A COMPARISON OF EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF LANGUAGE
LEARNING STRATEGIES (LLSs) AND LEARNERS' REPORTED USE OF LLSs
IN THEIR ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSES

HÜLYA ŞEN

JANUARY 2009

A COMPARISON OF EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF LANGUAGE
LEARNING STRATEGIES (LLSs) AND LEARNERS' REPORTED USE OF LLSs
IN THEIR ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSES

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

HÜLYA ŞEN

IN PARTIAL FULLFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

JANUARY 2009

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Prof. Dr. Wolf Konig
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Daloğlu
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Daloğlu (METU, FLE)   _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nurdan Ö. Gürbüz   (METU, FLE) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Bilal Kırkıcı (BU, FLE)   _____

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

Name, Last name :

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

A COMPARISON OF EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES (LLSs) AND LEARNERS' REPORTED USE OF LLSs IN THEIR ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSES

Hülya ŞEN

MA., Department of English Language Teaching
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof .Dr AYŞEGÜL DALOĞLU

January 2009, 126 pages

This study aims to find out teachers' and learners' perception of language learning strategies (LLSs). Three psycho-social variables regarding the teachers' use of strategy instruction at Başkent University were considered: 1. Level of awareness of language learning strategies 2. Beliefs in the effectiveness of language learning strategies 3. Ease of strategy instruction. These results were compared with the students' reported use of LLSs to increase our awareness of students' strategy use and needs so that teachers would be able to help learners facing problems in learning English.

This study employed both qualitative and quantitative research tools. The relevant data were obtained by means of two questionnaires: a teacher and a student version of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL, Oxford, 1990), and a semi-structured interview. A total of 70 teachers teaching at the English language department of Başkent University and 100 students studying in the same department were involved in the study. Data collected from the questionnaire were analyzed quantitatively by employing descriptive statistics, such as frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. Content analysis was performed to analyze the interview data.

The results of the study suggest that for most of the items in the strategy inventory, if the teachers are aware of learning strategies, believe in the effectiveness of LLSs instruction and find them easy to apply in the classroom, they may use them more often in their classes. Furthermore, in variance analysis, the only variable that made a difference in teachers' perceptions of LLSs was found to be the level of education, Finally, when the teachers' and students' frequency of LLSs use was compared, it was found out that teachers reported a higher frequency of LLSs use than their learners. However, there was a great similarity between the two parties in terms of frequency of strategy use in the most and least preferred strategy categories. It is essential to find the reasons for the difference in the frequency of LLSs among the two parties before planning a LLSs training.

Key Words: Language learning strategies (LLSs), teachers' perception, strategy instruction, autonomous learner.

ÖZ

İNGİLİZCEYİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRETEN ÖĞRETMENLERİN DİL ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİNİN İNGİLİZCE DERSLERİNDE KULLANIMI İLE İLGİLİ GÖRÜŞLERİ VE ELDE EDİLEN SONUÇLARIN ÖĞRENCİLERİN STRATEJİ KULLANMA SIKLIĞI İLE KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI

Hülya ŞEN

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Dili Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Ayşegül Daloğlu

Ocak 2009, 126 sayfa

Bu çalışma, öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin dil öğrenme stratejileri ile ilgili görüşlerini ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır. Başkent Üniversitesi'nde çalışan öğretmenlerin strateji kullanımları ile belirli psiko-sosyal değişkenler incelenmiştir. Bu değişkenler; 1. Öğrenme stratejilerine yönelik farkındalık derecesi, 2. Öğrenme stratejilerinin faydasına yönelik inanç ve 3. Strateji eğitiminin kolaylığı olarak belirlenmiştir. Öğrencilerin strateji kullanımı ve ihtiyaçlarına yönelik farkındalığımızı artırmak ve İngilizce öğrenme sürecinde karşılaştıkları problemlerde onlara yardımcı olabilmek için bu sonuçlar öğrencilerin dil öğrenme strateji sıklığı ile karşılaştırılmıştır.

Bu çalışma hem nicelik hem de niteliksel olarak analiz edilmiştir. İlgili bilgiler öğrenci ve öğretmenlere uyarlanan iki strateji envanteri anketi ve mülakat yoluyla toplanmıştır. Bu çalışmaya, Başkent Üniversitesi İngilizce hazırlık bölümünde çalışan 70 öğretmen ve aynı bölümde eğitim gören 100 öğrenci katılmıştır. Anketlerden toplanan bilgiler frekanslar, yüzdeler ve standart sapmalar hesaplanarak niceliksel olarak analiz edilmiştir. Mülakatlar içerik analizine tabi tutulmuştur.

Bu çalışmanın sonunda strateji envanterindeki çoğu madde için söylenebilir ki; öğretmenler öğrenme stratejilerin farkındalar, bunların faydasına inanıyor ve uygulamayı kolay buluyorlarsa, bu öğrenme stratejilerini sınıflarında daha fazla kullandıkları belirlenmiştir. Dahası, varyans analizinde, öğretmenlerin dil öğrenme stratejilerinde fark yaratan tek etmenin aldıkları eğitim düzeyi olduğu saptanmıştır. Son olarak öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin dil öğrenme strateji sıklıkları karşılaştırıldığında, öğretmenlerin bu stratejileri daha fazla kullandıkları tespit edilmiştir. Fakat, her iki grup içinde en fazla ve en az tercih edilen stratejiler açısından büyük bir benzerlik saptanmıştır. Strateji eğitimi planlanmadan önce bu iki grup arasında dil öğrenme stratejilerinin kullanım sıklığının farkının nedenleri araştırılmalıdır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Dil öğrenme stratejileri, öğretmen görüşleri, strateji eğitimi, özerk öğrenci

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xiii

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1.   Background of the Study

One of the areas that language research is primarily concerned with is the identification of the factors affecting learners' performance in language learning. The mediating role of learning strategies was first noticed while second language researchers were examining the features of good language learners the results of which indicated that it was not only a language aptitude or motivation that caused a learner to excel in language but students' own active participation in the learning process through the application of individualized learning techniques or learning strategies (Rubin, 1975). Willing (1989) and Vogely (1995) also attribute students' learning problems particularly to the use of inadequate or inappropriate learning strategies, in addition to other learning factors which influence the ultimate level of achievement.

