REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ISTANBUL SABAHATTIN ZAIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE EDUCATION INSTITUTE
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

INVESTIGATING ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL STUDENTS' LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGY USE AND ACHIEVEMENT SCORES

MA THESIS

İlker TEK

Istanbul
February – 2021

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ISTANBUL SABAHATTIN ZAIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE EDUCATION INSTITUTE
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

INVESTIGATING ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL STUDENTS' LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGY USE AND ACHIEVEMENT SCORES

MA THESIS

İlker TEK

Supervisor
Asst. Prof. Dr. Hidayet SARANDİ

Istanbul
February - 2021

TEZ ONAYI

Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Müdürlüğüne,

Bu çalışma, jürimiz tarafından Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalında YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Danışman	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Hidayet SARANDİ	……
Üye	Doç. Dr. Emrah GÖRGÜLÜ	……
Üye	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Mehdi SOLHİ	……

Onay

Yukarıdaki imzaların, adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylarım.

……

Prof. Dr. Ali GÜNEŞ

Enstitü Müdürü

DECLARATION OF SCIENTIFIC ETHICS AND ORIGINALITY

This is to certify that this MA thesis titled "**Investigating English Preparatory School Students' Language Learning Strategy Use and Achievement Scores**" is my own work and I have acted according to scientific ethics and academic rules while producing it. I have collected and used all information and data according to scientific ethics and guidelines on thesis writing of Sabahattin Zaim University. I have fully referenced, in both the text and bibliography, all direct and indirect quotations and all sources I have used in this work.

İlker TEK

February 2021

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Hidayet Sarandi, for his sustained support, encouragement, and constructive suggestions. No matter what time zone or country he was in, he offered invaluable guidance during the writing of this thesis.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to the other committee members, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emrah Görgülü and Asst. Prof. Dr. Mehdi Solhi, for their valuable feedback and positive energy.

In addition, special thanks go to my dear colleagues, Fikri Geçkinli, Polat Erdoğan, Mehmet Ulus, and my esteemed coordinator, Hasan Ayhan Akbaş, who were always there to help me out both academically and personally.

I also thank the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) for the financial support within the scope of the 2210-A National Scholarship Program for Master's Students.

Last but not least, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my beloved mother, father, and sister for their endless love and support throughout my whole life.

İlker TEK

February 2021

ABSTRACT

INVESTIGATING ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL STUDENTS' LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGY USE AND ACHIEVEMENT SCORES

İlker TEK
MA, Department of English Language Teaching
Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Hidayet SARANDİ
February 2021 – Page 96 + x

This study aimed to identify what language learning strategies (LLS) English preparatory school students employ as well as focusing on the relationship between strategy use and academic achievement. Three hundred and fifty-four students who were studying English at three different proficiency levels at a foundation university participated in the study. The data were collected through the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (Oxford, 1990), end-of-module final grades and semi-structured interviews. SPSS Statistics and thematic analysis were performed to answer the research questions. The statistical findings revealed that the participants make use of overall LLS at medium level showing a tendency to employ social and metacognitive strategies most frequently and affective strategies least frequently. Also, the high achievers seem to use significantly more strategies than the low achievers. The findings obtained from the interviews also supported this judgment since the interviewees with higher scores reported employing a wide range of LLS. Regarding the strategy use across proficiency levels, the upper intermediate students reported employing cognitive and compensation strategies significantly more frequently than the elementary students. Furthermore, the elementary students reported using social strategies significantly less often than their intermediate and upper intermediate counterparts. Lastly, the results indicated the significant superiority of the female over the male regarding the use of memory, cognitive, metacognitive and affective strategies. All in all, the present study reinforces the view that the awareness of LLS among learners must be increased through the incorporation of these strategies in language classes and teaching materials for the sake of successful language learning.
Keywords: language learning strategies, successful language learning, proficiency level

ÖZET

İNGİLİZCE HAZIRLIK OKULU ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN DİL ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİNİ KULLANIMLARI VE BAŞARI PUANLARININ İNCELENMESİ

İlker TEK
YL, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Hidayet SARANDİ
Şubat, 2021 – Sayfa 96 + x

Bu çalışma, İngilizce hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin hangi dil öğrenme stratejilerini (DÖS) kullandıklarını belirlemenin yanı sıra strateji kullanımı ile akademik başarı arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırmaya bir vakıf üniversitesinde 3 farklı yeterlilik düzeyinde İngilizce öğrenen 354 öğrenci katılmıştır. Veriler, Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanteri (DÖSE) (Oxford, 1990), modül sonu final notları ve yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Araştırma sorularını yanıtlamak için SPSS istatistik programı ve tematik analiz kullanılmıştır. İstatistiksel bulgular, katılımcıların genel DÖS'leri orta düzeyde kullandıklarını ortaya koymuştur. Katılımcıların, kategorik bazda sosyal ve üstbilişsel stratejileri en sık, duyuşsal stratejileri ise en az sıklıkla kullandıkları görülmüştür. Daha başarılı öğrencilerin, az başarılı öğrencilere göre önemli ölçüde daha fazla strateji kullandığı görülmektedir. Görüşmelerden elde edilen bulgular da daha başarılı katılımcıların geniş DÖS yelpazesinden faydalandıkları sonucunu desteklemiştir. Strateji kullanımı ile yeterlilik düzeyi arasındaki ilişki ile ilgili olarak, üst orta düzeydeki öğrencilerin bilişsel ve telafi stratejilerini temel düzeydeki öğrencilere göre anlamlı şekilde daha sık kullandıkları ortaya çıkmıştır. Ayrıca, temel düzeydeki öğrencilerin sosyal stratejileri orta ve üst orta düzeydeki öğrencilere göre önemli ölçüde daha az kullandıkları görülmüştür. Son olarak, kadın öğrencilerin bellek, bilişsel, üstbilişsel ve duyuşsal stratejileri erkek öğrencilerden önemli ölçüde daha fazla kullandığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Sonuç olarak, bu çalışma, başarılı bir dil öğrenimi için söz konusu stratejilerin dil derslerine ve öğretim materyallerine dahil edilerek öğrenciler arasında DÖS farkındalığının artırılması gerektiği görüşünü güçlendirmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: dil öğrenme stratejileri, başarılı dil öğrenimi, yeterlilik seviyesi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TEZ ONAYI ..... **i**

DECLARATION OF SCIENTIFIC ETHICS AND ORIGINALITY ..... **ii**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **iii**

ABSTRACT ..... **iv**

ÖZET ..... **v**

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... **vi**

LIST OF TABLES ..... **ix**

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ..... **x**

CHAPTER I **1**

INTRODUCTION **1**

1.1. Background of the Study 1

1.2. Statement of the Problem 3

1.3. Purpose of the Study 3

1.4. Research Questions 4

1.5. Significance of the Study 4

1.6. Structure of the Study 5

CHAPTER II **6**

LITERATURE REVIEW **6**

2.1. Introduction 6

2.1.1. Defining Language Learning Strategies 7

2.1.2. Language Learning Strategies & Learning Styles 13

2.1.3. Importance of Language Learning Strategies 15

2.2. Taxonomies of Language Learning Strategies 17

2.2.1. Rubin's Classification (1987) 18

2.2.2. O'Malley and Chamot's Classification (1990) 20

2.2.3. Oxford's Classification (1990) 22

2.2.4. Stern's Classification (1992) 27
2.3. Variables Influencing the Use of Language Learning Strategies 29
2.3.1. Motivation 30
2.3.2. Age 30
2.3.3. Cultural Background 31
2.3.4. Learning Context 32
2.3.5. Gender 32
2.3.6. Proficiency Level 34
2.4. Language Learning Strategies & Success in the Target Language 37
2.5. Language Learning Strategies Studies Conducted in Turkey 40
CHAPTER III 44
METHODOLOGY 44
3.1. Research Design 44
3.2. Setting and Participants 45
3.3. Data Collection Instruments 46
3.3.1. Demographic Information Form 46
3.3.2. Strategy Inventory for Language Learning 47
3.3.3. End-of-Module Final Grades 48
3.3.4. Interviews 49
3.4. Data Collection Procedure 50
3.5. Data Analysis Procedure 52
CHAPTER IV 54
RESULTS & DISCUSSION 54
4.1. Language Learning Strategy Profile of Participants 54
4.2. Language Learning Strategy Use: Low versus High Achievers 59
4.3. Language Learning Strategy Use and Proficiency Level 65
4.4. Language Learning Strategy Use and Gender 69

CHAPTER V **73**

CONCLUSION **73**

5.1. Overview of the Study 73

5.2. Pedagogical Implications 74

5.3. Limitations of the Study 76

5.4. Suggestions for Further Studies 76

REFERENCES **78**

APPENDICES **89**

APPENDIX-A. Ethics Committee Approval **89**

APPENDIX-B. Strategy Inventory for Language Learning **92**

APPENDIX-C. Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (Turkish Version) **94**

CV **96**

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.3.2.1: The SILL Categories 48

Table 4.1.2: LLS Use of Participants 55

Table 4.2.3: LLS Use and Success in Learning English 60

Table 4.3.4: LLS Use across Proficiency Levels 66

Table 4.3.5: Comparison of the Means across Proficiency Levels 67

Table 4.4.6: LLS Use and Gender 70

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CEFR	: Common European Framework of Reference for Languages
EFL	: English as a Foreign Language
ELP	: European Language Portfolio
ELT	: English Language Teaching
L2	: Second Language
LLS	: Language Learning Strategies
SILL	: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning
SLA	: Second Language Acquisition
SPSS	: Statistical Package for Social Sciences

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this chapter is to provide preliminary information about the present study. It first touches on the background of the study. Following the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study and research questions are presented. After that, the chapter explains why the present study is significant. Finally, it mentions what is included in the following chapters.

1.1. Background of the Study

It is a crystal-clear fact that communication, regardless of its form, is an irreplaceable part of human life, irrespective of age, culture or personality. In this regard, language has been the major tool for individuals to interact with each other both verbally and in writing as well as gestures throughout the history of humankind. Since the developments leading to globalization began, rapidly accelerating human mobility and interaction around the world has necessitated people learning a bridge language. English has taken this role in the last century. Accordingly, this requirement has boosted demand for effective foreign language learning.

In an attempt to assist language learners to go through this challenging process smoothly, a number of viewpoints on second/foreign language learning/acquisition have been put forward at different times. The early attempts attached importance to rote-learning, rehearsal of grammatical patterns and unfamiliar vocabulary so that learners could develop and sustain new language habits. In other words, the time spent on the target language under the guidance of an authority was regarded as the major contribution to learning success (Moeller and Catalano, 2015: 327). With some groundbreaking research on unique productivity of children in their mother tongue underestimating imitation as the only source (e.g., Chomsky, 1959), researchers began to focus on how second/foreign language learners experience and deal with learning process (Myles, 2010: 320). All in all, while the earlier teacher-centered teaching practice considered language learners as collective recipients of knowledge, the recent student-centered ones have underscored the importance of individual differences and

what each language learner brings to the process of language learning (Richards and Rodgers, 2014).

Regarding individual learner differences, strategy use has been considered one of the components that is strongly associated with language achievement (Pawlak, 2012: xx). Attempts to investigate what makes a good language learner (Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975) initiated extensive research into language learning strategies (LLS). Oxford (1990: 8) described these strategies as "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, and more transferrable to new situations". Researchers have aimed to identify and classify LLS; reveal how frequently and successfully learners employ them; find out how different variables such as proficiency level, age and gender influence the effective use of these strategies; and discover whether LLS instruction makes a positive difference in learners' performance (Hardan, 2013: 1718). All in all, language learning strategies have been highlighted by many researchers as they can contribute to the learning process considerably in various ways such as assisting learners in coping with learning difficulties and increasing learner autonomy.

In an attempt to summarize what is known about strategies in the field of foreign/ second language learning, Gu (2012: 319) came up with four points. First, it is to learners' benefit to use as many strategies as possible since this results in a better language performance. Secondly, when strategy use is examined in detail, it turns out that the desired outcomes depend on how LLS are employed rather than whether they are employed. Thirdly, learners had better pay attention to the orchestration of the strategies they are utilizing in order to make the most of them. Lastly, the learner profile, task requirements and context play a key role in the selection and effective use of LLS.

Numerous definitions and taxonomies along with the criticism over the "conceptual ambiguity" (Dörnyei and Skehan, 2003: 610) have reflected the complicated nature of language learning strategies. Describing the nature of LLS, the quote below also shows that the answer to the question of what strategies learners need to employ varies a lot and is highly situational.

> *A holistic view suggests the need for an eclectic theory of language learning strategies which views the learner as a complex, dynamic, cognitively active,*

contextualized, goal-oriented individual who operates within a social environment, and whose learning is mediated by interaction with various others according to his or her own individual needs and characteristics. And all of these various factors influence the strategies that learners are willing or able to choose (Griffiths, 2018: 123).

1.2. Statement of the Problem

A large number of university students in Turkey spend almost one year at English preparatory schools either voluntarily or mandatorily in order to have a good command of English and commence their departmental programs. Instructors use the same materials and follow similar teaching methods that are encouraged by the school authorities. A group of students go through this process smoothly by taking responsibilities for their learning and devoting greater efforts to both class and extracurricular activities. On the other hand, the others encounter numerous difficulties such as feeling anxious when speaking English and the inability to store and retrieve new knowledge. As a consequence, the former group achieve the desired outcomes while the learning process ends up in failure for the latter group. Ehrman, Leaver and Oxford (2003: 313) consider learning strategies as one of the three major individual differences in language learning. With these observations and the remark in mind, the present study aimed to find out if the existing differences between students' success in learning English are mediated by their language learning strategy use.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The present study aimed to identify what LLS English preparatory school students at a foundation university employ as well as focusing on the relationship between strategy use and academic achievement. Furthermore, it examined whether the participants' strategy use differs depending on the proficiency level and gender.

1.4. Research Questions

In accordance with the purpose of the present study, the following research questions are addressed:

1. What language learning strategies do EFL learners report using?
2. Is there any difference between low and high achievers' use of language learning strategies?
3. Does EFL learners' use of language learning strategies differ depending on their proficiency levels?
4. Does EFL learners' use of language learning strategies differ depending on their genders?

It is important to note that the data collection instruments in the current study did not allow the researcher to examine what LLS the participants actually use. Instead, the findings are only based on the statements made by the participants. In this regard, it is assumed that the participants were honest reporting their use of LLS.

1.5. Significance of the Study

The present study is considered significant in the sense that it provides illuminating insights into the language learning strategy use of EFL learners at university level in Turkey. To be more precise, it reveals the strategy preferences among the participants, and compares more successful and less successful students in terms of their LLS use. Furthermore, the study attempts to explore the LLS use across different proficiency levels as well as genders. In this regard, the findings are very likely to contribute to the progress towards the widespread recognition of the importance of LLS, thus promoting the integration of strategies into coursebooks and teacher education programs (Griffiths, 2015: 432). Based on the results, language instructors, particularly those who are working in a similar context, could have an opinion about the strengths and weaknesses that their students possibly have in the process of language learning. Therefore, it provides them with an opportunity to modify their teaching methods appropriately. This awareness might ultimately lead to more fruitful learning experiences. It could be also beneficial for learners to become aware of their

strengths and weaknesses in terms of LLS prior to strategy instruction. The findings of the present study can serve this purpose. In other words, it helps pinpoint the strategies that are underdeveloped among less successful language learners so that they could be subjected to appropriate instruction afterwards.

1.6. Structure of the Study

In the present study, Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature by presenting broadly accepted definitions of LLS and taxonomies. Differentiating between styles and strategies, it also includes common factors which influence LLS use, and sheds light on the relationship between LLS use and success. Chapter 3 presents the methodological procedures for the present study including the research design, setting, participants, data collection procedure with the tools used and data analysis. Chapter 4 provides the findings of the present study and the discussion of these findings. Chapter 5 includes the conclusion including an overview of the study, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study and a number of suggestions for further studies in the field.

CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The main purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of the literature about language learning strategies (LLS) behind the current research. Firstly, the chapter forms the basis referring to general background and broadly accepted definitions of LLS, their comparison with learning styles and the role they play in language learning. Then, the chapter introduces an overview of the taxonomies designed by the prominent researchers in the field of language education (e.g. Rubin (1987), O'Malley and Chamot (1990), Oxford (1990), and Stern (1992). After that, common factors which affect language learners in terms of the use of strategies are discussed. These variables are followed by the insights into the relationship between LLS and academic achievement in the target language. Finally, a number of case studies around the world and Turkey are highlighted in line with the goals of the present study.

2.1. Introduction

The process of language learning varies considerably depending on learners. While a certain group go through this period smoothly, the others are most likely to experience a series of learning difficulties at different levels. This wide diversity has been one of the major starting points for research in the field of language learning and teaching. For almost five decades, a considerable number of researchers have focused on various aspects of the issue with the growing trend towards student-centered learning. Accordingly, a number of factors such as age, language aptitude, motivation, language anxiety, learning styles and strategies have been highlighted in relation to language learning (Ellis, 2015).

Forming the core of this study, language learning strategies have been investigated from different perspectives based on the crucial role they play in improving one's language skills. Hismanoglu (2000) stated that all language learners follow a set of strategies consciously or unconsciously when they engage in class activities. Taking this fact into consideration, researchers and language teachers have paid specific attention to the identification of the strategies (through observations, interviews etc.),

classification of strategies, determinants of strategy use and possible ways of language learning strategy instruction (Chamot, 2004). As a result of becoming the focal point, numerous attempts have been made in order to define language learning strategies, including certain similarities and variances. In his book "The Study of Second Language Acquisition", Ellis (1994) pointed out that research on learning strategies has great potential for language education and for justifying individual differences in second language learning. Since there has been a close tie between learning strategies and LLS during the course of their development, it is of critical importance that both concepts are presented in tandem.

2.1.1. Defining Language Learning Strategies

MacIntyre (1994) stated that "one of the most fertile areas of research in language learning in recent years is the topic of language learning strategies". Accordingly, a considerable number of scholars have offered definitions from their own perspectives while dealing with this concept. Despite a large amount of research into the subject, there is not much agreement among researchers on how to define strategies. Wenden (1987: 7) characterized the nature of the concept as "elusive". Similarly, Ellis (1994: 533) claimed that the definitions display a tendency to be "ad hoc and atheoretical" while strategy as a notion looks "somewhat fuzzy and not easy to tie down" (Ibid: 529). Macaro (2001) and Dörnyei and Skehan (2003) also laid emphasis on the inconsistency in the literature which complicates thorough understanding of the issue universally. Some scholars use terms such as learning behaviors (Politzer and McGroarty, 1985), tactics (Seliger, 1984) and techniques (Stern, 1992) interchangeably with strategies to mean the same concept. This current situation makes it necessary to provide a comprehensive overview of prominent attempts in the field.

As one of the key figures in this area thanks to her preliminary investigation into the characteristics of good language learners, Rubin (1975: 43) widely defined learning strategies as "the techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge". Besides contributing to the foundation of fruitful language learner strategies, Rubin specifies that these actions are likely to show dramatic variations depending on the exercise, learning phase, age, personal characteristics and situation.

In an attempt to reveal effective language learning strategies, she shares seven observations on the ways successful students go through learning process. Paving the way for future strategy taxonomies, these findings are presented below.

- The good language learners feel at ease even when they feel somewhat uncertain about incoming written and spoken message. The reason is that they are able to make accurate predictions by means of various clues such as from familiar vocabulary or body language.
- Because of their strong desire to maintain effective communication in the target language, they give their best to convey what they intend to say to an interlocutor in different ways such as using gestures or cognates.
- Such learners are considered to be courageous enough to make mistakes even if they risk their personal charisma for the sake of reasonable interaction.
- They seek for patterns, forms or schemes to facilitate the internalization of new information.
- The good language learners are insistent practitioners of target language regardless of time or context. A typical feature of extrovert characters, this persistence assists them to stand out among others.
- These learners often track their own speech checking how 'quality' their performance is and whether the intended message is transmitted successfully.
- Lastly, they are aware that meaning is as crucial as grammar for comprehension. For this reason, such learners pay special attention to context, participants' profile or rules of effective speaking (Ibid: 45-48).

Tarone (1981) drew a distinction among three types of strategies. First, she portrays communication strategies as efforts to establish a meaningful connection between the linguistic knowledge of both the second language learner and the other person being addressed in the target language during the conversation (e.g., making use of body language to make up for a vocabulary item). Secondly, production strategies refer to the ways a language learner employs his/her linguistic background eloquently and economically (e.g., planning a speech in advance). Tarone states that what makes the second type different from the first is its neglect of attention to the agreement of both sides in the dialogue. Lastly, she defines learning strategies as "attempts to develop linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the target language- to incorporate these into one's interlanguage competence" (Ibid: 290). The driving force behind the third

type is considered to be improving the target language skills rather than conveying one's ideas in an understandable manner.

