayır”ı “X” ile işaretleyiniz. Lütfen tüm maddelere yanıt vermenizi rica ederiz. İş birliğiniz için teşekkürler.

Feyza Havva MANDIRALI

Yaş: 8 9 10

Cinsiyet: E/K

İngilizce kursu alıyor musunuz ? Hayır Evet

Kaç kardeşe sahipsiniz ? 0 1 2 3 3+

Bölüm A			
1. Öğretmenim, arkadaşlarım ve ailemle İngilizce konuşmaya çalışırım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
2. Bir akranla çalıştığım bir aktivitede notlarımı paylaşıyorum ve / veya ona anlamadığım noktaları sorarım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
3. İngilizce bir şeyler yazdıktan veya söyledikten sonra öğretmenime, arkadaşıma veya hatalarımı düzeltebilecek birine sorarım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
4. Doğru telaffuz etmek için cümle içinde yeni bir kelime kullanırım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
5. İngilizce bir şey söylemeden önce konu hakkında ne öğrendiğimizi görmek için kitabıma, defterime vb. bakarım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
6. İngilizcemi geliştirmek için kendimi test ederim.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
7. Dersi, okulda aldığım notları, eski kitaplarımı ve defterlerimi, bilinmeyen veya yeni öğrendiğim kelimeleri okuyarak veya yazarak gözden geçiririm.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
8. Konuşma aktivitelerinden önce ailemle veya başka biriyle pratik yaparım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
9. Konuşma aktivitelerinden sonra hatalarımı çalışırım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
10. Öğrenemediğimi düşündüğümde aileme yardıma ihtiyacım olduğunu söylerim. Ör: Özel ders almak	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
Bölüm B			
11. İngilizcemi geliştirmek için daha önce okuduğum kitapları okurum.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
12. Turistler ve anadili İngilizce olan kişilerle konuşurken son öğrendiğim kelimeleri doğru telaffuz etmek için kullanırım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
13. İngilizceyi eğlenceli şekillerde kullanmayı severim. Örneğin; İngilizce şakalar yapmaya çalışırım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
14. İngilizcemi geliştirmek için İngilizce öğreten kitaplar, CD'ler gibi destekleyici materyallerle çalışırım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
15. İngilizcemi geliştirmek için testler yaparım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
16. Okurken bilinmeyen yapıyı bildiğim yapı ile karşılaştırarak tahmin etmeye çalışırım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
17. İngilizce yazmadan veya dinlemeden önce o konuyu okurum, üniteyi gözden geçiririm, benzer bir paragraf okurum, bir örnek bulmaya çalışırım, bir taslak hazırlarım veya konuyla ilgili cümleler kurarım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
18. Konuşurken, bilmediğim kelimeler yerine benzer anlamı olabilecek kelimeleri bulurum.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır

Bölüm C			
19. Kelimeleri telaffuzlarını ilişkilendirerek aklımda tutmaya çalışırım. Örneğin snake ve sinek (fly).	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
20. Bilinmeyen kelimeleri, akranlarımla sorularını ve / veya drama etkinliklerinden sonra hatırladığım şeyleri not alırım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
21. İngilizce şeylerin anlamlarını açıklamada sorun yaşadığımda jestler kullanırım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
22. Yazarken veya konuşurken bilinmeyen bir kelimenin resmini çizerim.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
23. Konuşurken bir kelimenin anlamını bilmiyorsa Türkçesini söyler ve konuşmaya devam ederim.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
24. Doğru söyleyebilmek için yeni kelimeyi defalarca yazarım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
25. Yazarken veya okurken, yazma ve okuduğumu anlamamı kolaylaştırmak için benzer sözcüklerden yararlanırım. Örneğin; radio (radyo), television (televizyon), leopard (leopar), chimpanzee (şempanze).	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
Bölüm D			
26. Okuduğum ve dinlediğimi anlamamı, yazmamı ve konuşmamı kolaylaştırmak için sözlükler, ders kitabım, defterim veya dil öğretim CD'leri kullanırım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
27. Bir kelimeyi bir sayfadaki yerini düşünerek hatırlarım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
28. İngilizce bir metni bir kez okuduktan veya dinledikten sonra tekrar okur veya dinlerim.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
29. Bir şey yazmadan önce kitabımdan ve defterimden kelimeleri ve yapıları tanımlarım.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır
30. Yeni bilgileri düzenli aralıklarla gözden geçiririm.	Evet	Bazen	Hayır