Learning strategies are defined as behaviours or actions which learners use to make language learning more successful, self-directed and enjoyable (Oxford, 1989). Although the study of language learning strategies has seen an "explosion of activity" as interpreted by Skehan (1991) and a large number of research studies have been conducted in this language area in recent years, most of the studies have mainly focused on features of good language learners. Some other related studies can be categorized as cross-sectional studies that try to identify correlations between strategy use and second language proficiency, identifying and raising students' awareness in learning strategies, attempts to train learners to employ particular strategies and the potential effect of strategy training on learners' language performance. On the other hand, there are not enough studies concerning teachers' own perception about incorporating language learning strategies into their teaching.

As Anderson (2005) states in his book, in order to have metacognitively aware learners, we must have metacognitively aware teachers. Studies that are mainly about learners' perception fail to consider teachers' own beliefs and experiences as factors affecting language learning process.

Students spend a considerable time trying to internalize the language as intensive language programs are compulsory in a number of universities in Turkey and students deal with the language in their departments through departmental English courses. They are still not able to reach the desirable level in language either in production or in formal examination settings. As Cohen (1998) suggests, language learning will be facilitated when students are trained to learn long-term strategy use and become more aware of the range of possible strategies that they can consciously select during language learning and use. While investigating the effects of learning strategies on students' learning processes, there is still a gap in language research concerning the crucial role of teachers that is neglected. Although the foremost aim of strategy training should be facilitation of autonomy or help students gain control of their own learning process, teachers play a crucial role in guiding students to autonomous learning and evaluating their own learning processes. O'Malley et al. (1985) noted that transfer of strategies to new learning activities may be extremely sensitive, requiring continuous prompts and structured directions until the strategies become autonomous. Although the ultimate goal is to help learners take control of their own learning, it is the teachers' role to bring about the learners' self-awareness, to empower them by providing structured directions on when and how to use a strategy and to give feedback, evaluate their performance and provide support if needed.

1.2.   Statement of the Problem

Due to the increasingly common phenomenon of "international English" which refers to the use of English as a lingua franca around the world, there is a tremendous shift in Turkey as well to revive the use of English as a medium of instruction at some universities. Although Başkent is a Turkish-Medium University, English still has a pivotal role in education and it is a requirement before graduation. The students

are required to take an English Proficiency test when they are first admitted to the university. The ones who get a score of 59.50 or above out of 100 are accepted to their departments. The rest of the students receive a one-year preparatory English language education. While the general English courses in the preparatory program and in freshman focus on all skills integratively, from the second year onwards, students receive ESP courses such as preparation for TOEFL, translation, oral presentation skills and so on in relation to their needs in their departments and for their future studies. Based on the researcher's experiences in the institution and her observations in the weekly-held peer coaching meetings, despite the pivotal role of English both in education and for the future career of students, some teachers complain about encountering certain problems related to some of the students' having difficulties in coping with the language in spite of their efforts. Some other students are not so willing to participate in the lessons which might be due to the fact that they spend about 26 hours a week with the same teacher and the same peers.

In the mission statement of Başkent University, it is specified that students need the language mostly in order to be equipped with the skills and strategies so that they can deal with the literature in their departments and use learning skills and strategies to promote further independent learning for their future careers as well. In order to equip the learners with these necessary skills, first of all, the strategy awareness level of teachers working in the preparatory program and in departmental English courses need to be identified. Also, factors affecting teachers' decisions related to incorporation of strategy training into their lessons and their own experiences while dealing with these strategies in their courses need to be explored. Finally, the findings need to be compared with the students' reported use of LLSs so as to examine these variables in relation with teachers' decision making. With the findings obtained from this study, teachers can combine language learning strategies with their classroom teaching since it would enable them to be better able to help students facing problems in learning English. Ultimately, all insights into these constructs would promote the learning process since studies on learning strategies show that teachers' orientation and expertise in language learning strategies play a critical role in successful learning strategy instruction (Thompson and Rubin, 1996).

1.3.   Significance of the Problem

Research in the field of second and foreign language education indicates that the use of appropriate language learning strategies leads to improved proficiency and achievement in overall and in specific skills (Chamot & Küpper, 1989; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Wenden & Rubin, 1987) and successful language learners use more learning strategies and more facilitating ones than poor learners (Chamot & Küpper, 1989; Oxford, 1990). There has been a lot of research on learners' strategy instruction on specific skills such as reading and speaking and teachers' perception on such specific skills (Sallı, 2002; Yetgin, 2003; Sadık, 2005; Zalioğlu, 2000). To the knowledge of the researcher, however, there are no local studies about teachers' perception in incorporating all language learning strategies in their classes with a comparison of learners' reported use of LLSs. Before training students on strategy use, it is essential to analyze teachers' awareness and the factors affecting teachers' decisions in incorporating language learning strategies into their lessons. Therefore, this study may give an idea to English language preparatory schools to have a clear understanding on teachers' perception in structuring language learning environment suitable for strategy training. Comparing teachers' perceptions on LLSs with learners' reported use of strategies would give insights to English teachers and enable them to help students facing problems in learning English. It will also provide a useful framework which may guide the teacher educators in incorporating strategy training in their programs in order to help learners become more successful by gaining strategic behaviours. For the following years, teachers may be provided with a guideline on how and when to train their students to be strategic learners. Furthermore, strategies and belief components can be implemented within the language curriculum as recommended by Oxford (1990) who points out that strategy training is best integrated into language classes by language teachers on a daily and regular basis. These findings may add to the findings of research in this area and can be used in the future to inform pedagogy and as such the outcomes from this research are important for a country where the learning of English is an important educational requirement.

1.4.   Research Questions

The study aims to investigate teachers' and learners' perception in order to explore how language learning theory relates to practice. In order to find out this relationship, certain psycho-social variables regarding the teachers' use of strategy instruction at Başkent University were examined. Three variables were considered: 1. Level of awareness of language learning strategies 2. Beliefs in the effectiveness of language learning strategies 3. Ease of strategy instruction. These results were compared with the students' reported use of LLSs.