Stern (1983: 405) underlined a slight difference between the two commonly used terms in the field. From his perspective, learning strategies are regarded as "general tendencies or overall characteristics of the approach employed by the language learner" while learning techniques are related to "particular forms of observable learning behavior, more or less consciously employed by the learner". The ways to achieve certain features of learning process such as making use of a dictionary are viewed under the umbrella of techniques whereas the efforts to overcome motivational problems of language learning serve as an example of strategies. Bialystok (1983), on the other hand, found language learning strategies connected with the tasks that guide learners in the development of their competence in the target language. Weinstein and Mayer (1986) added a new dimension to the concept taking a cognitive process into consideration. From their point of view, learning strategies are learners' thoughts in company with their actions that aim at assisting the encoding process. Furthermore, the purpose of deploying such strategies is to strengthen the willpower that learners possess and back up the manner they deal with the new information.

Rubin (1987: 19) represented learning strategies as "any set of operations, steps, plans, routines used by the learner to facilitate the obtaining, storage, retrieval, and use of information". From the point of language learning, strategies play a key role in shaping the learner's progress.

Playing one of the leading roles in the development of LLS, Oxford (1989b) suggested that strategies in question are behaviors or actions performed by learners to experience more successful, autonomous and pleasant language learning process. According to Oxford, the definition of learning strategies asserted by Rubin (1987) is beneficial enough to gain insights about the concept but does not reflect its vast nature. Accordingly, Oxford (1990: 8) broadened its scope by remarking that "learning strategies are specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, and more transferrable to new situations". Oxford also mentioned their salient characteristics as follows: Language learning strategies

- contribute to the main goal, communicative competence.
- allow learners to become more self-directed.

- expand the role of teachers.
- are problem oriented.
- are specific actions taken by the learner.
- involve many aspects of the learner, not just the cognitive.
- support learning both directly and indirectly.
- are not always observable.
- are often conscious.
- can be taught.
- are flexible.
- are influenced by a variety of factors. (Ibid: 9)

Another definition that brings the cognitive process to the fore was offered by O'Malley and Chamot (1990). They identified strategies as particular thoughts or actions that learners exploit in an effort to have a good grasp of new information. In concordance with the previous attempts, Ellis (1997) pointed out that learning strategies are specific approaches or techniques deployed by students for the purpose of learning a second language. These strategies can be observed from actions or connected with the mind, usually stemming from difficulties in language learning. In addition, learners are often conscious enough to disclose how they acquire new information.

The trend towards naming LLS from relatively different angles continues in the second millennium. Citing Cohen (1998), Gao (2003: 41) stated that "learner strategies are steps or actions selected by learners either to improve the learning of a second language, or their use of it, or both". Reviewing the current issues relating to the teaching of the strategies, Chamot (2005) called the attention to target oriented operations that learners make use of to tackle challenging language activities. She also emphasizes that learning strategies are likely to differ depending on the learning context and students' choices of internal processing.

In an attempt to address the need for an operational definition, Griffiths (2008: 85-87) first gathered definitional focal points together under six headlines:

- Activity: LLS are both physical and mental behaviors. This feature also explains the difference between learning strategies and styles.

- Consciousness is considered by the majority as a key feature of LLS, and it cannot be excluded based on the automatic usage of the strategies.
- Choice: LLS are chosen by learners and depend on various factors such as the context and individual differences.
- Goal-orientation: The aim is to learn language.
- Regulation: LLS are deployed by learners to regulate or control their own learning.
- Learning focus: The goal is to facilitate learning.

Based on the list of essential features, Griffiths (Ibid: 87) came up with a new definition by characterizing LLS as "activities consciously chosen by learners for the purpose of regulating their own language learning". She claimed that this version makes it possible for researchers to conduct investigations into the concept while establishing its boundaries in order to clear up any misunderstandings between LLS and related terms (e.g., learning styles or communication strategies).

Another concept closely related to language learning strategies is self-regulation (Rose, 2012). Zimmerman (2000: 14) suggested that the term refers to "self-generated thoughts, feelings, and actions that are planned and cyclically adapted to the attainment of personal goals". Taking this concept into consideration, Oxford (2011) designed a model called Strategic Self-Regulation and describes self-regulated learning strategies as intentional, target oriented endeavors to operate struggles to master a language. In order to identify the characteristics of Self-regulated learning strategies, Oxford holds that these strategies:

- are implemented on purpose, embracing four points (awareness, attention, intention and effort, Schmidt, 1995, as cited in Oxford, 2011).
- make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, and more effective.
- are demonstrated through particular tactics depending on the context and goal.
- reflect the whole, multidimensional learner.
- interact with one another during their implementation.
- are not single-use, rather transferrable to related situations. (Ibid: 15)

Cohen (2014: 7) stated that language learner strategies are "thoughts and actions, consciously chosen and operationalized by language learners, to assist them in carrying out a multiplicity of tasks from the very onset of learning to the most advanced levels

of target-language performance". He qualified the factor of choice as fundamental for a strategy on the condition that the student is conscious of his/her acts at least to some degree. Cohen also argued that another way to describe LLS is to differentiate them from language use strategies which are typically employed to use the language knowledge that a learner has mastered.

Recently, Oxford (2017) gathered the strategy definitions in the literature to analyze their constituents. Developing eight master themes as a result of the data analysis, Oxford (Ibid: 48) propounded an elaborate definition that serves a crucial function in her Strategic-Self Regulation model:

> *L2 learning strategies are complex, dynamic thoughts and actions, selected and used by learners with some degree of consciousness in specific contexts in order to regulate multiple aspects of themselves (such as cognitive, emotional, and social) for the purpose of (a) accomplishing language tasks; (b) improving language performance or use; and/or (c) enhancing long-term proficiency. Strategies are mentally guided but may also have physical and therefore observable manifestations. Learners often use strategies flexibly and creatively; combine them in various ways, such as strategy clusters or strategy chains; and orchestrate them to meet learning needs. Strategies are teachable. Learners in their contexts decide which strategies to use. Appropriateness of strategies depends on multiple personal and contextual factors.*

This updated version of LLS has the potential to be an important milestone since the author sets out to achieve a consensus on the definition and approaches the concept from a couple of novel standpoints such as complexity or dynamism (Tassinari, 2018; Kałdonek-Crnjaković, 2018).

In the hope of providing her final strategy definition, Griffiths reshaped the previous suggestion by removing the elements "consciousness" and "regulation" points and altering the "activity" factor among the focal points. Therefore, Griffiths (2018: 18) presented language learning strategies in the form of "actions chosen by learners for the purpose of learning a language".

As can be seen from the summary of prominent definitions in the literature so far, a considerable number of attempts have contributed to the field, accumulating certain

pillars of LLS on every occasion. During the course of time, learning styles have arisen as a closely related term. They are discussed next.

2.1.2. Language Learning Strategies & Learning Styles

It goes without saying that individuals tend to follow divergent paths in language learning experience. It has become one of the common clichés among learners and teachers to utter the word 'style' to explain why a certain activity works well for some but fails to attract the others. Dunn and Griggs (1988: 3) clarified this situation by defining learning style as "the biologically and developmentally imposed set of characteristics that makes the same teaching wonderful for some and terrible for others". Similarly, Reid (1995), in an attempt to define the concept, emphasized learners' instinctive and usual ways of taking in, analyzing and storing new information.

Willing (1994, cited in Wong and Nunan, 2011) came up with four dominant types of style based on language learners' strategy choices. 'Communicative' style comes out of activities in which individuals interact with native/nonnative speakers in the target language or tend to be exposed to new information through certain channels such as podcasts or movies. 'Analytical' style is related to examining sources such as journals and grammar books individually or dealing with challenges by realizing one's own flaws. 'Authority-oriented' style come to light in the situations where students feel dependent on the source of knowledge (e.g., a teacher or a coursebook). Lastly, 'concrete' style is associated with the learners who go for animations, language games or pair work activities.

During their investigations into the learning style, a number of researchers find it necessary to distinguish between learning styles and strategies while calling attention to the close connection between both. Leaver, Ehrman and Shekhtman (2005: 65) described styles as "habitual patterns of perceiving, processing, or reacting to information" and strategies as "particular actions for the purpose of learning". In addition, they classify learning styles into three groups taking account of language learning. First, 'sensory preferences' are related to the ways we become aware of new information such as visual, auditory and muscle-related procedures. 'Cognitive styles'

are about mental procedures regarding the understanding of study material feature. The last category, ‘personality types’, pertains to individual characteristics such as relying on intuitions or facts. It is also suggested that learning strategies are the observable forms of one’s underlying learning styles. That is, the style plays a key role during learners’ decision-making process as to which strategies to follow. Cohen (2014), based on his experience, also had a similar opinion on the prevalence of these three style preferences among language learners. He added that language learning strategies are inextricably linked with the learning styles that learners opt for.

Wintergerst, DeCapua and Verna (2003) pointed out that learning styles are constituents related to one’s personality whereas strategies are specific strategies to achieve various tasks such as an oral exam. Another noteworthy remark is the flexibility of learning styles in terms of showing variance that is also possible to observe in human characters depending on conditions. Similarly, Oxford (1989a) described them as hereditary, extensive and a mixture of mental, emotional and conduct-related factors. In addition, Oxford (1989b) proposed that an intimate connection comes to light when students’ learning styles and their use of learning strategies are taken into consideration.

Nunan (2015) is of the opinion that individuals tend to choose the language learning methods that appeal to their learning styles. For instance, a kinesthetic learner might prefer expanding his/her vocabulary knowledge by attaching words to related objects while an auditory one may find it more advantageous to learn the same words by hearing them in meaningful contexts. In an attempt to differentiate the concept from strategies, Nunan (ibid.) described styles as intangible, asserting that the only way to observe them is watching for learners’ actions which are associated with the strategies.

It is widely accepted that language learners are able to facilitate the learning process by raising their awareness of learning styles and adopting new strategies oriented to the objectives. One way to achieve this goal is style stretching (Zhou, 2011; Tuan, 2011). The concept requires learners to avoid being strict about their style preferences so that they get used to unfamiliar learning situations. Investigating learners’ perceptions about styles and language test scores, Griffiths and İnceçay (2016) concluded that more successful ones display a tendency to embrace more than one learning style in compliance with the concept in question.

All in all, despite the fact that language learning styles and strategies are interrelated, the styles differ by nature. Having a place in learners' identities, they are of vital importance when it comes to discovering the most efficient way to enhance one's language skills. On the other hand, LLS that are employed based on style preferences have a critical role in coping with learning difficulties and gaining advantage in practice.

2.1.3. Importance of Language Learning Strategies

Foreign or second language learning brings with it certain challenges for each and every learner whether it takes place within a classroom environment or outside. In order to cope with these difficulties, language learners come up with relevant solutions based on the problem. Research into these kinds of attempts has revealed that there is no single set of ways to follow; instead, a large variety of actions exists among learners. Existing studies have reported learners reaping great benefits of language learning strategies. In general terms, language learning strategies boost and ease the learning process significantly (Martínez, 1996).

According to Oxford (1990: 1), providing that LLS are chosen in a way appropriate to certain points such as task requirements, it is very likely for learners to improve their language skills and increase self-confidence. In addition to that, the concept is of particular importance since these strategies are "tools for active, self-directed involvement, which is essential for developing communicative competence". Sharing the same view about the role of LLS in improving that competence, Lessard-Clouston (1997) added that they are effective enough to transform an ordinary language student into a conscious and knowledgeable one.

Hismanoglu (2000) argued that, based on learners' strategy use, teachers could draw some inferences about strengths and weaknesses of their progress in learning. Therefore, language teachers may directly support the ones who experience insurmountable difficulty. To be able to fulfil their needs, language teachers are primarily expected to have general awareness about learning strategies.

In an attempt to shed light on the understanding of the concept in a language classroom, Griffiths (2007) investigated teachers' opinions on the significance of LLS and the

strategies learners often employ. It turned out that the substantial majority of LLS students report using match those teachers perceive as critical. This study is a reliable indicator of how the value given to strategies is growing in language education.

With the intention of reaching a consensus on the role of LLS, Cohen (2014) asked a group of language strategy specialists across the globe for their opinions about LLS' most common functions. Based on the prevailing view, strategies play a vital role in promoting language learning, fulfilling given tasks, overcoming particular difficulties and accelerating learning in a pleasant way.

In this day and age, there is an enormous demand for learning languages through online platforms. More and more educational institutions are integrating Internet-based language classes into their curricula because of certain advantages such as flexibility, accessibility and affordability. This type of environment necessarily requires learners to adapt themselves to new conditions. Lin, Zhang and Zheng (2017) pointed out that online learning achievement is deeply bound up with multiple strategies which enhance the management of learning. They infer from the findings that it is likely for learners to derive pleasure and advance considerably in their studies providing that they follow a wide range of learning strategies.

Almost all language learners tend to use LLS consciously or unconsciously. However, one should note that this process does not always result in success. The effectiveness of such strategies relies on a range of variables including the activity, purpose and personal characteristics; consequently, one had better take these factors into consideration to succeed (Ma and Oxford, 2014). In this regard, language teachers can observe how their students go through complex processes such as metacognitive dimensions of learning by investigating the ways these students employ LLS. These insights allow teachers to step in with specific recommendations and help learners overcome the problems (Chamot, 2005).

Another major benefit of language learning strategies is their substantial contribution to learner autonomy. The outcomes of effective use of these strategies have been associated with certain achievements such as greater learner independence, gaining conscious control over learning experience, coping with possible challenges while studying the target language autonomously (Fedderholdt, 1998; Hsiao and Oxford, 2002; White, 2008). Ehrman, Leaver and Oxford (2003) proposed lifelong learning

and increased degree of self-efficacy as additional perks. They also underlined how deeply learning strategies affect students' success by pointing to a large number of efforts to increase the awareness about the concept through strategy development sessions.

Improving basic language skills by means of learning strategies has been another common goal among language teachers and students. Following his analysis of sixty-seven books on how to learn a language by experienced authors, Takeuchi (2003) concluded that a broad range of LLS exists in their language learning accounts ranging from studying grammar to enhancing speaking skills. Research into the field backs up these judgments by emphasizing the considerable effects of LLS on listening comprehension and note-taking skills (Carrier, 2003); accurate and comprehensive writing (Macaro, 2001); correct pronunciation (Varasarin, 2007) and effective speaking (Ma and Oxford, 2014); efficacious reading (Ghafournia, 2014); expanding vocabulary knowledge (Tılfarlıoğlu and Bozgeyik, 2012; Zhang, Lin, Zhang and Choi, 2016); strong motivation (Nunan, 1997).

2.2. Taxonomies of Language Learning Strategies

The issue of reaching a compromise on the definition of language learning strategies has necessarily resulted in another controversial topic regarding the classifications of the aforementioned concepts. The related literature has been updated constantly as a result of numerous attempts to make up the alleged deficiencies in the previously devised categorizations. While Griffiths and Oxford (2014:3) underlined the slight consensus among the researchers, Chamot (2004:17) claimed that the existence of multiple groupings must be quite normal because each and every learning context requires a different set of strategies, thus making it necessary for the researchers to utilize an appropriate classification that fits the specific environment in which they function. Following a comprehensive review of the literature, four taxonomies (Rubin's, 1987; O'Malley and Chamot's, 1990; Oxford's, 1990; Stern's, 1992) have been considered to be prominent and are elaborated in the following sections.

2.2.1. Rubin's Classification (1987)

As one of the initiators of language learning strategies research with a special focus on what makes language learners 'good', Rubin (1987: 23-27) classified existing LLS into three groups: learning strategies that are comprised of cognitive and metacognitive ones; communication strategies, and social strategies. This classification also represents the first (systems associated with successful language learners) of the five basic systems that were formed by Oxford (1994: 4) from among approximately twenty-five classification systems.

Learning Strategies

Playing a key role in the construction of the language system by the learner, these strategies are considered to shape the process of learning directly. The first type of learning strategies, namely cognitive strategies, are described as actions which are taken in order to cope with possible challenges during learning. Rubin expands on them by providing six prevailing strategies that are likely to facilitate language learning experience.

- Clarification/ verification: Since learners are unfamiliar with the language being studied, they may feel the need to have their linguistic performance confirmed. These strategies serve students by allowing them to keep the new and verified information for the future.
- Guessing/ inductive inferencing: Facing a difficulty with the understanding of the new language items such as words or an interlocutor's intention, learners may find some clues based on their existing knowledge by employing these strategies.
- Deductive reasoning: Learners use this analytical strategy to formulate and reach widely applicable rules in a systematic way for the future use rather than dealing with particular meanings for once.
- Practice: Putting language use with precision in the center, this type of strategies such as mimicry or repetition assist students with storing language items and using them later.
- Memorization: Setting the organization of new items as a main goal, this type bears a close resemblance to the previous one concerning the storage and

retrieval of language. The process of these two concepts becomes the primary focus.

- Monitoring: These strategies allow learners to become aware of linguistic and communicative mistakes, observe the transmission of a message, and then make their own decisions. The process of monitoring is considered to include metacognitive strategies as well because of the decision-making period.

The second type of learning strategies, namely metacognitive ones, serves a function in controlling or organizing language learning. According to Wenden (1982, cited in Rubin, 1987: 23-25), one way of doing that is through choosing what and how to learn, prioritizing immediate needs or first preferences, setting a target, and lastly planning what strategies to use and a plan B for the adjustment of these strategies in case of failure.

Communication Strategies

Unlike learning strategies, communication strategies are not considered to have a major contribution to language learning. The reason why this type exists on the list is that learners might seize a chance to be exposed to diverse use of L2 or put what they have learned into practice since such strategies aid inexperienced language learners to stay connected to the conversation. Therefore, it might lead to numerous learning experiences. Closing the gap between one's knowledge and his/her communicative intention, these strategies could be making simplified sentences or using body language (Rubin, 1987: 26).

Social Strategies

This group of strategies might be considered as the key of a gate that opens to opportunities for practice and exposure to the target language. Social strategies lack a direct contribution to learning as they do not necessarily result in acquisition on their own. Interacting with native speakers or active participation in class can be associated with this type (Ibid: 27).

2.2.2. O'Malley and Chamot's Classification (1990)

In a long-term study with foreign language students from different levels, O'Malley and Chamot (1990) set out to identify learning strategies by means of think-aloud methods. Among the principal objectives is to disclose what kind of cognitive processes participants go through to cope with the given tasks. Following the data analysis, the scholars regarded some of the revealed strategies as independent while incorporating the others into the previously identified components of existing strategy lists. All in all, the proposed taxonomy consists of three subheadings built on particular techniques and is presented below.

Metacognitive Strategies

This group is associated with contemplating how to proceed to learn, organization of learning, overseeing the learning activities and evaluation of one's own performance. These strategies can be summarized as follows:

- Planning: It is comprised of advance organization (preliminary enquiries into the forthcoming tasks), suggesting appropriate strategies and organizational planning (mapping out a route to follow the right order with goal-oriented language functions).
- Directed attention: It provides a better concentration span while engaging in a task, thus preventing any distractibility.
- Selective attention: It is about focusing on particular aspects of language input to gain advantage for the accomplishment of a task.
- Self-management: It refers to actualizing the right circumstances in order to succeed in language activities and taking the command of language performance to make the most of what is already acquired.
- Self-monitoring: It allows learners to inspect or reorganize their understanding or performance at the very moment of a task. It includes a close watch on comprehension, language production and strategies being employed etc.
- Problem identification: It is applied to resolve the problematic situations while performing a task.

- Self-evaluation is considered necessary to examine the outcomes of language performance and strategies implemented. It includes a review of language repertoire, abilities and production etc. (Ibid: 137)

Cognitive Strategies

These strategies pertain to learners' interaction with new language components. Both mental and physical manipulation of such materials reflects the execution of cognitive strategies. By making use of specific techniques, learners are able to deal with challenging language tasks. The related part of the taxonomy is provided below.

- Repetition, as one of the most common techniques, is applied by most of the learners to recall unfamiliar words or phrases.
- Resourcing refers to taking advantage of existing information sources regarding the target language such as online dictionaries and grammar books.
- Grouping is implemented by dividing language material into separate categories based on their common characteristics, thus facilitating the retention of new information.
- Note taking assists learners to internalize key concepts and new vocabulary items through various forms for future use.
- Deduction and induction increase proficiency by applying rules or developing them within a context.
- Substitution is about adapting different methods, reorganized plans, or alternative words for the purpose of achieving a task.
- Elaboration could be described as forming an association between newly studied material and previously acquired knowledge and personalizing new information. World and creative elaboration or imagery to recall new information in the future are examples of elaboration.
- Summarization of the language and information faced in a task is done by stating main points in mind or in a written form.
- Translation is considered as a comparatively word for word reproduction of ideas in a different language.
- Transfer is described as exploiting previously gained linguistic knowledge to ease a language task.

- Inferencing is employed in order to compensate for missing information or predict word meanings based on available information and context clues (Ibid: 138).