Appendix C

Interview Questions

1. What are the things you do to improve your English?
2. Are there any reasons that make you feel unsuccessful in learning English?
 - a. If yes, what are they?
3. What do you do to improve your English?
4. What are the obstacles that make you unable to do the things related to English?



Sayın Veli:

Çocuğunuzun katılacağı bu çalışma “İlkokul Dördüncü Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Dil Öğrenme Stratejilerinin Belirlenmesi (Pandemi Dönemi)” adıyla 01/11/2020 ve 30/05/2021 tarihleri arasında yapılacak bir araştırma uygulamasıdır.

Araştırmanın Hedefi: 4. Sınıf öğrencilerinin dil öğrenme stratejilerini belirlemek

Araştırma Uygulaması: Anket ve görüşme şeklindedir.

Araştırma T.C. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nın ve okul yönetiminin de izni ile Gerçekleşmektedir. Araştırma uygulamasına katılım tamamıyla gönüllülük esasına dayalı olmaktadır. Çocuğunuz çalışmaya katılıp katılmamakta özgürdür. Araştırma çocuğunuz için herhangi bir istenmeyen etki ya da risk taşımamaktadır. Çocuğunuzun katılımı **tamamen sizin isteğinize bağlıdır**, reddedebilir ya da herhangi bir aşamasında ayrılabilirsiniz. Araştırmaya katılmama veya araştırmadan ayrılma durumunda öğrencilerin akademik başarıları, okul ve öğretmenleriyle olan ilişkileri etkilemeyecektir.

Çalışmada öğrencilerden kimlik belirleyici hiçbir bilgi istenmemektedir. Cevaplar tamamıyla gizli tutulacak ve sadece araştırmacı tarafından değerlendirilecektir.

Uygulamalar, genel olarak kişisel rahatsızlık verecek sorular ve durumlar içermemektedir. Ancak, katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden çocuğunuz kendisini rahatsız hissederse cevaplama işini yarıda bırakıp çıkmakta özgürdür. Bu durumda rahatsızlığın giderilmesi için gereken yardım sağlanacaktır. Çocuğunuz çalışmaya katıldıktan sonra istediği an vazgeçebilir. Böyle bir durumda veri toplama aracını uygulayan kişiye, çalışmayı tamamlamayacağını söylemesi yeterli olacaktır. Anket çalışmasına katılmamak ya da katıldıktan sonra vazgeçmek çocuğunuza hiçbir sorumluluk getirmeyecektir.

Onay vermeden önce sormak istediğiniz herhangi bir konu varsa sormaktan çekinmeyiniz. Çalışma bittikten sonra bizlere e-posta ile ulaşarak soru sorabilir, sonuçlar hakkında bilgi isteyebilirsiniz. Saygılarımızla,

Araştırmacı: Feyza Havva MANDIRALI

Velisi bulunduğum sınıfı numaralı öğrencisi
.....'nin yukarıda açıklanan araştırmaya katılmasına izin veriyorum.
(Lütfen formu imzaladıktan sonra çocuğunuzla okula geri gönderiniz *).

.../.../.....

İsim-Soyisim-İmza:

Veli Adı-Soyadı:

Telefon Numarası:



CURRICULUM VITAE

EDUCATION

2014-2016 Bursa Uludağ University, Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching

2012-2014 Çanakkale 18 Mart University, Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching

2008-2012 Bursa Anadolu Kız High School

2017- Bursa Uludağ University, Institute of Education Sciences, MA in English Language Teaching

WORK EXPERIENCE

18/04/2019 Kocaeli Dilovası Solventaş Primary School