The study aims to answer the following research questions:
1. Do language teachers at Başkent University teach language learning strategies (LLSs) in their language classrooms? If so, what is the frequency of their reported teaching of LLSs?
2. What are the teachers' awareness levels and beliefs in the effectiveness of language learning strategies and reported level of ease of strategy instruction?
3. How do the teachers' awareness levels, beliefs in the effectiveness of language learning strategies and reported level of ease of strategy instruction relate to their reported use of strategy instruction in their language classrooms?
4. How do gender, teaching experience, age and the highest degree of education obtained relate to the teachers' perspectives on and reported use of strategy instruction in their language classrooms?
5. Which groups of LLSs do the students studying general English at Başkent University use to improve their language proficiency?
6. What is the relationship between teachers' perceptions on how they teach LLSs and students' perception of which strategies improve their language proficiency?

As teachers are the most important catalysts in helping learners realize their full language learning potential, this study aims to investigate EFL teachers' awareness on language learning strategies with specific factors affecting their decision. The

results were compared with students' reported use of LLSs to increase our awareness of students' strategy use and needs so that teachers would be able to help learners facing problems in learning English and language learning process can be facilitated more effectively. The researcher used 50 language learning strategy items from Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) to investigate both teachers' perception and students' reported use of LLSs. The variables used in the teachers' questionnaire were taken from MacIntyre's (1994) social psychological model that examines certain factors affecting language learning strategy use in terms of frequency of use, knowledge, effectiveness, anxiety and difficulty level. For the first questionnaire, Lee's (2006) adaptation of this learner questionnaire into teachers' perspectives was used. To investigate students' reported use of LLSs, EFL version of SILL that was translated into Turkish was used.

The participants were EFL teachers at Başkent University, which is a Turkish-medium university but English is compulsory for both the preparatory year and for departments so that students can deal with the literature in their departments and use learning skills and strategies to promote further independent learning for their future careers as well. The researcher examined specific factors such as teachers' awareness level in language learning strategies, their beliefs on the effectiveness of these strategies and affective factors such as anxiety or ease of strategy instruction. The researcher also investigated whether teachers with more teaching experience differed in their frequency of strategy use compared to the ones with less experience. The other sub-variables examined were age, gender and the highest degree of education obtained. The results were compared with students' reported use of LLSs to increase our awareness of students' strategy use.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction to Learning Strategies

Following on from the observation that some students were more successful than the others no matter what teaching methods or techniques were used in the language classroom attracted a continuous interest for research. In fact, students were found to employ various learning strategies to assist themselves while learning a second or foreign language. It is assumed that the strategies employed by the more successful students may be learnt by those who are less successful and the teachers can assist the language learning process by promoting awareness of them and encouraging their use. This teachability component means that LLSs enhances an individual's ability to learn a language (Griffiths & Parr, 2001). It will be comprehensive to start with considering a number of definitions of learning strategies before moving to the methods that have been used to investigate them.

2.1.1 Definition of learning strategy

Ellis (1996) refers to the concept of strategy that "is a somewhat fuzzy one (p.529). Numerous definitions of strategy exist in literature and it is not easy to make a generalization. According to Ellis (1996), "...a strategy consists of mental or behavioural activity related to some specific stage in the overall process of language acquisition or language use. Cohen (1996) defines learning strategies as: "learning processes which are consciously selected by the learner which may result in actions taken to enhance learning (p. 5). Rubin (1975) also refers to strategies as "…strategies which contribute to the development of the language system that the learner constructs and affect learning directly." When we investigate the definitions it is not easy to make a generalization. Ellis (1996) perceives strategies as both observable and mental activities while Cohen (1996) sees them as deliberate,

conscious and intentional processes and Rubin (1985) assumes that strategies have a direct effect on interlanguage development.

Although different researchers highlight different aspects of learning strategies, the common point is that learning strategies exist to solve some learning problems and to promote learning. A broader categorization has been made by Cohen and Macaro (2007) about the purpose of language learning strategies. The main purpose of incorporating language learning strategies into lessons is to enhance learning. Another aim is to perform specified tasks and solve some specific problems. For instance, if a learner has difficulty in perceiving and analyzing the structure of an utterance, he or she can make use of a series of listening strategies. Learning strategies also make learning easier, faster and more enjoyable, compensate for a deficit in learning such as making use of prior knowledge while reading an advanced text in the target language.

2.1.2 Language use versus language learning strategies

In literature, there are two different terms as "language use strategies" and "language learning strategies". Cohen (1996) defines language use strategies as the ones primarily focus on employing the language that the learners have in their current interlanguage whereas language learning strategies have an explicit aim of helping learners improve their knowledge in the target language. However, Oxford (2002) points out that in daily language, language learning and language use strategies overlap with each other. The reason for Cohen's (1996) distinction suggests that language learning strategies (cognitive and metacognitive strategies) occur during the learning phase not the use phase of language. However, as learners' proficiency in language improves, they move from thinking about the language to knowing how to use it (Anderson, 2005). Due to that reason, "language learning strategies" that are used to improve performance in the target language will be the focus of this study.

2.1.3 Related concepts to learning strategies

Before moving on to the research on language learning strategies, it would be useful to consider the concepts related to strategy use. One of these concepts is

'autonomous language learning'. One of the ultimate goals of strategy training is to help learners 'have control over their own learning', which is defined as autonomous language learning (Tumposky, 1982). These two concepts are closely related but they are not interchangeable as Cohen and Macaro (2007) distinguish these two concepts as "autonomous learning is not the same as strategic learning in that a learner can work independently in a rote non-strategic manner" (p. 40).