Social and Affective Strategies

This group is basically connected to the process of interacting with other people so as to contribute to learning. Steps to be executed under this category are closely related to learners' emotions and attitudes. These strategies are presented in the taxonomy as follows:

- Questioning for clarification is regarded crucial especially when in doubt. It is applied for confirmation, illustration and even self-discovery.
- Cooperation is another inevitable way of learning a language when learners confront challenges. Several examples include modelling, gathering diverse perspectives and receiving constructive feedback.
- Self-talk is recommended to relieve anxiety. Thanks to this technique, learners may feel more capable to cope with demanding tasks.
- Self-reinforcement might be effective in generating the necessary motivation via encouraging reward systems for accomplished learning activities (Ibid: 139).

2.2.3. Oxford's Classification (1990)

In addition to her list of salient features that language learning strategies have, Oxford (1990) brought forward a new system of LLS which allegedly differ from the previously suggested ones in a couple of ways. Standing out as being more elaborate and comprehensible, this taxonomy provides a bigger advantage in associating individual strategies with the four basic language skills. It is comprised of two main groups as direct and indirect strategies. Each is divided into three subgroups built on a more specific set of strategies as shown below. These six strategy groups are closely interrelated. In other words, learners are very likely to derive maximum benefit when complementary strategies are put into practice concurrently (Ibid: 14). The questionnaire used to collect data in the present research is based on this taxonomy.

Direct Strategies

This group of strategies is considered to have an immediate impact on enriching the target language. Necessitating 'mental processing of the language' at heart, each type of direct strategies fulfils its function in a unique way to accomplish particular goals. This group is comprised of memory strategies for the storage and retrieval of new input; cognitive strategies for the comprehension and usage of language in different forms; compensation strategies for the maintenance of linguistic performance despite the lack of information (Ibid: 37). Furthermore, the taxonomy elaborates on these types by presenting their underlying sets.

Oxford (Ibid: 39) stated that memory strategies are based on commonplace principles such as putting things in order and establishing connections and concludes that the likelihood of success would increase when these associations and arrangements are made in suggestive ways. Despite the fact that memorization techniques are quite effective to deal with the challenges of learning vocabulary items, some studies reveal that learners make use of these strategies only occasionally (Ibid: 40). These findings might be attributed to the unawareness, among language learners, of how to learn new items by heart systematically.

Regarding the underlying sets of memory strategies, the taxonomy offers four subgroups. The first is named as 'creating mental linkages' which is also divided into 'grouping' for the meaningful classification of new material, 'associating and elaborating' for making mnemonic connections between new and previously obtained information, 'placing new words into a context' for the purpose of retrieving unfamiliar items by using them at the proper time. The second is called 'applying images and sounds' which is comprised of 'using imagery' for the utilization of visuals (whether mentally or physically) to recall words, 'semantic mapping' by drawing diagrams to display a concept and its derivatives or collocations, 'using keywords' obviously for appropriate watchwords, 'representing sounds in memory' by making use of audial techniques. The third one is about going over new language information for its consolidation. The last one is about employing actions such as acting out a verb and removing learned word cards from among the others still being studied.

Di Carlo (2017: 115) defined cognitive language learning strategies as "actions that learners adopt in a conscious (or potentially conscious), relatively controlled and

intentional manner, to optimize assimilation, internalization, construction, consolidation and transference of knowledge and language skills" and takes them into consideration based on three aspects: encoding, storage and retrieval. On the other hand, asserting that these are the most frequently used strategies among learners, Oxford (1990: 43) characterized cognitive strategies with one unifying function which is "manipulation or transformation of the target language by the learner".

Oxford's classification divides cognitive strategies into four sub-sets. The first one is 'practicing' that might take place through multiple repetitions, formal training with sound and writing systems, identification and utilization of common patterns, trying new combinations of phrases for advanced language use, and above all, practicing language in real-life contexts outside classroom. 'Receiving and sending messages' are another way to manipulate and transform the new language. They include common techniques such as skimming, scanning, written and nonprint sources to facilitate communication. The next set, namely 'analyzing and reasoning', is popular especially with adult learners since they tend to question and rationalize new input. They can be applied through deductive reasoning, breaking down unfamiliar and long expressions to be able to comprehend, revealing similarities and differences between the first and target languages and making use of them in challenging times. The last set, 'creating structure for input and output', is related to the management of a great number of input learners are exposed to. Relevant strategies may be regarded as note taking, recapitulation and emphasizing what matters more.

Compensation strategies that are peculiar to Oxford's taxonomy basically aid learners to maintain communication in the target language in spite of some deficiencies in knowledge. An example of compensation strategies is body language which is used to express opinions or ask for help. Last but not least, Oxford states that not only beginners but also advanced learners employ such techniques when they have problems making sense of the language (Ibid: 48).

Being considered as the third and last group under direct strategies, compensation strategies are comprised of guessing and overcoming limitations in speaking and writing. First of all, learners can make up for their lack of knowledge by making educated guesses. To be able to do so, 'linguistic' or 'other types' of clues particularly in listening and reading might be two options since they may lead to close associations between existing knowledge and unknown points. When it comes to productive skills,

the classification offers some strategies to reduce limitations. These include using first language or gestures in an ‘emergency’, determining the direction of communication in favor of oneself, inventing new words that correspond roughly to the intended ones or simply asking an interlocutor for help.

Indirect Strategies

Regarding the second main group of the present taxonomy, these strategies are in charge of the regulation of learning process by promoting and governing language learning circuitously. This group is comprised of metacognitive strategies for organizing the learning process through focusing, bringing an order, planning and assessment; affective ones for taking maximum advantage of feelings, sources of motivation, and attitudes; social ones for enriching language learning based on interpersonal communication. It must be noted that these three strategies are considered absolutely indispensable to maximize efficiency in the utilization of the direct strategies which are described above. Bearing a strong resemblance to certain parts of O’Malley and Chamot’s (1990) classification, these indirect strategies differ slightly in their underlying sets which are presented below.

Carrying a meaning of higher or beyond cognition, metacognitive strategies enable learners to sustain their learning process at higher concentration level despite various challenges such as unfamiliar structures or unusual teaching methods.

Metacognitive strategies have three underlying components in order to elaborate on metacognitive strategies. The first is named as ‘centering one’s learning’ which is also divided into ‘overviewing and linking with already known material’ for building bridges to protect the skeleton of future learning experience, increasing concentration on essential parts of upcoming tasks through selective attention and postponing speech production until one develops necessary listening skills. The second subcomponent is comprised of certain strategies such as setting short and long-term objectives and raising awareness as to why one is engaged in a particular task to be able to organize and plan his/her learning. Lastly, learners must take a lead role to evaluate their own performance. This might be achieved through ‘self-monitoring’ to realize fundamental mistakes and avoid them afterwards, or self-assessment of the overall progress in different aspects such as basic language skills.

The next type of indirect strategies are affective strategies. It goes without saying that effective language learning requires learners to have control over emotions and attitudes since this long-lasting process necessarily involve challenging moments. Drawing attention to the remarkable comprehensiveness of the affective domain, Oxford (1990: 140) mentioned several concepts related to this realm such as self-esteem, apprehension and risk-taking. With these remarks in mind, affective strategies might be vital for most to overcome drawbacks like disappointment about vocabulary acquisition or decreased motivation in language learning.

Oxford's classification divides affective strategies into three sub-sets. The first one is about the strategies implemented to reduce anxiety. The recommendations for physical and mental sides are consisted of progressive muscle relaxation (by first tensing a muscle group, then releasing that), relaxing music depending on personal preferences, laughter by means of different sources such as comic strips. The next set is 'encouraging oneself', and it is typically overlooked by the ones who seek exhortation from the others (Ibid: 143). Self-encouragement can be achieved through making confidence-boosting statements, taking reasonable risks such as speaking out in class, and self-awarding following any good action in language learning process. The last set, 'taking one's emotional temperature', is related to becoming aware of how strong emotions and motivation are towards learning. Learners could keep track of their affective status by writing down their ambivalent feelings or observing their body reactions to language learning such as sweating during a presentation or getting excited when talking to a native speaker.

Language by its nature is unimaginable without individuals interacting with each other. In an attempt to account for this reality, Bo (2015: 88) asserted that "the primary function of language is communication rather than representation, so language is essentially a social phenomenon". Consequently, learning a new language necessarily leads learners to situations in which they need to communicate with others. Social strategies are very likely to facilitate this process which may be tough for most due to unfamiliar language and culture.

Being considered as the third and last group under indirect strategies, social strategies are comprised of three sets of strategies. First of all, learners could consult someone with greater knowledge to clarify unclear points or elicit correction simply by asking questions. Another strategy to boost both language performance and social integration

is through cooperation and collaboration. The last one, namely 'empathizing with others', recommends learners to broaden their understanding of target culture and analyze others' ideas and behaviors to be able to establish a close rapport with them.

2.2.4. Stern's Classification (1992)

Stern (1992: 261) posited strategies as comprehensively designed directions learners take on purpose and identified techniques as observable and behavioral reflections of the strategies. Acknowledging the variety of definitional terms and lists in the literature, he holds the view that there is an agreement on the fundamental strategies in general terms. He asserted that it is quite complicated to compile a globally feasible list of strategies. With this in mind, Stern divides language learning strategies into five groups.

Management and Planning Strategies

These strategies are associated with the leading role that shifts from teachers to learners. In other words, the learner becomes more responsible for his/ her learning experience. Some of the usual techniques under this strategy group include:

- deciding how much desire and hard work to dedicate to language learning,
- setting attainable learning goals,
- following an appropriate procedure with proper sources, and checking the advancement of knowledge,
- assessment of the outcomes by taking initial objectives into consideration (Ibid: 263).

These steps substantially match up with the metacognitive strategies specified in Rubin's taxonomy, thus proving that there is considerable overlap between different classifications.

Cognitive Strategies

For the purpose of elaborating on this group, the scholar uses the six cognitive steps introduced by Rubin under learning strategies. Stern is of the opinion that it is a must for learners to monitor their own learning objectively. Regarding language learning as a problem-solving process, both deductive logic (making use of rules to cope with

challenges) and inductive reasoning (making use of examples to establish rules) are inseparable parts of this type as well. Lastly, making practice such as applying grammar rules in speaking for the purpose of accuracy in language use, and rote learning are two essential techniques to be consciously implemented under cognitive strategies.

On the other hand, Stern draws attention to certain language learning methods that place more importance on unconscious or instinctive learning processes; thus, questioning the foolproof structure of cognitive strategies. From his point of view, the list proposed by Rubin is imperfect since it has some deficiencies (e.g., observation including active listening or attentive watching not available) (Ibid: 264).

Communicative-Experiential Strategies

It goes without saying that one cannot have an excellent command of a second/ foreign language unless s/he combines instructed learning and adequate engagement with language use with authentic materials which refer to any source produced for the purposes other than language teaching (Nunan, 1989: 54). The primary goal of such strategies is to assist language learners to stay connected to the conversation in an active manner rather than mastering a point of language directly. Among these techniques are asking for more details, circumlocution, or restatements. Stern strongly recommends learners to implement cognitive strategies in company with communicative-experiential ones as both complete each other (Stern, 1992: 265).

Interpersonal Strategies

It is not instantaneous for language learners to be autonomous especially when we consider the early stages of learning. In other words, it takes a considerable amount of time and effort to reach the level where it is possible to take the full control of learning. Until that stage, it is inevitable to remain dependent on authorities such as teachers or peers who are more proficient in the target language for the right direction. Interpersonal strategies serve the function of managing the social relationships within the learning environment since the lack of knowledge may put pressure on learners. Last but not least, these strategies also help out the learners who are striving to get used to the culture of the target community as this experience is very likely to require them to interact with individuals or organizations that might possess distinct social or cultural norms (Ibid: 265-266).

Affective Strategies

The challenges students face during the process of language learning may sometimes lead to negative emotions such as anger, disappointment or exhaustion. Among such problems are demanding requirements of the learning task, the strange nature of the target language especially at the early stages of learning, or baseless prejudice against native speakers of the target language (Ibid: 266). As a consequence, learners are likely to gradually lose their motivation, and end up failing to achieve the goals set in the beginning. Thanks to the strategies in this group, however, learners are able to generate optimum conditions for increased enthusiasm so that they gain strength to deal with demoralizing feelings. Establishing achievable goals or creating a reward system throughout the language learning period are examples of these strategies.

2.3. Variables Influencing the Use of Language Learning Strategies

One of the focal points of the research on the present topic has been the factors which might influence the choice of language learning strategies and their frequency of use. Motivation, age, cultural background, learning context, gender and proficiency level comprise the majority of such variables (Ehrman and Oxford, 1989; Oxford and Nyikos, 1989; Wharton, 2000; Liu, 2004; Lai, 2009; Khamkhien, 2010; Griffiths, 2018). Classifying them into individual learner differences, situational and social factors, Ellis (1994) emphasized that these elements circuitously play an active role in affecting the extent of language acquisition and final degree of success by shaping the use of LLS.

For the purpose of elaborating on the role of these variables, this section basically provides an overview of the language learning strategy studies that have been conducted outside Turkey. Since gender and proficiency level related to the utilization of aforementioned strategies are being investigated in the present study, a more comprehensive explanation about them is provided following the fundamental views and findings on the others.

2.3.1. Motivation

According to Gardner (1985: 10), motivation in the context of language learning pertains to the combination of endeavour and wish to reach the ultimate goal with a positive mindset. This complex construct has been extensively investigated in relation to its role in the use of language learning strategies. In their study with a large group of foreign language students at a university in the U.S., Oxford and Nyikos (1989: 294) set out to reveal the variables affecting the choice of LLS. Among several factors, the extent of expressed motivation was found to be the most influential one on strategy choice, thus indicating that the more willpower learners have, the more diverse strategies they employ. Focusing on Thai and Vietnamese university students' LLS use through Oxford's strategy inventory and a background questionnaire, Khamkhien (2010), in agreement with the previous findings, concluded that the choice of LLS is significantly affected by high motivation particularly among Thai participants. On the other hand, it turned out that motivation level, in general terms, is not influential for Vietnamese learners in terms of strategy use (Ibid: 77).

Since motivation is also divided into several types such as extrinsic or intrinsic, some researchers prefer to go into more details in their studies. In their study with Iranian EFL learners, Nikoopour et al. (2012: 1280) stated that intrinsic motivation is significantly associated with cognitive and metacognitive strategies, whereas there is no positive and significant relationship between extrinsic types of motivation and strategy use. A similar study conducted in Morocco by El Aouri and Zerhouni (2017: 63) confirmed the previous findings as the results also reveal a large correlation only between the same motivation type and strategy groups.

2.3.2. Age

Critical period hypothesis nourishes the belief that young learners outperform their older counterparts when it comes to foreign language learning thanks to their superior traits (Hu, 2016: 2168). This presumption has necessarily sparked some researchers' interest in investigating potential effects of age on strategy choice. On the other hand,

pointing to the complexity of dealing with this variable purely, Oxford (1989b: 238) claimed that motivation and learning context are very likely to surpass the age factor.

Based on their literature review, Lee and Oxford (2008: 9) reported that social strategies such as asking for help are more frequently associated with the young whereas the adult attend to metacognitive ones such as organization and self-evaluation of L2 learning. In a well-attended study, Chen (2014) focused on different levels of education in order to reveal any possible influence of age on LLS use. The findings indicated significant relationships among three groups which vary from primary school to university regarding their strategy preferences. The researcher concluded that more and more social and functional strategies are being employed as the age increases (Ibid: 144).

2.3.3. Cultural Background

In broad terms, learners' cultural entities are considered to impact on the ways they study a foreign language and their language performance (Bedell and Oxford, 1996 as cited in Dörnyei and Ryan, 2015:151). To illustrate this influence, Cohen (2014) referred to the fact that English learners of Japanese might tend to apply visualization strategies while their Chinese counterparts may not feel that need because of their familiarity with the language. There exists some research attempting to compare various 'cultural' groups in terms of strategy choice.

Investigating oral communication strategy use among learners of Chinese from 21 countries, Hsieh (2014: 1) revealed that the participants from North America make use of social-affective and conversation maintenance strategies more frequently whereas the ones from East Asian regions employ more detail-oriented strategies. Reviewing previous studies on this matter, Lee (2010) reported that Asian language learners prefer rote learning and rule-driven strategies while Hispanic ones are more open to new techniques for mastering the target language.

2.3.4. Learning Context

Language learning process is very likely to be shaped by environmental factors that play a determining role in eventual outcomes (Collentine and Freed, 2004). Batstone (2002: 1) advocated providing encouraging contexts in which learners could benefit from contextual cues and interpersonal environment in order to individualize new input by taking on responsibility. Taking contextual differences into consideration, this variable also has the potential to affect the use of language learning strategies. Claiming that even different class sizes might lead to discrepancies in strategy choice, Locastro (1994: 413) stated that many facets of educational practice, including the LLS, are open to change based on values and beliefs peculiar to a learning context.

Some case studies in literature provide better insights into this matter. Investigating possible impacts of context on strategy use of Korean learners of English, Kim (1995: 341) reported that the participants studying at university employ particular strategies such as cognitive ones much more frequently than the community students, thus labeling the former group as more sophisticated. To take a step further, Takeuchi, Griffiths and Coyle (2007) designed a 'strategic classroom' to observe the effects of deliberate attempts such as encouraging learners to self-regulate, cooperate and use the target language strategically. Based on the findings, the researchers emphasize how vital learning context is to learner strategy use.

2.3.5. Gender

Despite its two-dimensional nature as a biological and social construct, the 'gender' factor has become prominent among individual learner differences that presumably influence strategy preferences and frequency of use. Numerous studies in the related literature assert that the female are more apt to perform better in language learning and employ LLS more frequently because of their stronger interest in social integration, academic achievement and planning (Griffiths, 2008; Macaro, 2001). On the other hand, there exist some studies providing evidence to the contrary (Wharton, 2000).

Salahshour, Sharifi and Salahshour (2013), in their study with Iranian high school students, questioned whether participants' use of LLS differ as to gender through the

SILL. The findings indicated more frequent overall strategy use in favour of the female, particulary regarding cognitive ones at a significant level. When it comes to the strategy profile of each group, the male seemed to prefer metacognitive and social ones the most while the other group went for metacognitive and compensation strategies. The results also revealed that memory strategies were the least favoured category for both genders.

Investigating Hungarian elementary school students' LLS preferences through an adapted form of the SILL, Doró and Habók (2013) also covered the effect of gender on strategy use. It turned out that the girls used significantly more strategies than the boys in each category, thus implying more promising engagement in language learning. As a common point for both genders, the most frequently employed group was seen to be metacognitive strategies while the least preferred one was compensation strategies in each group, which corresponded with the previous study results to a large extent.

Another study with a similar purpose belongs to Xue (2015) who focused on Chinese learners of English at university level. Following the SILL and semi-structured interviews, the researcher found out that participants in general made use of LLS with a medium frequency while employing compensation strategies the most and affective ones the least. Furthermore, the data analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between genders in terms of cognitive, metacognitive and social strategy use in favor of female learners.

On the other hand, Liyanage and Bartlett (2012), in their study with Sri Lankan learners of English, investigated individual strategies preferred by both genders separately instead of examining only the categorized version. The first step of analysis that is concerned with strategy categories confirmed the previous findings above to some extent underlining the superiority of the female over the male regarding the use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in general. However, when strategies were taken into consideration item by item, no consistent dominance was found between genders. This type of analysis led to distinct and peculiar patterns of strategy use for both groups such as 'self-monitoring' under metacognition in favor of the male, and 'cooperation' under social-affective strategies in favor of the female.

In an attempt to gain insights into male and female Cambodian EFL learners' use of LLS at university level, Seng and Khleang (2014) asked 159 participants to complete the SILL. They reported employing these strategies with a high degree of frequency opting for metacognitive strategies the most and memory ones the least. Contrary to prevailing research, the male in this study seemed to be adopting LLS in each category more frequently than their counterparts even if there was not a significant difference. Similarly, Dawadi (2017) investigated the LLS profile of Nepalese university learners of English. The results suggested that the whole group used metacognitive strategies much more frequently than the other strategies while using the affective ones the least. Moreover, it turned out that there were significant differences between genders- in other words, the male preferred compensation, social and affective strategies more whereas cognitive and metacognitive ones were employed more frequently by the female.

Lastly, Alhaysony (2017) set out to discover whether gender has a role in the use of LLS among Saudi EFL students of a university. The findings indicated that cognitive and metacognitive strategies prevailed over the other categories among the participants of both genders while affective ones were located at the bottom of the list regarding the frequency of strategy use. Even though mean scores were in favour of the female, the researcher stated that the difference was too slight to mention any dominance resulting from this variable.

2.3.6. Proficiency Level

As learners enhance their knowledge of target language and linguistic performance, the way they approach learning process tends to alter. This phenomenon has sparked researchers' interest in exploring the relationship between proficiency level and strategy choice. Lee and Oxford (2008: 9) noted that the prevailing view is the more proficient learners are, the wider and more proper set of LLS they utilize. On the other hand, deeming this idea as somehow problematic, Cohen (2014: 22) asserted that greater proficiency sometimes gives individuals a chance to absorb new information faster, thus making certain strategies redundant for such learners.