Another concept that is related with learning strategies is 'self-regulation' or 'self-management'. Vygotsky once identified self-regulation with his theoretical and practical focus on specific sets of learning behaviours and this term is interpreted as cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies. While some researchers see general learning strategies as what students use to become more self-regulated in their own learning, others view self-regulation as a broader term that allows for both the cognitive and the affective side of strategy learning. Two more terms that are related to learning strategies are 'independent language learning' and 'individual language learning' which refer to learning through independent study , for example in a self-access centre. However, independence should be balanced with an awareness and concern for the support available to ensure successful learning experiences. For individual language learning, what we should keep in mind is that a strategy useful for a learner may not be so appealing to another learner (Cohen and Macaro, 2007).

2.2 Research on Language Learning Strategies

2.2.1 Good language learner studies

Investigations of language learning strategies date from the "good language learner" studies in the early seventies. Two approaches have been followed: In the first one, good language learners were identified, interviewed and asked to complete a written questionnaire (Naiman et al. 1978). However, in the second approach, successful and unsuccessful learners were compared (Reiss, 1985). The study "What the Good Language Learner Can Teach Us" carried out by Rubin in 1975 is considered as the birth of language learning strategy research by many authors (Cohen and Macaro, 2007) in which she set out techniques and approaches employed by successful

language learners in terms of processes contributing to learning both directly and indirectly. In the same study she observed learners of mixed ages through a video camera and listed the characteristics of a good language learner as being a willing and accurate guesser, having a strong drive to communicate, being uninhibited and willing to make mistakes in order to learn or communicate, focusing on form by looking at patterns, taking advantage of all practice opportunities, monitoring his or her own speech as well as that of others and paying attention to meaning.

One of the most comprehensive studies on good language learners has been carried out by Chamot et al (1988) which provides evidence of a good language learner in terms of being a flexible and appropriate user of learning strategies. Chamot (1988) investigated beginner, intermediate and advanced level students of Spanish and Russian over four school semesters. The students were classified as being effective or ineffective by their teachers. At the end of the research, the effective students turned out to be using greater range of strategies and appropriate ones that were suitable for a particular task. The effective learners were also observed to be engaging in attending to separate linguistic components and making use of their general knowledge as well as the linguistic knowledge of the target language.

In order to find out whether there are specific strategies which are statistically related to second language proficiency, Bialystok (1981) examined the relationship between four learning strategies such as functional practice, inferencing, formal practice and monitoring. He divided these strategies into two groups according to their purposes. Formal practice and monitoring were classified as more conscious attempts to learn the language for the sake of mastering the formal aspect of the language like filling the blanks in an exercise or memorizing vocabulary lists. The second category included functional practice and inferencing that were used for communicating meanings in the target language like talking to a native speaker. She investigated students studying French in Grades 10 and 12 in Canada and collected the information by using a questionnaire. At the end of the study, Bialystok (1981) found out that while the use of these strategies had positive effects on students' success, functional practice correlated significantly with learners' proficiency.

Studying good language learners has proved a useful way of investigating how strategies affect language learning they include some reservations, though such as reflecting only formal learning settings, collecting data through learners' verbal reports and so on. However, as Ellis (1996) highlights in his book; "…they still constitute one of the most effective lines enquiry in learning strategy research" (p. 550).

2.2.2 Classification of learning strategies

Strategies used by second language learners have also been distinguished from each other. In the earlier studies carried by Rubin (1975 and 1981), Naiman et al. (1978), they focused on gathering inventories of learning strategies that the learners were observed to be using without an attempt to classify them under specific headings. However, in the subsequent studies it was suggested that it was possible to observe, record and classify LLSs and many researchers attempted to group the specific strategies under broad classes. A significant study that was conducted to classify the learning strategies in accordance with the information processing model is O'Malley and Chamot's framework. They identified 26 learning strategies through an interview and further classified these strategies as cognitive, metacognitive and affective strategies. Cognitive strategies refer to "the steps or operations used in problem solving that require direct analysis, transformation or synthesis of learning materials" (Rubin, 1987). Among the cognitive strategies listed by Chamot (1985) are repetition, note-taking, translation, elaboration, inferencing. Metacognitive strategies make use of language about cognitive processes and constitute an attempt to regulate language learning by means of planning, monitoring and evaluating. Affective strategies are related with the ways learners interact with their peers and native speakers of the language. Chamot (1985) exemplifies them as cooperation, question for clarification and so on.

One of the most significant studies in the field of language strategies was conducted by Oxford (1990). As Ellis (1996) defines her study as "the most comprehensive classification of learning strategies to date" (p. 539). What Oxford did was to make use of all the earlier studies with the aim of incorporating every single strategy that

was previously mentioned in the literature into her classification scheme. After she came up with her first typology in 1985, she later updated and presented a new classification scheme that is called as The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) in 1990. It contains items related to sixty-four individual strategies divided into six parts and it aimed to measure a learner's frequency of strategy use. She made a general distinction between direct and indirect strategies. Direct strategies require the mental processing of the language whereas; indirect strategies provide indirect support for language learning through focusing, planning and evaluating.

Oxford (1990) categorised direct strategies under three groups as memory, cognitive and compensation strategies. Memory strategies help learners store and retrieve new information and she divided them into four sets such as a. creating mental linkages, b. applying images and sounds, c. retrieving well, d. employing. Cognitive strategies help learners understand and produce new language through various ways, for example, by summarising and reasoning and she put them under four sets such as a. practicing, b. receiving and sending messages, c. analyzing and reasoning, d. creating structure for input and output. Compensation strategies help learners use the language despite not having the necessary knowledge such as guessing or using synonyms and are divided into two sets such as a. guessing intelligently and b. overcoming limitations in speaking and writing.

Indirect strategies, defined as indirect support for language learning are divided into metacognitive, affective and social strategies. Metacognitive strategies deal with pre-assessment and pre-planning, on-line planning and evaluation and post evaluation of language learning activities. Such strategies allow learners to control their own cognition by planning, organizing and evaluating the learning process (Cohen and Weaver, 1998). Oxford (1990) divided metacognitive strategies into three sets such as a. centering your learning, b. arranging and planning your learning, c. evaluating your learning. Affective strategies help learners regulate emotions, motivations and attitudes and are further divided into three sets such as a. lowering your anxiety, b. encouraging yourself and taking your emotional temperature. Social strategies help learners learn through interaction with others and categorised as a. asking questions, b. cooperating with others, c. empathizing with others.

The fundamental claim of SILL was that it was possible to define and quantify the strategies: It had a great impact in ELT as by mid 1990s, it was used by more than 10.000 learners worldwide to assess their strategy use and the relationship to other variables such as learning styles, gender, proficiency level, culture and task. It has also been used with more than 30 doctoral dissertations and a number of refereed articles. Nyikos and Oxford (1989) provided evidence for SILL's reliability and validity.

> Internal consistency reliability using Cronbach's alpha is .96 based on a 1.200 person university sample and .95 based on a 483 person Defence Language Institute (DLI) field text sample. Content validity is .95 using a classificatory agreement between two independent raters who blindly matched each of the SILL items with strategies in the comprehensive taxonomy. Concurrent and construct validity can be assumed based on the demonstration of strong relationships between SILL factors and self-ratings of language proficiency and language motivation (p. 292).

Some researchers even have tried to make a distinction between strategies as language use strategies and language learning strategies. Cohen (2007) approaches this distinction from a more detailed perspective as he makes the distinction by function, purpose, skill areas, proficiency levels, culture, language and age. To clarify the distinction in terms of function; he argues that strategies to increase target language knowledge and understanding are distinguished from strategies aimed at using what has already been learnt. They include retrieval, rehearsal, and communication and cover strategies that learners use to look good when they do not have full control over language material.

However, if one tries to draw a line between these strategies, some problems are bound to surface as no clear agreement has yet been reached in literature related to classification schemes. Cohen (1996) points out to this issue in his article as follows:

> The problem is that the distinctions are not so clear-cut. In other words, the same strategy of ongoing text summarization may be interpretable as either cognitive or metacognitive. It might not be possible to neatly draw the line between metacognitive strategies aimed at planning and evaluating the results both while in the process of constructing the marginal entry and after finishing the writing of it, and cognitive

strategies involving the reconceptualization of a paragraph at a higher level of abstraction (p. 7).

Messick (1989) indicates that strategies can vary across people and tasks even when the same results are achieved. Phakiti (2003) supports what Cohen (1990), Ellis (1996) and Messick (1989) advocate in his article as "…Strategy items intended to assess particular cognitive and metacognitive strategies might have turned out to assess others, for example, due to the wording of the strategy item and test takers' misinterpretation of the item meaning" (p. 48).

Despite some reservations like the unease of classification of learning strategies, these schemes are quite helpful for researchers and teachers because they provide considerable amount of help in guiding everybody that are interested in learning strategies because they provide a basis for studying which strategies are affective in promoting learning. This point was also indicated by Ellis who noted that despite these issues, these schemes prove to be useful not just to the teacher and the researcher but are also quite beneficial, especially "where learner training is concerned" (1994, p.540).

2.3 Factors Affecting Strategy Choice

As well as various classification schemes in strategy training, learners also vary in the frequency of making use of learning strategies and specific strategy types they prefer to use (Ellis, 1996). The rationale behind this inquiry is that strategy instruction should be geared to learners' individual and situational or group needs (Cohen, 2007, p.70). Among various factors affecting learners' choice in strategy use, Oxford (1990) considers degree of awareness, stage of learning, task requirements, teacher expectations, age, sex, nationality/ethnicity, general learning style, personality traits, motivation level, and purpose for learning the language (p.13). Ellis (1996) has counted similar factors affecting strategy choice but he has grouped them under two broad categories as individual learning differences and situational and social factors. Under the category of individual learning differences, the related variables are beliefs about language learning, learner factors such as age, aptitude, learning styles, motivation, personality types and learners' personal

14

background. Situational and social factors include the language being learnt, the setting in which the learning takes place and the tasks that the learners are asked to perform. Identifying the factors affecting strategy choice has attracted a lot of attention in second language research and considerable advances have been made in this area. Some of these studies will be mentioned and their significance will be negotiated in the following paragraphs.

2.3.1 Individual learning differences

A number of educators and researchers have pointed out that students' beliefs play an important role in selection of learning strategies and learning in general (Fox, 1993; Green, 1993; Horwitz, 1988, 1990; Kern, 1995; Manltle-Bromley, 1995; McCargar, 1993; Oxford, 1989; Wenden, 1986, cited in Schulz, 2001). In order to find out whether beliefs about language learning has a considerable effect on the choice and use of learning strategies, Bialystok (1981) investigated a group of young learners studying French as their second language in Canada and at the end of the study, the students explained that language learning involves not only functional but also a formal practice and this belief has been found to influence their strategy choice.

There are numerous studies conducted to find out the relationship between learning strategy choice and age of the learners. One of these studies was carried out by Griffiths (2003) that involved 348 students aged from 14 to 64. As well as the effect of age, she also investigated course level, nationality and gender as variables. While neither age nor gender was found significantly related to strategy choice, she found considerable differences among the participants in terms of nationality. However, Oxford (1996) indicates that older learners use different strategies than younger learners and her claim was proved by Peacock and Ho (2003) in which they found that older students between 23 and 39 used four of Oxford's six strategy categories (memory, metacognitive, affective and social) more often than younger students between 28 and 22. The use of strategies among older students was higher for 13 individual students and much higher for seven other strategies. One more study that focused on the age variable as a significant factor was conducted by Victori and Traganat (2003) which involved 766 participants from three age groups (10-14 and

17 years-old). The mean taken from the youngest group of students varied considerably compared to the means of the two other groups. While older students' reported use of strategies were cognitively more complex, younger learners reported higher use of social strategies. According to Cohen (2007), the interpretation of the reason for different findings mentioned above was due to the fact that each study was conducted in different regions, context with a variety of ethnic backgrounds and student learning goals.

Another variable affecting the use of learning strategies is gender. Recent studies indicate that female learners use a much wider or at least a very different range of strategies than males for language learning (Oxford, 1996). One of the earliest studies conducted in this area was an examination of 90 American college students studying foreign language by Politzer (1983) at the end of which female students were found to be making use of social/interactional strategies more often than male participants. Oxford and Ehrman (1989) also found a much more frequent use of four strategies which were general learning, functional, searching for meaning and self-management by female learners. In a more current study by Dreyer and Oxford (1996), female learners were again found to be using metacognitive and social strategies more frequently.