Green and Oxford (1995), in their study consisting of university students studying English at three different levels, found that more proficient students were using many more learning strategies than the less proficient ones. However, the researchers went into more details and analyzed the SILL results in terms of the usage of strategy groups and each item in these groups among the participants. The findings showed that only 17 of 50 items varied positively by the proficiency level. Underlining how important it is to consider the entire list of the strategies chosen by more proficient students instead of the strategies only these students opt for more often, the researchers came up with the term 'bedrock strategies' to refer to the ones used by both groups of learners (Ibid: 289).

Bremner (1999) also set out to examine the relationship between strategy use and the proficiency level of the participants in Hong Kong. While cognitive and compensation strategies seemed to be used more commonly among high level students, affective ones were applied more frequently by the less proficient participants. When the items were analyzed individually, 11 of 50 strategies were significantly associated with the success level. Strikingly, 8 of them existed in Green and Oxford's (1995) 17-item list as well.

In this regard, one of the noteworthy studies belongs to Griffiths (2003) who shed light on the relationship between proficiency level and LLS use of 348 learners of English through the SILL. Based on the results, a statistically significant difference between advanced and elementary level students was found indicating that the frequency of strategy uses increases as the level rises. Furthermore, she detected that 12 'core strategies' were highly frequently employed across all levels. In addition to these, higher level participants were different from lower-level ones in that they used 15 strategies with higher frequency. She named them as 'plus' strategies.

Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006) set out to explore the LLS profile of an Intensive English Program students as well as any potential diversity resulting from their proficiency level. Based on the data collected through the SILL, the intermediate level participants seemed to be using more strategies compared to their lower and higher counterparts. The findings showed that the students at the beginning and intermediate levels favored metacognitive strategies the most while the advanced learners preferred social ones as the top category. On the other hand, affective and memory strategies were not much valued by the whole group.

In an attempt to reveal the LLS usage patterns of EFL learners from Taiwan in terms of their proficiency, Lai (2009) utilized a placement test to determine their actual levels and the SILL to identify their strategy tendencies. The results indicated a significant impact of the level on strategy choice proving that higher level students reported implementing more strategies. In accordance with some of the existing studies, this research also closely associated metacognitive and cognitive strategies with more proficient participants. Conversely, low level students embraced social and memory strategies more frequently. When strategies were analyzed individually, it was found that learners with better command of language attend to the organization of learning, rational skills and practicing speaking.

Radwan (2011) conducted another study with a similar purpose providing illuminating insights about the LLS use of university students studying English in Oman. Overall, metacognitive strategies turned out to be the most dominant category among the others while memory-related ones got the least attention. The researcher divided the participants into different proficiency levels based on their grade point averages in English classes. The analysis signified that cognitive, metacognitive and affective groups were being employed more frequently by higher level students. Following a stepwise regression analysis, only the use of cognitive strategies seemed to be able to predict whether a participant belongs to the less or more proficient group.

Alhaisoni (2012) focused on Saudi EFL learners at university level in terms of their proficiency level and strategy choices. While the participants reported employing cognitive and metacognitive strategies the most, affective and memory-related ones seemed not to be that popular among them. The results indicated the superiority of high-proficiency students over their lower-level counterparts regarding the use of strategies in each and every category. The researcher pointed out that those with vaster knowledge of English care more about communication, thus making use of diverse strategies such as guessing based on the context or asking for clarification when they think something is crucial to maintain the conversation. The less proficient ones, on the other hand, seemed concerned with understanding each word to keep the dialogue going.

Despite this prevalent research outcome that associates a richer set of strategies use with higher level learners, Ismail and Al Khatib (2013), in their study with university students in United Arab Emirates, revealed an equitable distribution of LLS across

three different levels and therefore no significant impact of proficiency on overall strategy use or any categories. Interestingly, the findings suggested uniformity across all the levels in terms of strategy profile. It turned out that the participants, regardless of their proficiency, preferred metacognitive strategies the most while memory strategies were favored the least.

In general terms, these findings support the claim that LLS use is positively correlated with proficiency level. On the other hand, it would lead to a negligent approach to ignore a fewer number of studies which suggest that higher proficiency level does not always result in the use of a wider and more proper set of strategies. This vagueness, as a consequence, creates the need to conduct more research on the strategy use across various proficiency levels with more language learners in different contexts.

2.4. Language Learning Strategies & Success in the Target Language

The relation between language learning strategies and second language achievement has been a center of attention of SLA researchers. While the majority of the studies seem to establish positive connections between both sides, a few of them abstain from making such deductions due to certain findings worth considering.

In his book Strategies for Success, Brown (2002: xiii) mentioned the vital role of language learning strategies in addition to some other pieces of advice such as striving for a certain goal and recommends learners to make use of these techniques to achieve greater success.

Being aware that a number of variables come to the fore when language learning success is taken into consideration, Ehrman and Oxford (1995) investigated how language learning strategies as well as certain individual differences such as age and motivation are related to the ultimate goal of improving reading and speaking skills in a number of languages. Contrary to the majority of the related research previous to this study, only the use of cognitive strategies was significantly correlated with the success in speaking. The scholars drew attention to the adult participants who were experienced in language learning to justify the unexpected findings.

Suwanarak (2012) focused on the relationship between the strategy use of Thai learners of English at university level and their achievement scores determined by self-

assessment. The study revealed that the participants who considered their success in language learning higher reported using more strategies with higher frequency. Almost half of the participants saw themselves underachievers and tended to apply compensation strategies a lot while the high achievers, in general, did not feel the need to employ memory strategies in their language learning process.

Bruen (2001), in her study consisting of Irish learners of German, found that the participants with higher success reported making use of more LLS, especially cognitive and metacognitive ones, compared to the less successful students. Collecting the data through the SILL, the researcher identified 10 individual strategies which are associated with high level of success in speaking skills. It is crucial to be aware that LLS were employed by high-achievers in an organized and goal-oriented way. Such students were also capable of using these strategies to cope with various language tasks and challenges faced during language learning process.

In Oxford's (2002) view, as long as language learning strategies are applied properly, the level of proficiency in the target language, in terms of both overall command and particular skills, tends to develop considerably. What makes a language student outstanding is his/her awareness of choosing right and compatible strategies at the right time. Oxford (Ibid: 126) stated that accomplished second language learners typically exploit cognitive and metacognitive strategies in a coordinated way. From her standpoint, almost all of the L2 learners use a great number of strategies; however, employing them aimlessly and incoherently differentiates low-achieving students from their more successful peers (Ibid: 126). As a potential proof of this statement, Porte (1988), following his interviews with fifteen failing learners of English, discovered that these participants were applying almost the same techniques to expand their vocabulary as high-achievers report. The researcher implied that polishing these students' fruitless use of imperfect strategies may help them out. Macaro (2006: 332) also attributed successful learning to the "orchestration of strategies" that learners possess rather than how often they use them.

On the other hand, Murray (2010) investigated the strategy use of English learners of Korean and their proficiency levels through the SILL and test scores. The findings showed that the correlations between these two variables were not strong enough to be able make any significant inferences. The researcher concluded that a wide range of

variables must be taken into consideration instead of focusing on only the strategies when it comes to successful learning.

Focusing on the relationship between language learning strategies, learning styles and achievement in reading comprehension, Cesur and Fer (2011) aimed to investigate the performance of Turkish learners of English at the university level. They discovered that learning strategies, in particular cognitive, memory and compensation, affected the success levels of the participants directly.

On the other hand, a significant insight into how academic success is associated with learning strategies was provided by Al-Qahtani (2013) in the context of Saudi Arabia. Devising an original instrument built on O'Malley and Chamot's classification, the researcher discovered that cognitive strategies were the category with the highest frequency use. However, regarding the achievement scores in the target language, social strategies were the only category that suggested a significant connection in a positive direction. It was concluded that instead of the other two types of strategy, some other variables not included in the study might have been influential in the participants' success level.

It goes without saying that language teachers play an active role in the achievement of learning goals through strategies. Based on the majority of the studies conducted in the last three decades, Rubin (2013) holds the view that assisting students to be able to make use of language learning strategies efficiently paves the way for better command of the target language and boosts their will power. Likewise, Zare (2012) recommended language instructors to raise their awareness of the strategies that both exist and need to be promoted in their classes so that they can assist especially the less successful students in the language learning process. Furthermore, in his study consisting of Iranian learners of English, Zare (2013) reported that participants' use of reading strategies were correlated with their success in reading comprehension positively and significantly.

In a Hungarian context of language learning, Habók and Magyar (2018) focused on the strategies in relation to learners' opinions towards the target language, proficiency levels and general success. The study revealed that metacognitive and social strategies in particular were applied much more frequently by the students with higher proficiency level. In addition, it was suggested that general success at school was

substantially affected by the use of language learning strategies. The researchers concluded that language learners are very likely to develop their mastery by implementing a diverse range of strategies relevant to the requirements of the activities.

Nasihah and Cahyono (2017), in their study consisting of Indonesian EFL learners, pointed out that the frequency of strategy use went up as the writing achievement increased, or vice versa. The researchers paid attention to the overall use of LLS instead of the specific groups of them. In another study with a Spanish writing class at advanced level, Olivares-Cuhat (2002) identified a significant correlation between the usage of memory strategies and success in writing.

In general terms, some researchers have revealed that certain strategy types such as cognitive and metacognitive strategies are highly favored by more successful language learners based on their participants' profile. However, it is not to possible to generalize from these findings. Furthermore, there exist a group of studies which either associate SLA achievement with other unpopular strategy types such as memory strategies or reach no impact of LLS on success. This lack of consensus, as a consequence, calls for more research on this aspect with different participant profiles in various contexts.

2.5. Language Learning Strategies Studies Conducted in Turkey

The widespread popularity of language learning strategies has aroused researchers' interest in investigating the subject matter in the national context as well. Many studies with various research questions have been carried out to contribute to the literature. Overall, major aspects covered so far include strategy preferences, the effect of different variables such as gender and proficiency on strategy use, the relationship between the LLS and academic success in the target language through diverse instruments in various contexts (Yılmaz, 2010; Demirel, 2012; Çakır, 2012; Erarslan and Höl, 2014; Solak and Çakır, 2015; Çetinkaya, 2017; Balcı and Üğüten, 2018; Griffiths, 2018).

Yılmaz (2010) investigated the LLS use of students majoring in English Language Teaching (ELT) at a state university and potential effects of gender and proficiency in this regard. The participants reported using compensation, metacognitive and

cognitive strategies with high frequency. The least popular category among the learners was affective strategies and there was a significant difference in favor of the female. Dividing them into three groups based on their grade point average as an indicator of proficiency, the researcher found no significant effect of the mastery level on strategy use except for affective strategies that were considerably employed among more proficient students.

Demirel (2012) observed the impact of strategy use of English preparatory school students at a state university on their academic achievement. Based on participants' SILL and final grades, findings showed that compensation strategies seemed to be prevalent among learners while affective and memory-related ones got the least attention. Also, the female demonstrated overwhelming superiority over the male except for compensation strategies. The data analysis also proved a significant and positive correlation between the LLS use and success since the participants with the highest averages in the final also possessed strategy use at a high level.

Another study to gain insights into strategy profile and success of English preparatory school students at different proficiency levels at a state university belongs to Çakır (2012). The researcher utilized English Language Learning Strategy Inventory developed by Griffiths (2003), proficiency exam results and interviews to gather data. Overall, the use of dictionaries as well as films and songs in English turned out to be the most frequently used strategies among the participants while keeping a diary or reading newspapers in English turned out to be the least. The participants, regardless of their proficiency level, reported employing learning strategies almost in the same way, thus confuting the decisive role of proficiency level on the LLS choice contrary to prevailing opinion. Furthermore, the findings suggested that neither successful nor unsuccessful students following the exam differed significantly in terms of strategy use. The female, on the other hand, came to the fore since they made use of learning strategies with higher frequency compared to the male.

Investigating EFL learners' strategy preferences regarding gender and proficiency level through the SILL at another state university, Erarslan and Höl (2014) observed moderate use of LLS among the participants who reported using metacognitive strategies the most and affective ones the least. It seemed that gender did not have any strong impact on strategy choice. On the other hand, there existed slight differences across elementary, pre-intermediate and intermediate levels implying that progress in

language learning resulted in increased strategy use even though it was not statistically significant.

Solak and Çakır (2015) set out to reveal what strategies are used by the students studying English in an online learning platform and whether these techniques influence their achievement. Based on the findings from the SILL, the participants tended to employ metacognitive and memory strategies whereas cognitive and affective ones were favored the least. It also turned out that the cognitive strategies were prevalent among the female. On the other hand, male students preferred the metacognitive the most. The researchers concluded that using the LLS played a significant role on academic success in e-learning context as well.

Çetinkaya (2017) examined the relationship among the LLS, motivation and success of EFL learners at a public university. The findings indicated that both strategy use and motivation were positively associated with achievement. However, LLS seemed to have a stronger effect on the participants' success, implying that motivation did not lead to desired achievement on its own. Furthermore, it turned out that gender was not significantly influential in strategy preferences except for the female exhibiting more memory strategies and the male adopting more compensation strategies.

Balcı and Üğüten (2018), in their study with English preparatory school students at a state university, aimed to explore the relationship between LLS use and achievement as well as gender-based differences. While participants opted for metacognitive strategies the most, they reported using cognitive ones the least contrary to many of the previous findings. Another salient point was that except for the memory-related strategies gender did not appear to affect the strategy use. The researchers revealed a weak positive correlation regarding learners' success and overall strategy use, particularly cognitive, compensation and metacognitive ones.

Designing a new questionnaire based on widely accepted three inventories and experts' opinions, Griffiths (2018) focused on the LLS use of 204 Turkish learners of English from A1 to C2 level. It turned out that higher level participants employed a wider range of strategies three times more frequently than lower proficient ones. In terms of the connection between strategy use and language proficiency, the scholar examined the self-ratings and came up with particular groups. 'Core' strategies were applied across all levels implying that all the participants regarded them as essential to

learning. ‘Base’ strategies were mostly preferred by lower-level students. They were strongly related to notetaking, memorization, rule-oriented learning and being dependent on the teacher. ‘Plus’ strategies were mostly peculiar to higher-level students. This group involves cognition-oriented preferences such as language skills and metacognitive strategies for organization, cultural awareness and active participation. From Griffiths’ point of view, the core-plus repertoire proves that high proficient learners seem to be employing a large set of strategies while ignoring some basic steps taken in the beginning of language learning process.

When the findings of the studies conducted abroad and in Turkey are taken into consideration, it would not be wrong to report that there still exists some remarkable variety regarding the strategy patterns of language learners, the effect of gender and proficiency on strategy preferences in addition to the relationship between LLS use and academic achievement. On the other hand, most of the studies in Turkey which make use of the SILL to gain insights into learners’ strategy choices seem to be lacking the qualitative data which may yield more profound understanding of the issue. Furthermore, conducting LLS-related research with large numbers of participants in diverse contexts at different times has been prominent among researchers since the onset of the subject in question. Admittedly, each and every attempt has somehow contributed to the progress towards a general consensus about the nature of learning strategies. In this regard, Griffiths (Ibid: 8) underscored the significance of such efforts that are still deemed necessary to persuade the majority, particularly the ones in charge, to integrate strategy-oriented sections into language textbooks and teacher education programs with intent to raise both teacher and learner awareness. With these remarks in mind, the present study set out to investigate the LLS use of English Preparatory School students at a foundation university in Istanbul with a focus on the effect of gender and proficiency level. Collecting the data through the SILL and semi-structured individual interviews, the researcher also intended to shed light on the relationship between strategy use and academic achievement.

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The main purpose of this chapter is to provide methodological procedures for the present study. It starts by introducing the research design, setting and participants. Then, the chapter presents the tools used to collect the data in details. Finally, the data collection and data analysis procedures are explained.

3.1. Research Design

The aim of this study was to examine the possible relationship between LLS use and academic achievement of English preparatory school students at a foundation university in Turkey. In addition, the LLS use across different proficiency levels and genders was another point of interest for the present research. Thus, the present study embraces a descriptive investigation with a focus on the relationship between the two variables specified above.

The researcher made use of a questionnaire, more specifically the 50-item Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (Oxford, 1990), along with a demographic information form and semi-structured interviews in order to collect data. Chamot (2005) emphasized that questionnaires have been the leading tool to portray language learners' strategies. Regarding the high demand for questionnaires, Dörnyei and Taguchi (2009: xiii) provided some justification by describing them "extremely versatile, and uniquely capable of gathering a large amount of information quickly in a form that is readily processable". On the other hand, interviews are regarded as useful adjuncts to questionnaires that provide in-depth insights into a subject matter. Furthermore, the final scores of the participants at the end of the related module were included in the study and counted as the data pertaining to their academic achievement. Therefore, this study employed a mixed method design, adopting both quantitative and qualitative research. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) served as the main tool for the statistical analysis of the data while thematic analysis was carried out for the qualitative part.

3.2. Setting and Participants

This study was carried out in an English preparatory school at a foundation university in Istanbul. Considered as a center of international research, the university has a large population of international students as well as academics from many countries. Accordingly, there is a considerable number of departments in various faculties where the medium of instruction is English in either thirty or hundred percent of the courses offered. Taking the social environment on the campus and academic life into consideration, having a good command of English is perceived as a must by the majority of students. The English preparatory program provided by the School of Languages serves a function in meeting the needs of the ones who are supposed to reach a higher language level or would like to enhance English skills voluntarily.

Regarding the implementation of this program, all the incoming students whose departmental courses are taught completely or partially in English and the ones who decide of their own will to attend the program have a chance to take an online placement test at the beginning of the academic year. The students who prefer not to take the test are placed in the beginner level while the others, on condition that they get over sixty points out of one hundred, are entitled to take a proficiency test. This test mainly consists of three sections: multiple choice listening comprehension and grammar part, a writing task on a given topic and a speaking exam. Scoring over seventy points in the test gives the test takers the right to start their departmental programs right away. The ones who fail to obtain this result are placed in appropriate levels based on their placement test scores. The program is made up of five proficiency levels specified by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR): A1, A2, B1, B1+, and B2. Each level lasts for seven weeks and named as a module. Upon completing the B2 level successfully, students are allowed to commence their studies in the related departments.

During the course of each module, there are four types of courses taught by three different instructors. The main course forms the core of the weekly schedule with sixteen hours. The course content covered in this period is strengthened by a two-hour consolidation course mostly taught on Fridays. Both of these courses are typically taught by the same teacher that is also assigned as the supervisor of that class. Listening & speaking and reading & writing are the other two courses offered for four or six

hours a week depending on students' level. In each module, students are supposed to attend the classes at the rate of at least eighty-five percent of the total course time. Otherwise, they lose the chance to take the final exam, and automatically fail in that module. The assessment criteria are presented under the title of 'End-of-Module Final Grades'.

The present study was conducted with 354 participants who were studying English in this preparatory school. There were 188 female and 166 male participants. Based on their proficiency levels, the participants were divided into three groups. There were 208 students at elementary (A1 and A2), 95 students at intermediate (B1) and 51 students at upper-intermediate level (B1+ and B2). The majority of the participants were Turkish while there were a number of students with various nationalities as well (Turkish: 303, Syria: 8, Indonesia: 9, Georgia: 1, Egypt: 3, Jordan: 4, Sudan: 1, East Turkistan: 2, Palestine: 5, Thailand: 7, Somalia: 2, Yemen: 4, Germany: 1, China: 2, Sierra Leone: 1, Lebanon: 1). The age range of the participants was 18 to 24.

3.3. Data Collection Instruments

In accordance with the research questions of the present study, the data were collected through a demographic information form, a strategy inventory for language learning, the end-of-module scores and interviews. They are explained in turn below.

3.3.1. Demographic Information Form

The researcher designed this form to obtain the demographic information of the participants. It aimed to learn about their names, genders, proficiency levels, age and countries. This form was included at the bottom of the inventory so as to prevent any biased answers. In an attempt to clarify this preference, Dobosh (2017) states that it is, in certain cases, beneficial to place demographic questions at the end because they are likely to distort the purpose of the questionnaire, affecting the responses on survey items related to the subject in hand.

3.3.2. Strategy Inventory for Language Learning

For the purpose of getting insight into participants' language learning strategy preferences, the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) developed by Oxford (1990) was utilized in the present study. There are two versions of this inventory. Version 5.1 is used to investigate how English speakers are learning a new language while Version 7.0 is aimed at speakers of other languages learning English as a second or foreign language. In accordance with the participant profile, the second version was chosen as an instrument for this research. Considered as the most influential tool in the field of LLS with its comprehensive hierarchy of learning strategies (Lee, 2010), the SILL has contributed to innumerable studies in terms of obtaining data on a huge number of language learners across the world (Chamot, 2005; Griffiths, 2015; Dörnyei and Ryan, 2015). Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006) pointed out that this instrument has the potential to accurately assess learners reported LLS use since related studies in the literature seem to have reliability coefficients for this tool between .85 and .98. In the light of their analysis of the SILL-based studies, Oxford and Burry-Stock (1995) claimed that this tool has high utility, reliability and validity, and a nature free from social desirability response bias. Another point they made is the opportunity to be able to administer this inventory in participants' mother tongue. Accordingly, it is possible to find the translations of the SILL in a number of languages. As the majority of the participants were from Turkey, the researcher made use of the Turkish version of the SILL that was translated by Cesur and Fer (2007). Following their investigation into the reliability and validity of this version, it turned out that the inventory is successful in both aspects, thus allowing researchers to exploit this questionnaire among Turkish learners of English. Turkish participants completed the Turkish version of the SILL. On the other hand, foreign students who were interested to participate in the study were distributed the original version of the SILL in English. They filled out the questionnaire in company with their instructors so that they could get immediate assistance in case of need. Those who did not feel confident with the survey language were not included in the study.

Based on a five-point Likert scale, the SILL is made up of two main categories and six subcategories as shown in Table 3.3.2.1. It includes fifty strategy statements in total. Participants, considering how they are making progress in mastering English, are

asked to respond to each item by marking 1 (never or almost never true of me), 2 (usually not true of me), 3 (somewhat true of me), 4 (usually true of me), 5 (almost or almost always true of me). There are no right or wrong answers in the SILL. Therefore, the average point a participant gets in each category is in direct proportion to the frequency of the related strategy use in his/her language learning process. Regarding how one should interpret the averages, Oxford (1990) stated that points between 3.5-5.0 refer to high usage; points between 2.5-3.4 refer to medium usage; points between 1.0-2.4 refer to low usage. A full version of the SILL is included in Appendices.

Table 3.3.2.1: The SILL Categories

Part A		Memory
Part B	Direct Strategies	Cognitive
Part C		Compensation
Part D		Metacognitive
Part E	Indirect Strategies	Affective
Part F		Social

3.3.3. End-of-Module Final Grades

In order to examine the possible effect of strategy use on the academic success, participants' total scores were reviewed at the end of the module when they participated in the study. There are basically three types of assessment criteria in the preparatory school. Regarding their content and level, each and every method of assessment is devised in accordance with the learning outcomes on the basis of European Language Portfolio (ELP) and CEFR module system. First of all, throughout a module, students take 7 quizzes whose main focus, in general terms, is to evaluate the progress in listening, reading, writing skills and vocabulary, grammar knowledge based on the units covered in the main coursebook. These quizzes form 35 percent of the final grade. Another 15 percent of overall score comes from students' homework, active participation and portfolios. The last method of assessment is the end of module

exam that forms the rest of the final grade that equals to 50 percent. The exam includes a multiple-choice test designed to assess students' knowledge of the lessons covered during the module, a speaking test and a writing test. While the multiple-choice part forms 60 percent of the total grade, speaking and writing sections are evaluated out of 20 each. Following these three types of assessment, those who score 70 points or more are considered qualified to begin the next level.

It was assumed that using a score range of 70 as the threshold borderline to differentiate successful learners from unsuccessful ones may not serve the purpose of the present study. The researcher decided to take on a more fine-tune procedure, instead. In an attempt to differentiate participants into high achievers and low achievers, the researcher adopted a two-dimensional grouping method. Since the distribution of final grades was skewed, the median (82.5) was calculated as a measure of central location. Taking certain variables such as learners' anxiety during exams or teachers' perceptions during grading into consideration, a 'safety zone' was set by the researcher between 75 and 90 of the overall grade. This is calculated by adding/subtracting 7.5 points to/from median. A similar 'safety zone' was also applied to students' speaking and writing grades in the end of module exam with the same percentage (between 15 and 18). Consequently, the students who managed to get both 90 or more in the overall score and 18 or more in the speaking and writing parts were regarded as high achievers. On the other hand, the students who got 75 or less in the overall score and 15 or less in the speaking and writing parts were classified as low achievers. As a result, there were 53 low achievers and 59 high achievers in total.

3.3.4. Interviews

For the purpose of collecting the qualitative data, the researcher made use of semi-structured interviews. Adams (2015: 494) states that such an instrument is quite beneficial to have an in-depth look at studies which include quantitative findings. Thanks to its flexible and engaging nature, these interviews allow researchers to ask interviewees follow-up questions, thus creating ample opportunities to explore unforeseeable issues contrary to surveys or questionnaires. From the perspective of the present study, this type of data may be regarded as essential to support the self-reported

strategy use in the inventory. Furthermore, this tool could make it possible for participants to share other strategies that they are employing but not available in the inventory given.

Regarding the content of the present interview, a set of close/open ended questions followed by *how* and *why* was prepared by the researcher based on the six sections of the strategy inventory (the SILL). In addition, a couple of more questions were added to the list in an attempt to stimulate participants' critical thinking and encourage them to reflect on their personal language learning experience. As in the preparation of the inventory, the questions were also translated into Turkish as some participants might feel more comfortable with having the interview in their mother tongue. The interview questions are presented below.

- Are there any techniques that you use to recall new words you come across in English?
- What do you do to improve your language skills?
- What do you do when you forget a word when speaking English?
- Do you make any plans when studying English on your own? Can you observe your own progress afterwards?
- Do you feel excited or nervous speaking English? If so, what do you do to feel comfortable?
- Do the people around you help you improve your language skills?
- What has been the most challenging for you in learning English? Could you cope with this?
- Based on your experience, what advice would you give to someone who has just started to learn English?

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

The data of the present study were collected from the participants introduced above in three steps. Regarding the first one, there were two options: online or paper-based survey. The online survey method has been quite common to gather data in recent years because of its advantages such as practicality, being cost-free and promoting a confidential or anonymous environment. However, Teitcher et al. (2015) state that

some participants might get involved in fraudulent activities as a result of this survey's nature. By opting for paper-based questionnaires, it was aimed to increase the number of responses, and prevent any possible deceit at the same time.

Following the necessary permission granted by the school authorities, the questionnaires that also included the demographic information form were first distributed to forty students to check for potential problems regarding the inventory. Since it turned out to be completely understandable and caused no confusion, the researcher started to distribute the questionnaires during the class time of the participants mostly in person. When it was not possible for the researcher to be present, the instructors in charge of the target audience were informed about the procedure and asked to administer the survey.

In both cases, it was announced that taking part in the study was on a voluntary basis, and the students had an option not to fill it out if they were not interested. The instructors also stated that the inventory items were related to how students learn the language individually, thus having no right or wrong answers. In order to garner honest answers on the survey, the participants were given the guarantee that their personal information would remain confidential and the answers would have no impact on their academic life. They were also informed that, on their request, it would be possible to have a one-to-one meeting with the researcher to make the most of the study after the data were analyzed. In this way, it was aimed to generate students' interest in contributing to the research. Participants completed the questionnaire in about ten minutes. 17 of the questionnaires received were excluded from analysis because of missing responses or participants' absenteeism which prevented them from taking the final exam.

The second step of data collection was to obtain participants' final grades at the end of the module. Each participant's score was written on his/her questionnaire to be analyzed together. If a student filled out the survey but failed to take the final exam because of any reason such as inadequate attendance, he/she was exempted from the list of participants.

The next and last step of gathering data involved carrying out semi-structured individual interviews with a particular group of participants based on their final grades. First, the researcher arranged individual meetings with three university EFL learners

in order to try out the interview questions and uncover their potential problems. These experiences helped to detect ambiguous wording among the questions and inconsistent responses. In addition, they provided an opportunity to receive constructive feedback from these learners. Accordingly, necessary modifications were made to the interview guide prior to the major investigation.

Since one of the focal points in the present study is the relationship between the LLS use and achievement scores, the researcher contacted both low and high achievers by email inviting them to attend an interview about their language learning experience on a voluntary basis. As in the inventory, the learners were informed that their personal information would remain confidential. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with six high achiever volunteers. There was no participation from the low achiever group. These interviews took place on Microsoft Teams and were recorded to be analyzed afterwards. The interviewees were also given enough time to contemplate before responding to each question. Each interview lasted about fifteen-to-twenty minutes.

3.5. Data Analysis Procedure

The quantitative data obtained from the questionnaire were first entered in SPSS Version 22. The reliability analysis of the data showed that the SILL is highly reliable with a Cronbach's Alpha of .91. The test of normality indicated that the data is normally distributed as the Shapiro-Wilk significance values turned out to be greater than the alpha level of .05. Therefore, parametric tests were used to analyze the data in accordance with the research questions. To be more precise, descriptive statistics, one sample t-test, Independent samples t-test and One-Way ANOVA (analysis of variance) were performed.

The qualitative data obtained from the interviews were first transcribed. The data derived from the interviews that were conducted in Turkish were translated into English by the researcher. The translation was also checked by an English instructor and modified accordingly. Thematic analysis was carried out in order to explore language learning processes that the interviewees went through and language learning strategies that they employed during the study. As a result, the statements that were

relevant to the LLS were extracted and collected under six categories based on the SILL by the researcher. For the sake of inter-rater reliability, an expert in the field of English language teaching also followed the same steps separately. Following both analyses, the differing views were discussed. Finally, excerpts that reflect strategy use and related categories were determined by mutual agreement.

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this chapter is to provide the findings of the present study and the interpretations based on these findings. The research questions are addressed separately in the order in which they are presented in the introduction section. Following the strategy profile of the participants, the relationship between strategy use and success in English is examined. Then, the proficiency level and gender factors as potential variables influencing the use of LLS are investigated respectively. For each question, both quantitative and qualitative findings are first introduced in tandem by making use of tables and excerpts from the interviews. After that, the results are discussed based on the existing literature including similar and different points.

4.1. Language Learning Strategy Profile of Participants

The first research question was about what LLS the participants report using while studying English. Based on the participants' (N = 354) responses to the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning, the descriptive statistics were run to obtain the means of strategy use by category and in total. As stated in the methodology section, each item in this inventory is assessed on a 5-point Likert scale from 'never' to 'always'. Regarding how to interpret the means, Oxford (1990) stated that points between 3.5-5.0 refer to high usage; points between 2.5-3.4 refer to medium usage; points between 1.0-2.4 refer to low usage. As shown in Table 4.1.2, it turned out that English preparatory school students reported using overall LLS with a medium frequency (M = 3.23).

Table 4.1.2: LLS Use of Participants

Strategy Type	*Mean*	*Std. Deviation*
Metacognitive	3.54	.70
Social	3.54	.68
Compensation	3.32	.68
Cognitive	3.20	.58
Memory	2.95	.61
Affective	2.87	.66
Overall	3.23	.49

With regard to the subcategories, metacognitive and social strategies were the most frequently employed strategies among the participants. The utilization of both strategies was also considered high (M = 3.54) according to Oxford's scale. On the other hand, affective strategies were the least frequently employed strategies among the participants (M = 2.87).

Even though the interviews were conducted with a group of high achievers only, it would not be improper to present some of the relevant findings based on the interviewees' utterances as they comprised a certain proportion of the participants too. A number of statements regarding how they utilize both metacognitive and social strategies are as follows:

Metacognitive Strategies

> *I try to practice speaking everywhere possible like in class or in my dad's office because he has many customers from abroad.* (Student 1)
>
> *I remember I had difficulty in writing simple paragraphs. I was mixing up tenses. I did not know for example how to write an essay but now I think I can write essays because I take full scores in essays in my exams.* (Student 3)
>
> *I try to assess my progress in learning English from time to time. For example, I used to get the general idea when watching some videos in English before, but when I watch them now, I can easily focus on the pronunciations and catch the words I used to miss.* (Student 6)

Social Strategies

> *When I forget a word while speaking English, I just ask my friends about the word. In general, asking a friend for help in such situations helps a lot.* (Student 2)
>
> *When I am speaking to teacher or to someone who knows English very well, I ask them to correct my mistakes because I want to learn.* (Student 3)
>
> *Especially communicating with my classmates in English has improved my speaking skills. For example, we chat about movies and series in English.* (Student 4)

On the other hand, the descriptive statistics indicated that the participants made use of the other strategy types with a medium frequency including affective strategies that turned out to be the least favored category. Some of the statements made in the interviews related to each category are as follows:

Compensation Strategies

> *When I forget a word while speaking English, I try to express myself in different ways. For example, I explain the meaning of that word.* (Student 1)
>
> *I try to deduce the meaning of new words from the sentences they are used in.* (Student 2)
>
> *I'm trying to explain the word with my hands and I'm trying to speak with my hands at these times.* (Student 3)

Cognitive Strategies

> *I keep a diary in English. I write about important things in my life such as this pandemic.* (Student 2)
>
> *I am doing my best to speak English like the people who speak it perfectly.* (Student 3)
>
> *In general, I love reading books in English. Moreover, I'm reading them loudly in my room.* (Student 5)

Memory Strategies

> *I am trying to use the new words when speaking English. It helps me a lot to remember these words. When I do not use them, I forget them easily.* (Student 1)
>
> *I write sentences using these new words on different notebooks.* (Student 2)
>
> *I try to write a short story about a new word in order to remember it permanently. To give an example, let's assume that foster is a new word for me. I make up a phrase like 'fostering tree planting in forest'. Such small associations help me remember new words permanently.* (Student 5)

Affective Strategies

> *I feel very excited when speaking English especially with strangers, so I breathe deeply to get relaxed.* (Student 1)
>
> *I get excited at the moments when I am expected to speak English well.* (Student 2)
>
> *I am trying to forget about my mistakes while I am speaking and just continue it like it did not happen.* (Student 3)

Regardless of their focal points, a large number of studies conducted on language learning strategies have provided considerable insights into the frequency of strategy use and dominant preferences among learners. In this regard, the findings presented above are in line with those of Radwan (2011), Demirel (2012), Tam (2013), Miladinović (2014), Erarslan and Höl (2014), Xue (2015), Dawadi (2017) and Akmençe (2019) to a great extent. To begin with, the participants in these studies also reported using overall LLS at medium level. When it comes to strategy use by category, metacognitive and social strategies seem to be highly popular among other language learners too. Miladinović (2014), for example, found out that a group of Serbian university students employed these two types with a high frequency. Within similar contexts in Turkey, Erarslan and Höl (2014) and Akmençe (2019) identified metacognitive strategies as the most frequently used type among their participants.

On the other hand, memory and affective strategies are located at the bottom of the list as the least favored ones in a considerable number of studies too. In their studies with

Saudi, Nepalese, Serbian and Omani EFL learners at university level, Alhaysony (2017), Dawadi (2017), Miladinović (2014) and Radwan (2011) pointed to the fact that these participants preferred these two types the least. Furthermore, Algan (2006), Yılmaz (2010), Demirel (2012) and Altunay (2014) obtained the same finding in their studies with Turkish EFL learners studying at the same level of education.

The overall LLS use among the participants of the present study indicates that they are neither ignorant nor sophisticated about the strategies to follow to become proficient language learners. The reason behind this might be the lack of explicit instruction on LLS. It might result from the lack of awareness among the instructors as well as the learning materials which underestimate the importance of these strategies. Another reason for the average performance of learners on these strategies is that EFL learners might not feel highly dependent on LLS as mastering English is not a matter of survival for them (Alhaysony, 2017). In other words, the amount and frequency of strategy use might be related to how eager learners feel to have an excellent command of the target language.

In terms of LLS use by category, the participants seem to be very active in regulating their learning process by promoting language learning circuitously as they employ two subgroups of indirect strategies with a high frequency. First, we can deduce from the mean of metacognitive strategy use that the participants are constantly striving to coordinate their learning through focusing, planning and assessment. The main reason behind this could be the features of the coursebook. For instance, the students are supposed to run through a self-assessment checklist at the end of every week. Instant feedback following the online interactive activities is very likely to encourage the students to learn from their mistakes, thus enhancing self-monitoring. Moreover, taking the amount of weekly course hours and burden into consideration, the tight schedule could be another reason why the participants tend to organize their studies properly. Secondly, the coursebook and curriculum of preparatory school that are built on a communicative methodology could be the reasons behind the high utilization rate of social strategies. A large number of activities in pairs and groups such as role-play and debate must be influential in boosting cooperation and collaboration among these learners. In addition, classes are re-formed in each module. For this reason, the participants necessarily felt the need to communicate with more and more new classmates from various backgrounds with different personalities. Bearing in mind that

it is compulsory for all to speak only in English during the class, this kind of setting could have a major impact on their frequent use of social strategies.

On the other hand, the means of memory and affective strategies indicate that the participants are less interested in techniques such as associations for the retrieval of new input and the ways to control their emotions and attitudes about learning. Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006) argue that a certain number of memory strategies such as using rhymes and acting out new words in the SILL may not be appealing to adult learners. Taking the participant profile of the present study into consideration, it could be one of the underlying reasons behind the relatively rare use of this strategy type. In addition, they might not have felt a compelling need to memorize new input since the assessment criteria do not include any activities such as vocabulary tests that directly requires memorization. When it comes to the use of affective strategies, all the interviewees expressed how excited and nervous they felt while using the target language. With this finding in mind, the fact that affective strategies rank at the bottom clearly indicates a lack of awareness among the participants about how to control feelings.

4.2. Language Learning Strategy Use: Low versus High Achievers

The second research question was about whether there is any difference between low and high achievers' use of language learning strategies. As stated in the methodology section, these two groups of students were formed based on their final grades. The students who got both 90 or more in the overall score and 18 or more in the speaking and writing parts were regarded as high achievers, whereas the ones who got both 75 or less in the overall score and 15 or less in the speaking and writing parts were regarded as low achievers. The descriptive statistics showed that the mean score of the high achievers (M = 3.54) was higher than that of the low achievers (M = 2.84) in terms of overall LLS use. The results also suggested that the high achievers employ cognitive, compensation, metacognitive and social strategies at a high level (M = 3.56, M = 3.54, M = 3.88 and M = 3.77 respectively), whereas the low achievers use each strategy type at a medium level based on Oxford's scale.

Independent samples t-tests were performed in order to compare the means of strategy use by category and in total for each group. Levene's test showed that the variances were equal across the two groups in terms of strategy use both by category and in total. As shown in Table 4.2.3, it turned out that the high achievers employ significantly more overall strategies compared to the low achievers ($t(110) = 8.103$, $p = .000$). When strategy use is taken into consideration by category, the high achievers seem to have significant superiority over the low achievers in each strategy type (memory: $t(110) = 5.731$, $p = .000$, cognitive: $t(110) = 9.069$, $p = .000$, compensation: $t(110) = 4.474$, $p = .000$, metacognitive: $t(110) = 5.638$, $p = .000$, affective: $t(110) = 4.050$, $p = .000$, social: $t(110) = 4.467$, $p = .000$).

Table 4.2.3: LLS Use and Success in Learning English

Strategy Type	*Group*	*N*	*Mean*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*Sig. (2-tailed)*
Memory	Low Achiever	53	2.58	.66	5.731	110	.000
	High Achiever	59	3.25	.56			
Cognitive	Low Achiever	53	2.65	.55	9.069	110	.000
	High Achiever	59	3.56	.50			
Compensation	Low Achiever	53	2.98	.74	4.474	110	.000
	High Achiever	59	3.54	.64			
Metacognitive	Low Achiever	53	3.18	.69	5.638	110	.000
	High Achiever	59	3.88	.61			
Affective	Low Achiever	53	2.61	.62	4.050	110	.000
	High Achiever	59	3.12	.71			
Social	Low Achiever	53	3.22	.64	4.467	110	.000
	High Achiever	59	3.77	.64			
Overall	Low Achiever	53	2.84	.46	8.103	110	.000
	High Achiever	59	3.54	.44			

The data obtained from the semi-structured interviews also indicate that high achievers use a wide range of language learning strategies. In addition to the ones cited above, a number of statements regarding their use of LLS are as follows:

Memory Strategies

> *I am writing down the words that are new to me on small pieces of paper along with their counterparts in Turkish and Arabic. Then, I attach these sticky notes to different places at home so that I keep seeing them all the time.* (Student 1)

> *I write down the new words on the dictionary notebook I've designed. Then, I rewrite these words on a different notebook 3-4 times consecutively so that I can reinforce the right order of letters. I regularly check this notebook and it helps a lot.* (Student 2)

> *If this new word is a verb, I check its derivatives such as its noun form. I try to use new words in different sentences and review them in reading texts.* (Student 4)

Based on the thematic analysis results, the dominant memory strategies turned out to be using flashcards, writing down new vocabulary items, putting them into writing and speaking and reviewing recently studied materials periodically.

Cognitive Strategies

> *I really enjoy writing essays or compositions on my own so that I can evaluate how good I am at writing in terms of ideas, grammar and vocabulary. I write at least 3 essays a week.* (Student 1)

> *I watch series and movies in English. Most of the time, I try to find the English subtitles of the things I watch.* (Student 2)

> *In general, I love reading books in English. Moreover, I'm reading them loudly in my room. I think it helps me a lot to improve my pronunciation.* (Student 5)

Based on the thematic analysis results, the dominant cognitive strategies turned out to be watching TV series/ movies in English, reading books in English for fun and various writing activities such as essays and diaries.