Ellis (1996) suggests that aptitude does not appear to be strongly related to strategy use. However, general learning styles such as field-dependence-independence, analytic-global orientation or the judging-perceiving mode has a strong effect on the strategies the learners use but little research has examined this relationship (Oxford, 1996). Some researchers, on the other hand, have explored the effects of personality types measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) on strategy use. Ehrman and Oxford (1989), for instance have concluded that extraverts use two strategies (affective and visualization) more frequently than introverts. Introverts, however, use strategies for searching and communicating meaning more often than introverts. They also indicated that intuitive people used four strategy categories such as affective, formal model building, authentic language use and searching for communicating meaning more frequently than sensing people and feeling type people showed a greater use of general study strategies compared to thinkers (Cohen,

2007). Such findings prove the claim that being extravert rather than inhibited is an important factor both in using certain strategies as well as being a successful language learner.

The more motivated a student is, the wider range of strategies he or she makes use of. Many researchers have agreed with this claim and a number of studies have been conducted to prove it. Oxford and Nyikos (1989) found that "the degree of expressed motivation was the single most powerful influence on the choice of language learning strategies. Okada, Oxford and Abo (1996) investigated 36 learners of Japanese and 36 learners of Spanish and reached the conclusion that there is a strong relationship between the use of metacognitive, cognitive and social strategy use and motivational aspects of the language learners. A more recent study was carried out by Mochizuki (1999) and Wharton (2000) in which highly motivated Asian students were found to be using all six categories of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) more frequently compared to less motivated students (cited in Cohen, 2007). The question, however, is whether strategy use is enhanced by high motivation level or vice versa but few studies were carried out to bring into an answer to this question.

The last variable under the category of individual differences is related with the question whether learners' personal background has an effect in their strategy use. When we look at the studies conducted in this area, Ehrman (1990) found that professional linguists reported using more strategies more frequently compared to the untrained instructors and students. He also found that students with an experience of at least five years in studying a foreign language reported using more functional practice strategies compared to less experienced language learner.

2.3.2 Situational and social factors

When we consider situational and social factors, one of the variables affecting the choice and frequency of learning strategies is the language being learnt. A number of studies have proved that learners of some languages reported using more strategies. For example; Chamot et al. (1987) reported learners of Russian were found to be

using more strategy types compared to Spanish learners. Politzer (1983) found that learners of Spanish reported fewer strategy use than learners of French and German. Ellis (1996) claims that there is no evidence to suggest that learners of some languages possess greater strategy use. Oxford (1989) indicates that the findings of the studies mentioned above may be due to the fact that more successful students choose to study the languages that are less commonly taught in schools in the USA. On the other hand, when we look at the studies conducted to investigate the influence of career orientation on strategy use, in a recent study by Mochizuki (1999), English majors were found to be using compensation, social and metacognitive strategies more often than non-English majors.

The last two variables under the category of situational and social factors are the setting in which learning takes place and the tasks that the learners are asked to perform. When we compare the learners studying the language in a classroom with those in a more natural setting, a number of differences were reported. In a study conducted by Chamot (1988), it was suggested that many classrooms provide less opportunity for the use of social strategies and learners mentioned such strategies infrequently with the exception of questioning for clarification. Another study Wong-Fillmore (1979) reported more social strategy use by younger learners in a play situation.

The other situational variable is about task difficulty and in a recent study by Ikeda and Takeuchi (2000), the effect of task difficulty on the reported frequency of strategy use was investigated with 192 university-level EFL students in Japan and they indicated that task difficulty has a considerable influence on the use of strategies. Another research by Oxford, Cho, Leung and Kim (2004) indicated that task-based strategy assessment was useful as it allows for more contextualized and detailed analysis of strategy use. There are also some studies investigating the effect of ESL versus EFL environment on strategy use as a situational variable. For example, Riley and Harsch (1999) investigated a group of Japanese ESL students attending a language program with EFL university students. At the end of the study, they concluded that environmental factors play an important role in strategy use as

the students in the EFL setting reported using certain metacognitive strategies as well as some cognitive strategies such as reading aloud.

Whether considered as an individual or a social factor affecting learners' choice in strategy use, it is important to consider culture as a factor that affects strategy use because it plays a crucial role in language learning. As Finkbener (2008) states, culture influences whether learners are inhibited or not, whether and how much they practice. Some cultures praise creative and autonomous learning whereas some others value teacher-directed rote learning. There are a number of studies carried out on the role of culture in language learning. Young (1987) compared Asian and Western cultural context of language learning. He concluded that teaching and learning strategies were found to be very different depending on the language community the language learner belongs to. Chinese students reported to be using much more teacher-centered learning environment than Western learners. He concluded that Western language learning methods cannot be implemented in an Asian context. There must be some adaptations in terms of teaching methods and specific learning styles of different ethnic groups. Another study was conducted by Griffiths (2003) in which she stated that European learners appeared to be more effective learners of English compared to Asian students. However, while discussing the findings of her study, he related this difference to the similarity between English and many European languages. She also interviewed some highly successful Asian learners of English and found out that nationality alone is not a barrier to language learning success. She concluded that successful use of learning strategies might be a stronger influence on learning outcomes than culture.

The literature presented above has shown that individual differences and social and situational factors play an important role in learning strategy use. There are some other individual differences affecting strategy use in literature such as career orientation, reason for study, nationality, ethnicity, achievement and some other social factors such as socio-economic group. This section covered the most common variables with a review of empirical studies dealing with each of the variables. Consideration of the effect of such inhibitors is crucial for strategy training and

trainers due to their considerable effect on language learning. The next section will deal with finding a way to help our learners to be strategic language learners.