Compensation Strategies

> *If I see a sentence including new words in a text, I read the sentences just before and after that sentence. In this way, I can guess the meaning of these words.* (Student 1)

> *When I forget a word while speaking English, I try to find its synonym. If I can't find it, I'm just trying to change this word into something else that has a close meaning of that word but most of all I'm trying to find synonyms in English.* (Student 3)

> *Since I have the Turkish version of that word in my mind, I try to remember its meaning in the dictionary. For example, I forgot the word pencil. A tool for writing on paper.* (Student 6)

Based on the thematic analysis results, the dominant compensation strategies turned out to be expressing oneself in different words and guessing based on clues.

Metacognitive Strategies

> *After certain periods of studying English, I talk to foreigners in English so that I reflect on my performance by asking the question 'Have I improved myself or run around in circles?'* (Student 1)

> *I observe my progress by looking at my Twitter account. For example, I used to tweet in advanced level English in the past. Then, after some time, I could have some difficulty in understanding my own tweets. But I have recently started to understand them again.* (Student 2)

> *I make use of online sources, coursebooks, reading texts and songs in English when I study on my own.* (Student 4)

Based on the thematic analysis results, the dominant metacognitive strategies turned out to be managing time efficiently for self-study, various ways of observation on progress, having goals, reading in English as much as possible, different ways to use English and awareness about weaknesses.

Affective Strategies

> *I try to get motivated on my own through self-talk. I say to myself, 'You can do it. You don't have to use the dictionary. You will handle it one way or another.'* (Student 1)

> *Sometimes I utter complicated sentences while trying to combine grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. However, most of the time I try to keep speaking without thinking if my sentences are grammatical or not.* (Student 4)

> *Even if I get nervous while speaking English, I keep communicating in English by using fillers and summarizing my ideas instead of keeping silent, so I say to myself 'You see that you're speaking. You are doing well'.* (Student 6)

Based on the thematic analysis results, the dominant affective strategies turned out to be awareness about feelings, self-encouragement and having different reasons to get motivated to keep learning.

Social Strategies

> *I do my best to talk with foreigners in English. For example, I have many friends from different countries at school. I'm improving my speaking skills thanks to these friends.* (Student 1)

> *I speak English with my teachers and classmates. Also, my other friends outside school speak English with me because they know English very well, so I am trying to learn from them. It has really helped me improve my speaking skills.* (Student 3)

> *Watching English or American series has helped me learn about the target culture because they are generally related to daily life.* (Student 4)

Based on the thematic analysis results, the dominant social strategies turned out to be practicing English with others and asking for help and feedback.

The findings presented above are in line with those of Griffiths (2003), Aslan (2009), Suwanarak (2012), Demirel (2012), Aydoğdu (2014), Solak and Çakır (2015),

Çetinkaya (2017), Nurmela (2017), Balcı and Üğüten (2018) and Abdul-Ghafour and Alrefaee (2019) where it was also found that the students with better language performance utilized LLS more frequently than the students with poor performance. To give an example, Suwanarak (2012) made use of self-ratings to determine the Thai participants' language learning achievement and found that the amount and frequency of LLS use increased as the self-assessment level got higher. In her study with Turkish preparatory school students, Demirel (2012) took account of their final grades and stated a significant and positive correlation between the LLS use and success. Aydoğdu (2014) reached the achievement scores of the participants by giving the Key English Test of Cambridge University. It was revealed that there was a positive and significant relationship between achievement and strategy use both in total and by category.

The findings of the earlier studies also correspond with what was obtained in the current study regarding the strategy preferences of more successful participants. The students with higher achievement scores in Aydoğdu's (2014) study also reported using metacognitive strategies most frequently and affective strategies least frequently. Similarly, Çetinkaya (2017) revealed that high achievers employed LLS more frequently than low achievers in terms of strategy use in total and by category. Balcı and Üğüten (2018) also stated that the use of cognitive, compensation and metacognitive strategies was positively correlated with the EFL students' achievement. These findings that are mostly consistent with the ones presented above indicate that more successful language learners are good at coordinating their learning process, manipulating the target language and making up deficiencies in knowledge. In this regard, Griffiths (2003) asserted that such learners are more interested in employing sophisticated and interactive strategies rather than superficial and one-sided strategies. This might be one reason why the high achievers reported using cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies with a high frequency while utilizing memory strategies less frequently. All in all, as Chamot (2004) expressed, language learners with a higher success level are very likely to make use of a wider variety and a vast number of strategies.

Regarding the relationship in question, it is also essential to consider the other side of the coin. There are a relatively small number of studies whose findings indicated that the difference between high achievers and low achievers is more about a matter of

quality rather than quantity, namely how learners manipulate their existing strategies (Çakır (2012), Vann and Abraham (1990)). In this regard, Macaro (2006) attributed successful learning to the "orchestration of strategies" that learners possess rather than how often they use them. Griffiths and Cansiz (2015) also state that successful strategy use is not solely dependent on the number or frequency. Similarly, Oxford (1990) emphasized that choosing and utilizing LLS appropriately according to certain points such as task requirements and context result in achievement. From this perspective, it might be suggested that the high achievers are not only highly active strategy users but also successful at orchestrating their strategies effectively. The low achievers, on the other hand, reported using LLS with a low-medium frequency. This finding might indicate that they are not familiar with most of the strategies included in the SILL. These learners could lack awareness about how to use the strategies that they have already possessed properly as well. Last but not least, despite the huge amount of research on LLS and success, the key question of which one causes the other still remains unanswered because of the complex nature of language learning. In an attempt to shed light on this matter, Griffiths (2018) proposed that their relationship is somewhat spiral. To illustrate, a rich vocabulary supports enhanced reading, better communication and self-confidence that provide the learner with more vocabulary, new input and encouragement that lead him to produce more in the target language in return, and so on. She came up with the term 'Tornado Effect' to refer to this process.

4.3. Language Learning Strategy Use and Proficiency Level

The third research question was about whether EFL learners' use of language learning strategies differs across different proficiency levels. First, the descriptive statistics were run in order to obtain the means of strategy use by category and in total for each level. As shown in Table 4.3.4, it turned out that the overall strategy use rises as the proficiency level increases (M = 3.18, M = 3.29, M = 3.33). On the other hand, the means of overall strategy use indicate a medium usage across all the levels according to Oxford's scale. When strategy use is taken into consideration by category, the participants at the intermediate and upper intermediate levels reported employing social strategies most frequently while the participants at the elementary level prefer metacognitive strategies the most (M = 3.67, M = 3.77; M = 3.53 respectively). In line

with the findings regarding the first research question, the students at all levels reported using memory and affective strategies less frequently (*M* = 2.96, *M* = 2.86; *M* = 2.91, *M* = 2.93; *M* = 2.98, *M* = 2.83 respectively).

Table 4.3.4: LLS Use across Proficiency Levels

Strategy Type	*Level*	*N*	*Mean*	*Std. Deviation*
Memory	Elementary	208	2.96	.62
	Intermediate	95	2.91	.57
	Upper Intermediate	51	2.98	.65
Cognitive	Elementary	208	3.12	.59
	Intermediate	95	3.27	.56
	Upper Intermediate	51	3.36	.53
Compensation	Elementary	208	3.23	.66
	Intermediate	95	3.40	.72
	Upper Intermediate	51	3.56	.63
Metacognitive	Elementary	208	3.53	.72
	Intermediate	95	3.61	.63
	Upper Intermediate	51	3.49	.71
Affective	Elementary	208	2.86	.67
	Intermediate	95	2.93	.66
	Upper Intermediate	51	2.83	.62
Social	Elementary	208	3.43	.67
	Intermediate	95	3.67	.68
	Upper Intermediate	51	3.77	.65
Overall	Elementary	208	3.18	.49
	Intermediate	95	3.29	.47
	Upper Intermediate	51	3.33	.47

Levene's test showed that the variances were equal across the groups in terms of strategy use both by category and in total. Therefore, one-way ANOVAs were performed in order to compare the means of three groups both by category and in total. As shown in Table 4.3.5, it turned out that there were no significant differences between the groups with regard to overall strategy use ($F(2, 351) = 2.556$, $p = .079$) but there were significant differences between the groups in terms of cognitive, compensation and social strategy use ($F(2, 351) = 4.386$, $p = .013$; $F(2, 351) = 5.832$, $p = .003$; $F(2, 351) = 7.340$, $p = .001$ respectively).

Table 4.3.5: Comparison of the Means across Proficiency Levels

Strategy Type		*Sum of Squares*	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*Sig. (2-tailed)*
Memory	Between Groups	.228	2	.114	.300	.741
	Within Groups	133.435	351	.380		
	Total	133.663	353			
Cognitive	Between Groups	2.957	2	1.479	4.386	.013
	Within Groups	118.321	351	.337		
	Total	121.278	353			
Compensation	Between Groups	5.365	2	2.682	5.832	.003
	Within Groups	161.428	351	.460		
	Total	51	353			
Metacognitive	Between Groups	.614	2	.307	.624	.536
	Within Groups	172.730	351	.492		
	Total	173.344	353			
Affective	Between Groups	.503	2	.251	.573	.564
	Within Groups	153.885	351	.438		
	Total	154.388	353			
Social	Between Groups	6.691	2	3.345	7.340	.001
	Within Groups	159.972	351	.456		
	Total	166.663	353			
Overall	Between Groups	1.224	2	.612	2.556	.079
	Within Groups	84.034	351	.239		
	Total	85.258	353			

A Tukey's test for post-hoc analysis was carried out to see specifically where these differences lie. The results indicated that the means of the students at the upper intermediate level were significantly higher than the means of the students at the elementary level in terms of cognitive and compensation strategy use (p = .026 and p = .005 respectively). Regarding social strategy use, the means of the students at the intermediate and upper intermediate levels were significantly higher than the means of the students at the elementary level (p = .015 and p = .004 respectively) while there was not such a difference between the two top proficiency levels.

In this regard, the findings presented above are in line with those of Green and Oxford (1995), Bremner (1999), Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006), Lee and Oxford (2008), Lai

(2009), Yılmaz (2010), Salahshour, Sharifi and Salahshour (2013), Alhaisoni (2012), Erarslan and Höl (2014) and Kunasaraphan (2015) to a certain extent. To begin with, Green and Oxford (1995) stated that students with a higher proficiency level employed a greater number of strategies. They also found that the use of cognitive, compensation, social and metacognitive strategies significantly increased with the level that almost matches what was obtained in the present study. In a study with university freshmen in Thailand, Kunasaraphan (2015) reported a steady increase in LLS use from low to high level of proficiency as well as the significantly more utilization of social strategies by the participants with medium and high levels. In their study with Turkish EFL learners at elementary, pre-intermediate and intermediate levels in a preparatory school, Erarslan and Höl (2014) focused on the overall LLS use only. They found a slight increase in the participants' strategy use with the level although there was no statistically meaningful difference among these groups as in the present study. On the other hand, in Hong-Nam and Leavell's (2006) study, the participants' strategy preferences show certain similarities to those of the participants in the present study. To illustrate, in both studies, the participants with the lowest level of proficiency reported employing metacognitive strategies most frequently and affective strategies least frequently while the participants with the highest level of proficiency reported using social strategies most frequently and memory strategies least frequently. In his study with the university students majoring in English, Yılmaz (2010) determined their proficiency levels based on their self-efficacy, and divided them into three groups as poor, fair and good. It turned out that the participants with the highest self-efficacy reported employing significantly more cognitive, compensation and metacognitive strategies than their counterparts with the lowest self-efficacy that is mostly consistent with the present study. Radwan (2011) made use of grade point averages to identify the participants' proficiency levels and found that the more proficient students used overall LLS more frequently. Lastly, in his study with university students in Hong Kong, Tam (2013) used the results of an English exam that is based on four basic language skills as a proficiency indicator. It turned out that the participants with a better command of English employed significantly more LLS, particularly compensation, cognitive and social strategies that corresponds exactly with what was found in the present study.

With the data collection procedure for the present study in mind, it would be illuminating to take a look at three possible ways that Bremner (1999: 505) came up with regarding the interpretation of the relationship in question. First, learning strategies might be considered as the consequences of proficiency; as a result, this claim would shift the focus towards the ways to increase proficiency. Secondly, it might be argued that employing learning strategies ultimately results in greater proficiency; however, it would be too assertive due to the lack of powerful evidence. The last and the most plausible way of interpretation is based on the suggestion made by Green and Oxford (1995). According to this, there is a bidirectional relationship between these two points in which LLS use helps learners increase their proficiency that gives them more opportunities to employ a wider range of strategies in return. In this regard, the participants at the upper intermediate level might be using significantly more cognitive strategies than the participants at the elementary level because their proficiency could allow them to manipulate and transform the target language in more diverse situations in which they have ended up improving their command of English. Accordingly, the greater knowledge of language and increased confidence in making up for the deficiencies to maintain communication in English could be the underlying reasons behind the significant superiority that upper-intermediate students had over the elementary students in terms of compensation and social strategy use.

Our findings on metacognitive strategy use, however, imply that all the participants were quite active in managing their learning process. It could be because of the course book used at each level that supports self-monitoring and self-assessment and the tight schedule throughout the whole year that necessitates all the students organizing their studies properly. Lastly, as in the first research question, memory and affective strategies seem to be relatively unpopular at each proficiency level. This might be explained by the unappealing memory strategies in the SILL and the lack of awareness about how to control feelings.

4.4. Language Learning Strategy Use and Gender

The last research question was about whether there is any difference between male and female students' use of language learning strategies. The descriptive statistics showed

that the mean score of the female students was higher than that of the male students in terms of overall LLS use (*M* = 3.31 vs *M* = 3.14). The results also suggested that the female employ metacognitive and social strategies at a high level (*M* = 3.70 and *M* = 3.59 respectively), whereas the male do not use any strategy type at this level. On the other hand, the mean scores of both genders indicated overall strategy use at a medium level based on Oxford's scale.

Independent samples t-tests were performed in order to compare the means of strategy use by category and in total for each gender. Levene's test showed that the variances were equal across the two genders in terms of strategy use both by category and in total. As shown in Table 4.4.6, it turned out that the female participants employ significantly more overall strategies compared to the male participants ($t(352) = 3.382$, $p = .001$). When LLS use is taken into consideration by category, the female participants seem to have significant superiority over their male counterparts in terms of memory ($t(352) = 3.552$, $p = .000$), cognitive ($t(352) = 2.370$, $p = .018$), metacognitive ($t(352) = 4.686$, $p = .000$) and affective ($t(352) = 2.077$, $p = .039$) strategies.

Table 4.4.6: LLS Use and Gender

Strategy Type	*Gender*	*N*	*Mean*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*Sig. (2-tailed)*
Memory	Female	188	3.05	.58	3.552	352	.000
	Male	166	2.83	.62			
Cognitive	Female	188	3.27	.57	2.370	352	.018
	Male	166	3.12	.59			
Compensation	Female	188	3.32	.68	.075	352	.940
	Male	166	3.32	.68			
Metacognitive	Female	188	3.70	.65	4.686	352	.000
	Male	166	3.36	.71			
Affective	Female	188	2.94	.64	2.077	352	.039
	Male	166	2.80	.67			
Social	Female	188	3.59	.68	1.455	352	.147
	Male	166	3.49	.69			

Overall	Female	188	3.31	.48	3.382	352	.001
	Male	166	3.14	.48			

The differences between male and female learners in terms of strategy use have been either the focal point or one aspect of numerous LLS-related studies. In this regard, the findings presented above are in line with those of Chang, Liu and Lee (2007), Aslan (2009), Çakır (2012), Demirel (2012), Tam (2013), Xue (2015) and Akmençe (2019) to a great extent. To begin with, in his study with English preparatory school students who were at the same proficiency level, Aslan (2009) found that the female participants employed significantly more overall strategies than the male participants. In terms of the strategy use by category, the female had significant superiority over the male in terms of memory, metacognitive and social strategy use. In their studies with Taiwanese and Chinese EFL learners at university level, Chang, Liu and Lee (2007) and Xue (2015) pointed to the fact that the female students in both groups used cognitive, metacognitive, social and overall strategies more frequently than their male counterparts did. Within similar contexts in Turkey, Akmençe (2019) and Demirel (2012) made use of the SILL to investigate the relationship in question. Akmençe (2019) reported that the female outperformed the male by employing all the strategy types significantly more frequently. Demirel (2012) revealed the superiority of the female in the utilization of all the categories except for compensation strategies. Çakır (2012) utilized a different tool named the English Language Learning Strategy Inventory and developed by Griffiths (2003) to identify strategy preferences of EFL learners at a university in Turkey. It also turned out that gender was significantly correlated to LLS use, and the female had a higher frequency than the male in this regard.

The nature of gender makes it essential to consider existing justifications in the field when uncovering the possible reasons behind the female's superiority in question. Oxford, Nyikos and Ehrman (1988: 324) pointed out that women might be more inclined to "desire signs of social approval such as good grades" and "fit in with conventional norms, both linguistic and academic". As a consequence, they could apply LLS more frequently to be able to sharpen their language skills and sustain the learning process at higher concentration level. In their study with Turkish university students, Öztürk and Gürbüz (2013: 661) revealed that the female students had a higher

level of motivation for learning English and attributed it to the desire to have a more qualified status in society by representing a good command of a foreign language as one requirement for such a life. It also turned out that the female students expressed a significantly higher level of speaking anxiety. These two findings might account for why the female participants in the present study reported employing overall LLS and particularly affective strategies significantly more frequently than their male counterparts. On the other hand, the learning materials and curriculum of preparatory school that encourage all the students, regardless of their proficiency levels and genders, to communicate in English through a wide variety of activities could explain why the male reported using social strategies almost as often as the female did. Accordingly, both groups might have felt the need to come up with different ways to maintain communication in English in such activities despite deficiencies in knowledge. This situation might shed light on why the male reported employing compensation strategies just as often as the female did.

Regarding the difference in question, it is also necessary to consider the other side of the coin. A number of studies showed that there were not any significant differences between the genders in terms of LLS use (Radwan, 2011; Erarslan and Höl, 2014; Seng and Khleang, 2014). Moreover, Dawadi (2017) pointed out that the male preferred compensation, social and affective strategies while the female opted for cognitive and metacognitive strategies significantly more frequently. In this regard, Green and Oxford (1995: 291) pointed to learning styles, sources of motivation and attitudes to justify the differences in strategy choices of both genders. All in all, it would be more reasonable to adopt a broader perspective to generalize about LLS preferences by involving other individual and contextual factors in addition to gender.

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

The main purpose of this chapter is to provide concluding remarks on the present study. It starts by presenting a brief overview of the study. Then, the chapter touches on the pedagogical implications and limitations of the study. Finally, a number of suggestions are offered for further studies.

5.1. Overview of the Study

Individual differences can account for the differences in achievement between the language learners who receive the same education through the same sources in the same setting. Considered one of these differences, language learning strategies (LLS) stand out as being the most manageable on the way to success (Ma and Oxford, 2014: 103). In this regard, the present study focused on LLS use and academic achievement of the preparatory school students at a foundation university in Turkey. The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) developed by Oxford (1990) was utilized to find out the strategy preferences of the participants, and their final grades were taken into consideration as a criterion for success. In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted to support the self-reported strategy use in the inventory.

First of all, the participants reported employing overall strategies at a moderate level according to Oxford's (1990) interpretation. While metacognitive and social strategies were the most frequently used strategies with a high frequency, affective strategies were the least frequently used strategies with a low-medium frequency. These findings are in consistent with those of the majority of the previous studies such as Demirel (2012), Tam (2013) and Dawadi (2017). Secondly, the study revealed a significant positive relationship between language achievement and strategy use. In other words, the high achievers reported using significantly more strategies than the low achievers in terms of strategy use both by category and in total. Furthermore, the interviewees who were all high achievers gave a considerable number of responses which reflected the use of a wide range of language learning strategies. Contributing to the field of

good language learners, these findings are in line with those of some of the previous studies such as Aslan (2009), Çetinkaya (2017) and Abdul-Ghafour and Alrefaee (2019). Thirdly, it turned out that overall strategy use rose slightly as the proficiency level increased. Furthermore, the students with the highest proficiency level preferred significantly more cognitive, compensation and social strategies than the students with the lowest proficiency level. Interestingly, memory and affective strategies were the least frequently used strategies at all levels. These findings confirm those of a number of previous studies such as Radwan (2011), Tam (2013) and Erarslan and Höl (2014). Finally, the study found a significant difference between genders in favor of the female in terms of overall strategy use. The female participants also reported using memory, cognitive, metacognitive and affective strategies significantly more frequently than the male participants. These findings are in agreement with those of some of the previous studies such as Demirel (2012), Tam (2013) and Xue (2015). In the light of the findings of the present study, a number of implications are explained below.

5.2. Pedagogical Implications

Based on the findings, the present study offers several suggestions on how to facilitate and enhance language learning. First of all, language learning strategies are widely known for their vital role in promoting language learning, coping with difficulties, and turning the learning process into a pleasant experience (Cohen, 2014; Lin, Zhang and Zheng, 2017). Taking the moderate use of overall LLS among the participants into consideration, the incorporation of strategies in language classes and learning materials could make a dramatic difference in raising students' awareness about these powerful tools. Their familiarity with LLS might eventually transform them into more independent, conscious, confident and competent learners. Furthermore, given the least frequently used strategies, language instructors had better ponder how their students store and retrieve new information, and whether they have control over emotions and attitudes throughout the learning process. Following the identification of their students' weaknesses, educators could come up with detailed recommendations on the use of appropriate strategies. In this regard, Rubin (2013: 2-3) pointed out six fundamental principles of strategy instruction.

- Contextualization: Strategies are introduced in accordance with specific goals to be achieved in a lesson.
- Scaffolding: The dominant role of the teacher in strategy use gradually disappears as language learners raise their awareness about where to use which strategies.
- Explicitness: Direct instruction is considered effective in teaching how and why strategies are used in language learning.
- Choice: Offering language learners options about the materials to use and the objectives to set promote their self-management skills.
- Control: Strategy instruction must primarily aim to help language learners gain control over their learning.
- Relevance: Strategies are introduced by considering the problems language learners face.

Based on the findings of the present study, strategy use seems to enhance the performance in the target language considerably. Accordingly, instructors could support underachievers by making them familiar with LLS. Moreover, as Khalil (2005: 115) stated, educational materials can be designed by taking account of the differences in LLS use across proficiency levels. To illustrate, the textbooks used at an elementary level may include a great number of activities which require learners to collaborate with their classmates or strategy-related sections which promote the use of social strategies. The present study also revealed that the female participants significantly outperform the male participants in terms of the use of certain strategy types. Consequently, gender might be another factor to take into consideration when training language learners to become active strategy users. To set an example, language teachers could come up with certain tasks that raise male students' awareness about their responsibility for their own learning such as writing a reflection on their weekly progress. Last but not least, educators must bear in mind that there could be other variables which shape LLS use and achievement. In this regard, Griffiths (2018: 338) highlighted the importance of strategy orchestration as the use of more LLS does not necessarily lead to desired outcomes. Therefore, a number of factors such as task requirements, context and age must be taken into consideration before designing a strategy training program.

5.3. Limitations of the Study

The present study has a number of limitations in terms of sample size and data collection tools. First of all, this study is limited to the preparatory school students at a foundation university. As the organizational culture and learning context might affect students' attitudes towards language learning, it would be improper to make a generalization based on the available data. Secondly, the majority of the participants were at elementary level while there were a relatively smaller number of participants at intermediate and upper intermediate levels. In addition, although there was a balance between the number of male and female participants in the whole group, it was not the same case among high achievers, which precluded the investigation of possible gender differences among more successful learners. On the other hand, despite the presence of participants with various nationalities, the inadequate number of foreigners made it unfeasible to examine the role of cultural background and mother tongue in strategy use. Regarding the data collection tools, the final grades were given based on the assessment criteria of the preparatory school instead of an internationally recognized examination. Finally, only six high achievers accepted to participate in the interview, whereas no low achievers were interested. A greater number of interviewees from both groups would provide more profound insights into the issue in question.

5.4. Suggestions for Further Studies

In the light of the findings and limitations of the present study, it is possible to make a number of suggestions for further research on language learning strategies. First of all, a similar study can be conducted in other preparatory schools in order to reveal whether LLS use is positively associated with achievement when language learners in different learning contexts are assessed based on different criteria. Moreover, future studies could obtain more qualitative data through interviews with both low and high achievers to amplify participants' responses to the questionnaire. Since the success in the target language does not depend only on learning strategies, it would yield more beneficial results to focus on the role of other individual differences such as language aptitude and anxiety in language learning. In addition, the number of foreign students learning

English in preparatory schools in Turkey is increasing day by day. This situation might be a good opportunity to investigate how decisive learners' cultural background and mother tongue are in terms of strategy choice. The present study along with the previous ones shed light on the most and least popular strategies among university students in Turkey. The future research could aim to detect the underlying reasons behind the rare use of certain strategy types, i.e., memory and affective strategies. Instructors' awareness and attitudes about LLS might be another research subject because they are expected to guide their students through challenging times in language learning. Lastly, the language textbooks used in preparatory schools could be analyzed so as to discover their strengths and weaknesses in terms of promoting strategy use.

As a final comment, individual differences must be kept in mind when studying what leads to success in mastering a second/ foreign language. Furthermore, researchers should strive to provide insights about how these differences interact with one another and impact on learners' performance. In this way, language teachers and textbook authors could gain more awareness about the variables that are influential in shaping the learning process and take right actions in order to assist students in coping with challenges. In this regard, it is hoped that the findings of the present study will contribute to the body of knowledge about the relationship between language learning strategies and achievement.

REFERENCES

Abdul-Ghafour, A. Q. K. M., & Alrefaee, Y. (2019). The Relationship between Language Learning Strategies and Achievement among EFL University Students in Yemen. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal, 3*(3), 64-83.

Adams, W. C. (2015). Conducting Semi-Structured Interviews. In K. E. Newcomer, H. P. Hatry & J. S. Wholey (Eds.), *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 492-505.

Akmençe, E. (2019). *Investigation of University Preparatory Class Students' Foreign Language Learning Strategies in terms of Different Variables* (Unpublished MA Dissertation). Inonu University, Malatya.

Algan, N. (2006). *The language learning strategies used by the university preparatory students and the instructors' awareness of their students' use of these strategies* (Unpublished MA Dissertation). Marmara University, İstanbul.

Alhaisoni, E. (2012). Language learning strategy use of Saudi EFL students in an intensive English learning context. *Asian Social Science, 8*(13), 115-127.

Alhaysony, M. (2017). Language learning strategies use by Saudi EFL students: The effect of duration of English language study and gender. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 7*(1), 18-28.

Al-Qahtani, M. F. (2013). Relationship between English Language, Learning Strategies, Attitudes, Motivation, and Students' Academic Achievement. *Education in Medicine Journal, 5*(3), 19-29.

Aslan, O. (2009). *The role of gender and language learning strategies in learning English* (Unpublished MA Dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

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, 15*(3), 291-305.

Aydoğdu, Ç. (2014). *The Relationship Between Foreign Language Learning Anxiety, Attitude toward English Language, Language Learning Strategies and Foreign Language Achievement* (Unpublished MA Dissertation). Atatürk University, Erzurum.

Balcı, Ö., & Üğüten, S. D. (2018). The Relationship between EFL Learners' Language Learning Strategy Use and Achievement. *International Education Studies, 11*(2), 1-12.

Batstone, R. (2002). Making sense of new language: A discourse perspective. *Language Awareness, 11*(1), 14-29.

Bialystok, E. (1983). Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*, London: Longman, 100-118.

Bo, C. (2015). Social constructivism of language and meaning. *Croatian Journal of Philosophy*, *15*(43), 87-113.

Bremner, S. (1999). Language learning strategies and language proficiency: Investigating the relationship in Hong Kong. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *55*(4), 490-514.

Brown, H. D. (2002). *Strategies for Success: A Practical Guide to Learning English*. New York: Pearson Education.

Bruen, J. (2001). Strategies for success: Profiling the Effective Learner of German. *Foreign Language Annals*, *34*(3), 216-225.

Carrier, K. A. (2003). Improving high school English language learners' second language listening through strategy instruction. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *27*(3), 383-408.

Cesur, M. O., & Fer, S. (2007). Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanterinin Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması Nedir? *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *4*(2), 49-74.

Cesur, M. O., & Fer, S. (2011). A model explaining relationships between language learning strategies, learning styles and success in reading comprehension. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, *41*, 83-93.

Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in language learning strategy research and teaching. *Electronic journal of foreign language teaching*, *1*(1), 14-26.

Chamot, A. U. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: Current issues and research. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, *25*, 112-130.

Chang, C. Y., Liu, S. C., & Lee, Y. N. (2007). A study of language learning strategies used by college EFL learners in Taiwan. *Ming-Dao Journal of General Education*, *2*, 235-262.

Chen, M. L. (2014). Age differences in the use of language learning strategies. *English Language Teaching*, *7*(2), 144-151.

Chomsky, N. (1959). A review of B. F. Skinner's Verbal Behavior. *Language*, *35*(1), 26-58.

Cohen, A. D. (2014). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Routledge.

Collentine, J., & Freed, B. F. (2004). Learning context and its effects on second language acquisition: Introduction. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *26*(2), 153-171.

Çakır, Y. (2012). *The relationship between language learning strategies and success for Turkish university preparatory students* (Unpublished MA Dissertation). Yeditepe University, İstanbul.

Çetinkaya, G. (2017). *The relationship among language learning strategies, motivation and academic achievement of university preparatory school students* (Unpublished MA Dissertation). Abant İzzet Baysal University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Bolu.

Dawadi, S. (2017). Language learning strategies profiles of EFL learners in Nepal. *European Journal of Educational and Social Sciences, 2*(2), 42-55.

Demirel, M. (2012). Language learning strategies of undergraduate students. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 43*, 141-153.

Di Carlo, S. (2017). Understanding cognitive language learning strategies. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 6*(2), 114-126.

Dobosh, M. A. (2017). Survey: Demographic Questions. In M. Allen (Ed.), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*, Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc., 1702-1704.

Doró, K., & Habók, 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.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. Routledge.

Dörnyei, Z., & Skehan, P. (2003). Individual differences in Second Language Learning. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell, 589-630.

Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2009). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing.* Routledge.

Dunn, R., & Griggs, S. (1988). *Learning styles: Quiet Revolution in American Secondary Schools*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary Principles.

Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *The modern language journal, 73*(1), 1-13.

Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1995). Cognition Plus: Correlates of Language Learning Success. *The modern language journal, 79*(1), 67-89.

Ehrman, M. E., Leaver, B. L., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning. *System, 31*(3), 313-330.

El Aouri, Z., & Zerhouni, B. (2017). Motivation and language learning strategies used by Moroccan university EFL science students: A correlational study. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), 8*(2). 52-73.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Clarendon St. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2015). *Understanding second language acquisition 2nd Edition-Oxford applied linguistics.* Oxford university press.

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, 2*(2), 1-10.

Fedderholdt, K. (1998). Using Diaries to Develop Language Learning Strategies. Retrieved from https://jalt-publications.org/old_tlt/files/98/apr/fedderholdt.html.

Gao, X. (2003). Changes in Chinese students' learner strategy use after arrival in the UK: A Qualitative Inquiry. In D. Palfreyman & R. C. Smith (Eds.), *Learner Autonomy across Cultures*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 41-57.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Ghafournia, N. (2014). Language Learning Strategy Use and Reading Achievement. *English Language Teaching, 7*(4), 64-73.

Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(2), 261-297.

Griffiths, C. (2003). *Language learning strategy use and proficiency: The relationship between patterns of reported language learning strategy (LLS) use by speakers of other languages (SOL) and proficiency with implications for the teaching/learning situation* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). The University of Auckland.

Griffiths, C. (2007). Language learning strategies: students' and teachers' perceptions. *ELT Journal, 61*(2), 91-99.

Griffiths, C. (2008). Strategies and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 83-98.

Griffiths, C. (2015). What have we learnt from 'good language learners'?. *ELT Journal, 69*(4), 425-433.

Griffiths, C. (2018). *The strategy factor in successful language learning: The tornado effect*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Griffiths, C., & Cansiz, G. (2015). Language learning strategies: A holistic view. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 5*(3), 473-493.

Griffiths, C., & İnceçay, G. (2016). Styles and style-stretching: How are they related to successful learning? *Journal of psycholinguistic research, 45*(3), 599-613.

Griffiths, C., & Oxford, R. L. (2014). The twenty-first century landscape of language learning strategies: Introduction to this special issue. *System, 43*, 1-10.

Gu, Y. (2012). Language Learning Strategies: An EIL Perspective. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. McKay, G. Hu, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and Practices for Teaching English as an International Language*, London: Routledge, 318-334.

Habók, A., & Magyar, A. (2018). The Effect of Language Learning Strategies on Proficiency, Attitudes and School Achievement. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 2358.

Hardan, A. A. (2013). Language Learning Strategies: A General Overview. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 106*, 1712-1726.

Hismanoglu, M. (2000). Language learning strategies in foreign language learning and teaching. *The Internet TESL Journal, 6*(8), 12-12.

Hong-Nam, K., & Leavell, A. G. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System, 34*(3), 399-415.

Hsiao, T. Y., & Oxford, R. L. (2002). Comparing theories of language learning strategies: A confirmatory factor analysis. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*(3), 368-383.

Hsieh, A. F. Y. (2014). The effect of cultural background and language proficiency on the use of oral communication strategies by second language learners of Chinese. *System, 45*, 1-16.

Hu, R. (2016). The age factor in second language learning. *Theory and practice in language studies, 6*(11), 2164-2168.

Ismail, S. A. A., & Al Khatib, A. Z. (2013). Investigating the Language Learning Strategies of Students in the Foundation Program of United Arab Emirates University. *International Education Studies, 6*(9), 135-149.

Kałdonek-Crnjaković, A. (2018). Teaching and researching language learning strategies: self-regulation in context. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 28*(2). 350-352.

Khalil, A. (2005). Assessment of language learning strategies used by Palestinian EFL learners. *Foreign Language Annals, 38*(1), 108-117.

Khamkhien, A. (2010). Factors affecting language learning strategy reported usage by Thai and Vietnamese EFL learners. *Electronic Journal of foreign Language teaching, 7*(1), 66-85.

Kim, Y.M. (1995). The effect of gender and learning context on the use of language learning strategies. *English Teaching, 50*(2), 331-345.

Kunasaraphan, K. (2015). English learning strategy and proficiency level of the first year students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 197,* 1853-1858. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.246

Lai, Y. C. (2009). Language learning strategy use and English proficiency of university freshmen in Taiwan. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(2), 255-280.

Leaver, B. L., Ehrman, M., & Shekhtman, B. (2005). *Achieving success in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, C. K. (2010). An Overview of Language Learning Strategies. *Annual Review of Education, Communication & Language Sciences, 7*, 132-152.

Lee, K. R., & Oxford, R. (2008). Understanding EFL learners' strategy use and strategy awareness. *Asian EFL Journal, 10*(1), 7-32.

Lessard-Clouston, M. (1997). Language learning strategies: An overview for L2 teachers. *The Internet TESL journal, 3*(12), 6-16.

Lin, C. H., Zhang, Y., & Zheng, B. (2017). The roles of learning strategies and motivation in online language learning: A structural equation modeling analysis. *Computers & Education, 113*, 75-85.

Liu, D. (2004). EFL proficiency, gender and language learning strategy use among a group of Chinese technological institute English majors. *ARECLS e-Journal, 1*, 1-15.

Liyanage, I., & Bartlett, B. J. (2012). Gender and language learning strategies: Looking beyond the categories. *The Language Learning Journal, 40*(2), 237-253.

Locastro, V. (1994). Learning Strategies and Learning Environments. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(2), 409-414.

Ma, R., & Oxford, R.L. (2014). A diary study focusing on listening and speaking: The evolving interaction of learning styles and learning strategies in a motivated, advanced ESL learner. *System, 43,* 101-113.

Macaro, E. (2001). *Learning strategies in foreign and second language classrooms: The role of learner strategies*. London: Continuum.

Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: Revising the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(3), 320-337.

Maclntyre, P. D. (1994). Toward a social psychological model of strategy use. *Foreign Language Annals, 27*(2), 185-195.

Martínez, I. M. P. (1996). The Importance of Language Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Teaching. *Cuadernos de Filologia Inglesa, 5*(1). 103-120.

Miladinović, I. Ć. (2014). Language Learning Strategies Used by Adult Learners: Benefits for the Teacher as a Researcher. *Andragogical Studies, 1,* 171-189.

Moeller, A. K., & Catalano, T. (2015). Foreign language teaching and learning. In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.), Oxford: Pergamon Press, 327-333.

Murray, B. (2010). Students' language learning strategy use and achievement in the Korean as a foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 43*(4), 624-634.

Myles, F. (2010). The development of theories of second language acquisition. *Language Teaching, 43*(3), 320-332.

Nasihah, M., & Cahyono, B. (2017). Language learning strategies, motivation, and writing achievement of Indonesian EFL students. *Arab World English Journal, 8*(1), 250-263.

Nikoopour, J., Salimian, S., Salimian, S., & Farsani, M. A. (2012). Motivation and the Choice of Language Learning Strategies. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research, 3*(6). 1277-1283.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge university press.

Nunan, D. (1997). Does learner strategy training make a difference?. *Lenguas Modernas, 24,* 123-142.

Nunan, D. (2015). *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge.

Nurmela, J. (2017). *The Language Learning Strategies of Students at a University of Applied Sciences and How Strategy Use Correlates with Learning Success* (Unpublished MA Dissertation). University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä.

Olivares-Cuhat, G. (2002). Learning strategies and achievement in the Spanish writing classroom: A case study. *Foreign Language Annals, 35*(5), 561-570.

O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge university press.

Oxford, R. L. (1989a). The Role of Styles and Strategies in Second Language Learning. *ERIC Digest*. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED317087.pdf.

Oxford, R. L. (1989b). Use of language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. *System, 17*(2), 235-247.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.

Oxford, R. L. (1994). Language Learning Strategies: An Update. *ERIC Digest*. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED376707.pdf.

Oxford, R. L. (2002). Language Learning Strategies in a Nutshell: Update and ESL Suggestions. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 124-132.

Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Language Learning Strategies*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and Researching Language Learning Strategies: Self-Regulation in Context. (2nd Ed.)* New York: Routledge.

Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System, 23*(1), 1-23.

Oxford, R. L., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The modern language journal, 73*(3), 291-300.

Oxford, R., Nyikos, M., & Ehrman, M. (1988). Vive la Difference? Reflections on sex differences in use of language learning strategies. *Foreign Language Annals, 21*(4), 321-329. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1988.tb01076.x

Öztürk, G., & Gürbüz, N. (2013). The impact of gender on foreign language speaking anxiety and motivation. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70*, 654-665. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.106

Pawlak, M. (Ed.). (2012). *New Perspectives on Individual Differences in Language Learning and Teaching*. Springer.

Politzer, R. L., & McGroarty, M. (1985). An exploratory study of learning behaviors and their relationship to gains in linguistic and communicative competence. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(1), 103-123.

Porte, G. (1988). Poor language learners and their strategies for dealing with new vocabulary. *ELT journal, 42*(3), 167-172.

Radwan, A. A. (2011). Effects of L2 proficiency and gender on choice of language learning strategies by university students majoring in English. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, 13*(1), 114-163.

Reid, J. (1995). *Learning Styles in the ESL/EFL Classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Rose, H. (2012). Reconceptualizing strategic learning in the face of self-regulation: Throwing language learning strategies out with the bathwater. *Applied Linguistics, 33*(1), 92-98.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly, 9*(1), 41-51.

Rubin, J. (1987). Learner Strategies: Theoretical Assumptions, Research History and Typology. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin. (Eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning,* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 15-29.

Rubin, J. (2013). Teaching language-learning strategies. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. DOI: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1165.

Salahshour, F., Sharifi, M., & Salahshour, N. (2013). The relationship between language learning strategy use, language proficiency level and learner gender. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70*, 634-643.

Seliger, H. (1984). Processing universals in second language acquisition. In F. Eckman, L. Bell, D. Nelson (Eds.), *Universals of second language acquisition*, Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 36-47.

Seng, S., & Khleang, S. (2014). Language Learning Strategy Used by Cambodian EEL Students. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 7*(1), 58-67.

Solak, E., & Çakır, R. (2015). Language learning strategies of language e-learners in Turkey. *E-Learning and Digital Media, 12*(1), 107-120.

Stern, H. H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 31*(4), 304-319.

Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Suwanarak, K. (2012). English language learning beliefs, learning strategies and achievement of Masters students in Thailand. *TESOL in Context, S3*, 1-15.

Takeuchi, O. (2003). What can we learn from good foreign language learners? A qualitative study in the Japanese foreign language context. *System, 31*(3), 385-392.

Takeuchi, O., Griffiths, C., & Coyle, D. (2007). Applying strategies to contexts: the role of individual, situational and group differences. In A. D. Cohen & E. Macaro (Eds.), *Language Learner Strategies: Thirty Years of Research and Practice,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 69-92.

Tam, K. C. H. (2013). A study on language learning strategies (LLSs) of university students in Hong Kong. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics, 11*(2), 1-42.

Tarone, E. (1981). Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy. *TESOL Quarterly, 15*(3), 285-295.

Tassinari, M. G. (2018). Teaching and Researching Language Learning Strategies. *ELT Journal, 72*(3), 339-341.

Teitcher, J. E., Bockting, W. O., Bauermeister, J. A., Hoefer, C. J., Miner, M. H., & Klitzman, R. L. (2015). Detecting, preventing, and responding to "fraudsters" in internet research: ethics and tradeoffs. *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 43*(1), 116-133.

Tılfarlıoğlu, F. F. Y., & Bozgeyik, Y. (2012). The Relationship between vocabulary learning strategies and vocabulary proficiency of English language learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 1*(2), 91-101.

Tuan, L. T. (2011). Matching and Stretching Learners' Learning Styles. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research, 2*(2), 285-294.