2.4 Language Learning Strategy Training

The best strategy training not only teaches language learning strategies but also deals with feelings and beliefs about taking on more responsibility and about the role change implied by the use of learning strategies (Oxford, 1990, p. 201). The main purpose of strategy training is to help our learners realize their full potential of learning. There is a tremendous shift from the traditional view of teachers as authority figures controlling every aspect of the learning process and "spoon-feeding" education system in which it was the teacher responsibility to explain everything to a more humanistic atmosphere in which the students are responsible from their own learning and teachers adapt new roles as facilitators, helpers, consultants, advisors, coordinators and so on. Through providing the learners with systematic opportunities to focus on their learning process with strategy training, students become more active participants in their language learning which promote learning and eventually both learners and teachers feel more successful. Students now share the responsibility for language learning with the teacher by becoming less dependent on the language teacher and by diagnosing their learning strengths and weaknesses. When we help them become aware of these strategies, they will be encouraged to learn how to learn a foreign language. There are many issues that need to be solved before strategy training can be implemented effectively. Some of these issues are related with the way the strategies are implemented, the method to be adopted and instructors' training.

2.4.1 Separate versus integrated strategy training

One of the arguments in learning strategy training is whether strategy training should be given separately or should be integrated into classroom instruction. The argument of the researchers in favour of separate strategy training is that strategies are generalizable to many contexts and that students can focus all their attention on developing strategic processing skills rather than try to learn content at the same time

(O'Malley and Chamot, 1990). On the other hand, some other researchers argue that strategy training should be fully integrated into the language teaching materials as proposed by O'Malley and Chamot (1990) in their Cognitive Academic Learning Approach (CALLA) which integrates grade-appropriate content topics, academic language development and direct instruction and practice in using learning strategies to acquire both procedural and declarative knowledge to ESL students. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) asserted that knowledge strategies like L2 knowledge moves from declarative , meaning conscious, effortful knowledge discrete data points or facts such as definitions of words or grammar rules, to procedural knowledge in which knowledge is unconscious, automatic, effortless, habitual and implicit such as understanding a word without thinking of its meaning or using grammar automatically. Strategies that have become procedural are known as processes. In CALLA, declarative knowledge about strategies is taught, practiced, transferred and evaluated so that it gradually becomes procedural knowledge. CALLA is based on four important propositions:

1. Mentally active learners are better learners.
2. Strategies can be taught.
3. Learning strategies transfer to new tasks.
4. Academic language learning is more effective with learning strategies (O'Maley and Chamot, 1990, p.196)

2.4.2 Implicit versus explicit strategy training

The second argument in strategy training is about implicit or explicit strategy training. Many language teachers and researchers are in favour of explicit strategy training as they believe that it makes language learning more meaningful and facilitates self-reliance (Oxford, 1990). Since students cannot reach the mastery of strategy use on their own, it necessitates an explicit training to become aware of and proficient with the language. Explicit instruction aims to raise students' awareness and knowledge of strategies by enabling them to practice these strategies in a systematic way and apply these strategies flexibly in various language tasks. In explicit strategy training students are informed of why a strategy is useful, and how

and where to apply it (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990). Cohen (1996) points out explicit learning strategies as they need to be conscious and explicitly stated in order for them to be considered as strategies.

In strategy instruction process while some researchers insist on stating the strategies directly to learners, researches like O'Maley and Chamot (1990), Oxford (1990), Wenden (1987) recommend incorporating strategies into language learning implicitly. They assert that the most effective strategy instruction appears to include demonstrating when a given strategy might be useful, as well as practicing how to use and evaluate it and how to transfer it to other related tasks and situations. Cohen and Macaro (2007) states that the most beneficial strategy instruction is to be integrated into regular, everyday L2 teaching. Anderson (2005) also highlights the importance of integrating explicit instruction into classroom curriculum as he states that language classrooms should focus on developing learning processes as well as teaching language content.

Oxford (1990) claims that language learning strategies can be taught in at least three different ways: 1. Awareness training is also named as consciousness raising or familiarization training in which the participants become aware of and familiar with the general idea of language learning strategies. 2. One-time strategy training involves learning and practicing one or more strategies with actual language tasks. 3. Long-term strategy training is a prolonged process and covers a greater number of strategies in which students learn the significance of particular strategies, when and how to use them and how to monitor and evaluate their own performance (Oxford, 1990, p.203).

2.4.3 Two approaches in strategy training: CALLA and SSBI

Within the context of methodologies, strategies play a central role in two approaches: Style and Strategies-Based Instruction (SSBI) and the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA). The primary goal of SSBI is to integrate style and strategy instruction so that learners know about their preferred style of learning and how, when and how to use a strategy. Research suggests that there is a link between

learning styles and strategies. For example, a visual learner may draw a graphic organizer to help visualize the organization of a reading passage (Anderson, 2005). Cohen (2001) also highlights the link between language learning styles and strategies and summarizes the ultimate goal of integrating styles and strategies as it helps students to become more efficient, effective and responsible language learners. He focuses on crucial aspects of the instructional process of SSBI and provides sample tasks with illustrative activities to the teachers as he believes that SSBI enable teachers to get rid of the burden of imparting language knowledge and skills to students.

The other approach in which language learning strategies play a central role is Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA). As it was stated before, it integrates grade-appropriate content topics, academic language development and direct instruction and practice in using learning strategies to acquire both procedural and declarative knowledge to ESL students. Declarative , meaning conscious, effortful knowledge about strategies is taught, practiced, transferred and evaluated so that it gradually becomes procedural knowledge (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990).

2.4.4 Three instructional frameworks for strategy training

In order to train students on language learning, strategy researchers attempted to provide both teachers and learners with various means of learning about strategy use and strategy development and a number of instructional frameworks have been developed with utmost attention placed on the role of the teacher in strategy training. First of all, Oxford's suggested steps for strategy training will be outlined and then it will be compared with two contemporary frameworks developed for strategy instruction. Oxford (1990) lists the steps to be followed in strategy instruction as follows:

1. Determine the learners' needs and time available
2. Select strategies well
3. Consider integration of strategy training
4. Consider motivational issues

5. Prepare materials and activities
6. Conduct completely informed training
7. Evaluate the strategy training
8. Revise the strategy training (p.204)

While the first five items are planning and preparation steps, the last three items involve conducting, evaluating and revising the training.