Vann, R. J., & Abraham, R. G. (1990). Strategies of Unsuccessful Language Learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*(2), 177-198.

Varasarin, P. (2007). *An action research study of pronunciation training, language learning strategies and speaking confidence* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). Victoria University.

Weinstein, C. & Mayer, R. (1986). The Teaching of Learning Strategies. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching,* New York: Macmillan, 315-327.

Wenden, A. (1987). Conceptual Background and Utility. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 3-13.

Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language learning, 50*(2), 203-243.

White, C. (2008). Language learning strategies in independent language learning: An overview. In S. Hurd & T. Lewis (Eds.), *Language learning strategies in independent settings*, North York: Multilingual Matters, 3-24.

Wintergerst, A. C., DeCapua, A., & Verna, M. A. (2003). Conceptualizing learning style modalities for ESL/EFL students. *System, 31*(1), 85-106.

Wong, L. L., & Nunan, D. (2011). The learning styles and strategies of effective language learners. *System, 39*(2), 144-163.

Xue, S. (2015). Language learning strategy use of Chinese EFL students in relation to gender. *Sociology and Anthropology, 3*(5), 259-268.

Yılmaz, C. (2010). The relationship between language learning strategies, gender, proficiency and self-efficacy beliefs: a study of ELT learners in Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*(2), 682-687.

Zare, P. (2012). Language learning strategies among EFL/ESL learners: A review of literature. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 2*(5), 162-169.

Zare, P. (2013). Exploring reading strategy use and reading comprehension success among EFL learners. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 22*(11), 1566-1571.

Zhang, Y., Lin, C. H., Zhang, D., & Choi, Y. (2016). Motivation, strategy, and English as a foreign language vocabulary learning: A structural equation modelling study. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 87*(1), 57-74.

Zhou, M. (2011). Learning Styles and Teaching Styles in College English Teaching. *International Education Studies, 4*(1), 73-77.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts & P. R. Pintrich, (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation,* San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 13-39.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX-A. Ethics Committee Approval

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 13/11/2020-E.3343

İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi

ETİK KURULU BAŞKANLIĞI

Sayı : 20292139-050.01.04
Konu : Etik Kurul Kararları

Sayın İlker TEK
Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı Tezli Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

Kurulumuz 23.10.2020 tarihinde toplanarak, "İngilizce Hazırlık Okulu Öğrencilerinin Dil Öğrenme Stratejilerini Kullanımları ve Başarı Puanlarının İncelenmesi" başlıklı araştırmanızda kullanmak üzere kurula sunmuş olduğunuz Etik Kurul Başvuru Formunuzu onaylayarak imza altına almıştır. Araştırmanızın Etik Kurul Onay Formu ekte yer almaktadır. Bilgilerinizi rica ederim.

e-imzalıdır
Prof. Dr. Nasuh USLU
Kurul Başkanı

Ek: 8-İlker Tek (2 sayfa)

13/11/2020 Yeminli Katip : Zeyneb Funda TEZ

Mevcut Elektronik İmzalar
NASUH USLU (Etik Kurulu Başkanlığı - Kurul Başkanı) 13/11/2020 11:35

Evrakı Doğrulamak İçin : https://ebys.izu.edu.tr/enVision/Dogrula/5UEEDD
Adres :Halkalı Caddesi No: 281 Küçükçekmece/İstanbul
Telefon No : 444 97 98 Faks No: +90 (212) 693 82 29
E-Posta : bilgi@izu.edu.tr İnternet Adresi: www.izu.edu.tr
Kep : izu@hs01.kep.tr

Ayrıntılı Bilgi : Zeyneb Funda TEZ
Unvan : Yeminli Katip
Tel : 2126929606

Bu belge, 5070 sayılı Elektronik İmza Kanununa göre Güvenli Elektronik İmza ile imzalanmıştır.\nEvrak sorgulaması {VALURL} adresinden yap

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 11/11/2020-E.6462

23.10.2020 tarihli ve 2020/10 sayılı Etik Kurulu kararı ekidir.

İstanbul Zaim Üniversitesi	**İSTANBUL SABAHATTİN ZAİM ÜNİVERSİTESİ** **ETİK KURULU**
ARAŞTIRMA ETİK KURUL ONAY FORMU	
Tarih:	23.10.2020
Sayı:	2020/10
Ekler:	EK 1: Başvuru Dilekçesi EK 2: Etik Davranış Beyan Formu EK 3: Etik Kurul Başvuru Formu EK 4: Envanter (2 sayfa) EK 5: Görüşme Soruları (1 sayfa)
Yer:	İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü
İlgi:	Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Müdürlüğünün 13.10.2020 tarihli ve 5667 sayılı yazısı
Katılımcılar:	**1.** Prof. Dr. Nasuh USLU — Kurul Başkanı/ Rektör Yardımcısı **2.** Prof. Dr. Ali GÜNEŞ — Kurul Başkan V./ Müdür V. **3.** Prof. Dr. Mustafa ATEŞ — Üye/Dekan V. **4.** Prof. Dr. Mehmet Emin KÖKTAŞ — Üye/Dekan V. **5.** Prof. Dr. Kadir CANATAN — Üye/Öğretim Üyesi **6.** Prof. Dr. Yahya Kemal YOĞURTÇU — Üye/Öğretim Üyesi **7.** Bilal ŞAMAT — Üye/Raportör
Planlanan araştırma önerisi özeti aşağıdaki gibidir.	
Araştırmanın Niteliği:	Yüksek Lisans Tezi
Araştırmanın Başlığı:	İngilizce Hazırlık Okulu Öğrencilerinin Dil Öğrenme Stratejilerini Kullanımları ve Başarı Puanlarının İncelenmesi
Araştırmacılar ve adres bilgisi:	İlker TEK- İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı Tezli Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi, ilker.tek@izu.edu.tr, 0535 258 22 29
Araştırmanın Süresi (ay):	1 ay
Araştırmanın Amacı:	Bu araştırma, İngilizce Hazırlık Birimi'nde öğrenim gören öğrencilerin kullandıkları dil öğrenme stratejilerini ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca, söz konusu stratejilerin akademik başarı üzerinde herhangi bir etkisi olup olmadığı sorgulanmaktadır. Demografik bilgilerden yola çıkılarak strateji kullanımının cinsiyet ve yeterlik seviyelerine göre farklılık gösterip göstermediği araştırılmaktadır. Araştırma sonuçları, özellikle dil öğrenme sürecini verimsiz geçiren ve bunun sonucunda arzu edilen başarıya ulaşamayan öğrencilerin strateji farkındalığını artırma hususunda önem arz etmektedir. Karma yöntem odaklı olan mevcut çalışma, dil öğrenme stratejileri ve akademik başarı arasındaki ilişkiye üniversite bağlamında dil öğrenen öğrenciler üzerinden odaklanmakta olup değişken sonuçların var olduğu literatüre güncel bulgularıyla zenginlik katacaktır.
Araştırma Etiği:	Araştırmaya kurum izni ve gerekiyorsa veli/vasi izni alındıktan sonra başlanılacaktır. Araştırmada kişisel veri toplanacağından 6698 sayılı Kişisel Verilerin Korunması Kanunu ve ilgili mevzuat uyarınca kişisel verileri korumak amacıyla gerekli tüm tedbirler alınacak, gerekli her türlü yükümlülük özenle yerine getirilecektir. Çalışmanın bilimsel bir araştırma için veri toplamayı amaçladığı, çalışma sonuçlarının sadece bilimsel amaçlarla kullanılacağı, çalışmanın sonuçlarının katılımcıların aleyhine olacak şekilde kullanılmayacağı, çalışmaya katılımın gönüllülük esasına dayandığı, cevapların tamamen gizli tutulacağı,

Bu belge, 5070 sayılı Elektronik İmza Kanununa göre Güvenli Elektronik İmza ile imzalanmıştır.\nEvrak sorgulaması {VALUF

23.10.2020 tarihli ve 2020/10 sayılı Etik Kurulu kararı ekidir.

	çalışmaya katılanların kimliklerini açık edici davranışlardan kaçınılacağı ve çalışmaya katılanların katılım sırasında herhangi bir nedenle rahatsızlık hissetmeleri durumunda istedikleri zaman katılımlarını sona erdirebilecekleri bilgileri çalışma başlamadan katılımcılar ile paylaşılacaktır.
Araştırmada Kullanılacak Ölçme Araçları (adları) ve Kaynakları:	1- Demografik Bilgi Formu (Araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanmıştır.) 2- Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (Oxford, R. (1990) "Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know. Boston. MA: Heinle and Heinle.) 3- Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanteri (Oxford'un Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanteri'nin Türkçe'ye uyarlaması) (Cesur, M. O. & Fer, S. (2007) Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanterinin geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması nedir? Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 4/2, 49-74.) 4- Görüşme Soruları (Araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanmıştır.)
Araştırmaya Katılacak Örneklem Sayısı, Örneklemin Nereden ve Nasıl Seçileceği:	Katılımcı grubunun, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi İngilizce Hazırlık Birimi'nde farklı yeterlik seviyelerinde dil eğitimi gören hem kız hem erkek toplamda 400 öğrenciden oluşması hedeflenmektedir. Envanter bütün öğrencilere uygulanacak olup sonrasında hem daha başarılı hem de daha az başarılı öğrenci gruplarından 10'ar kişi ile bireysel görüşme yapılması planlanmaktadır.
Uygulamanın veya Ölçme Araçlarının Doldurma Süresi	Envanter yaklaşık 10 dakikada tamamlanmaktadır. Görüşmelerin ise katılımcı cevaplarına bağlı olarak yaklaşık 15 dakika süreceği tahmin edilmektedir.
KARAR	**ARAŞTIRMA İSTANBUL SABAHATTİN ZAİM ÜNİVERSİTESİNİN ETİK DURUŞUNA AYKIRI DEĞİLDİR.**

(İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi Etik Kurulu'nun kararı tavsiye niteliğinde olup, üniversitemizle ilgili etik ilkelerinin belirlenmesi ve değerlendirilmesi amacını taşımaktadır.)

Tarih: 23/10/2020

Sayı: 2020/10

İlgi: Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Müdürlüğünün 13.10.2020 tarihli ve 5667 sayılı yazısı

İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi Etik Kurulu tarafından hazırlanmıştır.

e-imzalıdır
Başkan
Prof. Dr. Nasuh USLU

e-imzalıdır
Üye
Prof. Dr. Ali GÜNEŞ

e-imzalıdır
Üye
Prof. Dr. Mustafa ATEŞ

e-imzalıdır
Üye
Prof. Dr. Mehmet Emin KÖKTAŞ

e-imzalıdır
Üye
Prof. Dr. Kadir CANATAN

e-imzalıdır
Üye
Prof. Dr. Yahya Kemal YOĞURTÇU

e-imzalıdır
Üye
Av. Bilal ŞAMAT

2 / 2

APPENDIX-B. Strategy Inventory for Language Learning

Since personal data will be collected in this study, all necessary measures will be taken in order to protect personal data in accordance with the Personal Data Protection Law No.6698 and the relevant legislation, and all necessary obligations will be meticulously fulfilled. The study aims to collect data for scientific research. The findings of the study will only be used for scientific purposes, and the results of the study will not be used against the participants. Participation in the study is voluntary. Your responses will be kept completely confidential, and any behavior that reveals your identity will be avoided. If you feel uncomfortable for any reason while participating in the study, you can terminate your participation at any time.

STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING

This inventory is for students of English. Please read each statement carefully, and circle the right number (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) **according to you**. **There are no right or wrong answers**. It takes almost 10 minutes to fill in the inventory.	**1= Never**	**2= Rarely**	**3= Sometimes**	**4= Usually**	**5= Always**
PART A					
1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help remember the word.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I physically act out new English words.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I review English lessons often.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.	1	2	3	4	5
PART B					
10. I say or write new English words several times.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I try to talk like native English speakers.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I practice the sounds of English.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I use the English words I know in different ways.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I start conversations in English.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I read for pleasure in English.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I try to find patterns in English.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I try not to translate word-for-word.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.	1	2	3	4	5

PART C					
24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.	1	2	3	4	5
25. When I cannot think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I read English without looking up every new word.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.	1	2	3	4	5
29. If I cannot think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.	1	2	3	4	5
PART D					
30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.	1	2	3	4	5
32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I look for people I can talk to in English.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.	1	2	3	4	5
37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.	1	2	3	4	5
38. I think about my progress in learning English.	1	2	3	4	5
PART E					
39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.	1	2	3	4	5
40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.	1	2	3	4	5
41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.	1	2	3	4	5
42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.	1	2	3	4	5
43. I write down my feelings in a language-learning diary.	1	2	3	4	5
44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.	1	2	3	4	5
PART F					
45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.	1	2	3	4	5
46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.	1	2	3	4	5
47. I practice English with other students.	1	2	3	4	5
48. I ask for help from English speakers.	1	2	3	4	5
49. I ask questions in English.	1	2	3	4	5
50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.	1	2	3	4	5

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

Name/ Surname: _____ Level: A1 A2 B1 B1+ B2

Gender : ☐ Female ☐ Male ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Age : _____ Country: _____

APPENDIX-C. Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (Turkish Version)

Araştırmada kişisel veri toplanacağından 6698 sayılı Kişisel Verilerin Korunması Kanunu ve ilgili mevzuat uyarınca kişisel verileri korumak amacıyla gerekli tüm tedbirler alınacak, gerekli her türlü yükümlülük özenle yerine getirilecektir. Çalışma bilimsel bir araştırma için veri toplamayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma sonuçları sadece bilimsel amaçlarla kullanılacak, çalışmanın sonuçları katılımcıların aleyhine olacak şekilde kullanılmayacaktır. Çalışmaya katılım gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır, verdiğiniz cevaplar tamamen gizli tutulacak ve kimliklerinizi açık edici davranışlardan kaçınılacaktır. Çalışmaya katılım sırasında herhangi bir nedenle rahatsızlık hissetmeniz durumunda istediğiniz zaman katılımınızı sona erdirebilirsiniz.

DİL ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ ENVANTERİ

Bu envanterde İngilizce öğrenmeye ilişkin ifadeler okuyacaksınız. Her ifadenin sizin için ne kadar geçerli olduğunu belirtmek adına, derecelendirmeye bakarak, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5' ten birini yuvarlak içine alınız. Verilen ifadenin, nasıl yapmanız gerektiği ya da başkalarının neler yaptığı değil, **sadece sizin** yaptıklarınızı ne kadar tasvir ettiğini işaretleyiniz. Envanterde **doğru ya da yanlış cevap yoktur**. Envanteri cevaplandırmak yaklaşık 10 dakika sürmektedir.	**1= Hiçbir zaman**	**2= Nadiren**	**3= Bazen**	**4= Sık sık**	**5= Her zaman**
BÖLÜM A					
1. İngilizcede bildiklerimle yeni öğrendiklerim arasında ilişki kurarım.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Yeni öğrendiğim kelimeleri hatırlamak için bir cümlede kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Yeni öğrendiğim kelimeleri akılda tutmak için kelimenin telaffuzuyla aklıma getirdiği bir resim ya da şekil arasında bağlantı kurarım.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Yeni bir kelimeyi o sözcüğün kullanılabileceği bir sahneyi ya da durumu aklımda canlandırarak, hatırlarım.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Yeni kelimeleri aklımda tutmak için, onları ses benzerliği olan kelimelerle ilişkilendiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Yeni öğrendiğim kelimeleri aklımda tutmak için küçük kartlara yazarım.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Yeni kelimeleri vücut dili kullanarak zihnimde canlandırırım.	1	2	3	4	5
8. İngilizce derslerinde öğrendiklerimi sık sık tekrar ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Yeni kelime ve kelime gruplarını, ilk karşılaştığım yerleri (kitap, tahta ya da herhangi bir işaret levhasını) aklıma getirerek, hatırlarım.	1	2	3	4	5
BÖLÜM B					
10. Yeni sözcükleri birkaç kez yazarak, ya da söyleyerek, tekrarlarım.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Anadili İngilizce olan kişiler gibi konuşmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Anadilimde bulunmayan İngilizcedeki "**th /θ / hw**" gibi sesleri çıkararak, telaffuz alıştırması yaparım.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Bildiğim kelimeleri cümlelerde farklı şekillerde kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
14. İngilizce sohbetleri ben başlatırım.	1	2	3	4	5
15. TV'de İngilizce programlar ya da İngilizce filmler izlerim.	1	2	3	4	5
16. İngilizce okumaktan hoşlanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
17. İngilizce mesaj, mektup veya rapor yazarım.	1	2	3	4	5
18. İngilizce bir metne ilk başta bir göz atarım, daha sonra metnin tamamını dikkatlice okurum.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce kelimelerin benzerlerini Türkçede ararım.	1	2	3	4	5
20. İngilizcede tekrarlanan kalıplar bulmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
21. İngilizce bir kelimenin, bildiğim kök ve eklerine ayırarak anlamını çıkarırım.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Kelimesi kelimesine çeviri **yapmamaya** çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Dinlediğim ya da okuduğum metnin özetini çıkarırım.	1	2	3	4	5

BÖLÜM C					
24. Bilmediğim İngilizce kelimelerin anlamını, tahmin ederek bulmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
25. İngilizce konuşurken bir sözcük aklıma gelmediğinde, el kol hareketleriyle anlatmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Uygun ve doğru kelimeyi bilmediğim durumlarda kafamdan yeni sözcükler uydururum.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Okurken her bilmediğim kelimeye sözlükten bakmadan, okumayı sürdürürüm.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Konuşma sırasında karşımdakinin söyleyeceği bir sonraki cümleyi tahmin etmeye çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Herhangi bir kelimeyi hatırlayamadığımda, aynı anlamı taşıyan başka bir kelime ya da ifade kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
BÖLÜM D					
30. İngilizcemi kullanmak için her fırsatı değerlendiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
31. Yaptığım yanlışların farkına varır ve bunlardan daha doğru İngilizce kullanmak için faydalanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
32. İngilizce konuşan bir kişi duyduğumda dikkatimi ona veririm.	1	2	3	4	5
33. "İngilizceyi daha iyi nasıl öğrenirim?" sorusunun yanıtını araştırırım.	1	2	3	4	5
34. İngilizce çalışmaya yeterli zaman ayırmak için zamanımı planlarım.	1	2	3	4	5
35. İngilizce konuşabileceğim kişilerle tanışmak için fırsat kollarım.	1	2	3	4	5
36. İngilizce okumak için, elimden geldiği kadar fırsat yaratırım.	1	2	3	4	5
37. İngilizcede becerilerimi nasıl geliştireceğim konusunda hedeflerim var.	1	2	3	4	5
38. İngilizcemi ne kadar ilerlettiğimi değerlendiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
BÖLÜM E					
39. İngilizcemi kullanırken tedirgin ve kaygılı olduğum anlar rahatlamaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Yanlış yaparım diye kaygılandığımda bile İngilizce konuşmaya gayret ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
41. İngilizcede başarılı olduğum zamanlar kendimi ödüllendiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
42. İngilizce çalışırken ya da kullanırken gergin ve kaygılı isem, bunun farkına varırım.	1	2	3	4	5
43. Dil öğrenirken yaşadığım duyguları bir yere yazarım.	1	2	3	4	5
44. İngilizce çalışırken nasıl ya da neler hissettiğimi başka birine anlatırım.	1	2	3	4	5
BÖLÜM F					
45. Herhangi bir şeyi anlamadığımda, karşımdaki kişiden daha yavaş konuşmasını ya da söylediklerini tekrar etmesini isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
46. Konuşurken karşımdakinin yanlışlarımı düzeltmesini isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
47. Okulda arkadaşlarımla İngilizce konuşurum.	1	2	3	4	5
48. İhtiyaç duyduğumda İngilizce konuşan kişilerden yardım isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
49. Derste İngilizce sorular sormaya gayret ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
50. İngilizce konuşanların kültürü hakkında bilgi edinmeye çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5

DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİ FORMU

Ad/ Soyad: _____ Seviye: A1 A2 B1 B1+ B2

Cinsiyet : ☐ Kız ☐ Erkek ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Yaş : _____ Ülke: _____

CV

İlker TEK

Küçükçekmece / Istanbul

A. EDUCATION

M.A.: Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, English Language Teaching, 2021, Istanbul

B.A.: Middle East Technical University, Foreign Language Education, 2017, Ankara

B. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Instructor, Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, English Preparatory School (September 2017 – Present)

C. PUBLICATIONS & PRESENTATIONS

Tek, İ. (2018). İngilizcedeki İşsel Eylemlerin Farklı Yeterlilik Düzeylerinde Kullanımı. In Ü. D. Turan, H. Kopkallı Yavuz, & A. Balcı (Eds.), *Dilbilimde Güncel Tartışmalar* (pp. 71-84). Ankara: Dilbilim Derneği Yayınları.

Tek, İ. (2020, December 4-5). *Investigating English Preparatory School Students' Language Learning Strategy Use and Achievement Scores* [Conference Presentation]. 5th International Marmara Social Sciences Congress, Kocaeli, Turkey.