There are many similarities between the list proposed by Oxford (1990) and the other two contemporary frameworks in terms of the flow of stages and attention placed on the role of the teacher in strategy training. One of them has been developed by Grenfell and Harris (1999) which starts with "awareness raising" and followed by "modelling, practice action planning and evaluation". In awareness raising stage, students brainstorm the strategies that they use and share the ones that work for them. Then, teacher demonstrates new strategies; learners are given a range of tasks to deploy new strategies. In action planning stage, learners are guided to select strategies that will help them address their particular difficulties and finally teacher guides students to evaluate their progress and strategy use so that they can set themselves new goals.

In another framework developed by Chamot in 2005, the steps are "preparation, presentation, practice, self-evaluation, expansion and assessment". In preparation stage, teacher identifies students' current learning strategies for familiar tasks. In presentation stage, teacher models, names, explains new strategies. It is followed by practice and students' evaluation of their own strategy use. In the expansion stage, students transfer strategies to new tasks, develop repertoire of preferred strategies and finally teacher assesses students' use of strategies and impact on performance.

Literature is full of studies offering ways to facilitate effective use of strategy knowledge for both young and adult learners. Since the focus of the present study is on investigating teachers' perceptions in an adult, university setting, ways to raise older learners' awareness of LLSs will be considered. In order to help learners gain responsibility for using the strategies independently, four sequence of steps need to be followed; raising awareness of learners, teacher modelling of strategies so that

students can be aware of their own thinking and learning processes, multiple practice opportunities to help learners move towards autonomous use of strategies and self-evaluation of the effectiveness of the strategies (Cohen and Macaro, 2007).

Research studies on strategy training aim to help learners become more effective language learners. Although numerous studies have been conducted in this area, there are some concerns related to longitudinal nature of such studies. That is, training language learners to use strategies is proved to be effective in the short term. However, there is not enough evidence whether its effects persist over time (Hassan, et. al., 2005, cited in Cohen and Macaro, 2007). Moreover, more research is needed on the development of language teacher expertise for integrating LLSs into their classrooms, including teachers' characteristics such as teaching approach, attitude and beliefs, which will be elaborated in the following section.

2.5 Teachers' Perception and Teacher Training on LLSs

There have been a number of studies concerning guiding teachers to incorporate language learning strategies into their classes. In spite of close collaboration with the classroom teachers, there have been differences among the classroom teachers in the degree of being able to implement strategy training successfully (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; Grenfell and Harris, 1990; Cohen and Macaro, 2007). In one of these studies, Chamot (1993) collaborated closely with classroom teachers who had not previously participated in the foreign language learning strategies studies. While outlining the findings, he stated that "...teachers tend to perceive learning strategy instruction as an extra activity rather than as part of their regular instruction" (p.309)." Before convincing our learners that strategy training is worthwhile, we should find ways to persuade and involve the teachers who will incorporate these strategies in their classes as it is not just an interesting research topic or area; it is a set of concepts and procedures that any intelligent teacher can use to help students learn more effectively (Oxford, Nyikos, 1990). In order to overcome these obstacles, we should first consider what the teachers' concerns are and then investigate the literature for recent teacher education programs on strategy training.

In the introduction to TESOL Journal on learning styles and strategies, Ely and Pease-Alvarez (1996) focus on the same topic as they claim that many teachers find themselves 'ambivalent' about implementing learning strategies. Some of the teachers are willing to help their learners discover more about themselves as learners while some other teachers are worried about the new instructional responsibilities as well as uncertainties this work produce. One of the reasons of this concern may be related to impact of this work on teachers' roles. Some teachers may be worried as their role is getting diminished since the new focus is on 'future out-of-class learning'. However, Ely and Pease-Alvarez (1996) suggest that rather than diminishing the role of the teacher, strategy orientation heightens the importance of classroom teacher as the teacher "...is the most important catalyst in bringing about the learners' self-awareness and it is the teacher who may be in the best position to empower students by showing them how to empower themselves (p.6)". They added that strategy training is getting more widespread which necessitates active teacher involvement in recursive work rather than linear so that more opportunities can be provided for self-reflection and self-monitoring. Through self-reflection, teachers achieve consistency between their perceived learning and their real development and inclusion of action research in language teacher education programs equip teachers with skills for reflection and facilitate the integration of these skills into their teaching routines in a structured and systematic way (Kwo, 1996).

Some of the factors that may effect classroom teachers' decision and cause them to experience difficulties in strategy training are curriculum constraints, teaching style, comfort with current style, teacher beliefs and lack of knowledge in promoting strategies (Vieira, 2003). The curriculum may determine the amount of time teachers can spend on strategy training. If the curriculum is too detailed, it may not give teachers the flexibility to include strategy training into the pacing and even strategy training can be assumed as an extra curricular activity. Another variable is related to teachers' preferred teaching style. Some teachers who are in favour of a transmission style of teaching may impose strategies on students without investigating their preferences and background knowledge about learning strategies (Cohen and Macaro, 2007). In such classes, rather than helping learners become conscious about their learning process, take their own responsibility of learning and become more

autonomous learners, strategy training turns out to be another burden for such students, something else to be memorized. In fact, ways have to be found of taking into account learners' own preferred learning strategies. Another concern that discourages teachers from incorporating learning strategies into their lessons may be the difficulty of providing individual support and advice to students when working with large classes. The teacher needs to come up with creative solutions like putting learners into smaller groups, using peer feedback, making use of student diaries and so on.

In order to overcome these prejudices and concerns against strategy training, teachers need to be equipped with knowledge and skill in this area through professional preparation programs. However, Cohen and Macaro (2007) stated the major focus of such programs as they are based on pedagogical techniques, lesson planning and classroom management. Teachers are informed about strategy training either through self-study or exposure in professional development workshop, not through an active and experiential approach. As Anderson (2005) highlights, in order to have metacognitively aware learners, we must have metacognitively aware teachers. In order to support teachers in effectives strategy instruction, Ely and Pease-Alvarez's (1996) suggests two model teacher training program. One of the models is about training teachers on appropriate instruction and the other model involves preparing teachers for development and heightening their ability to "observe, reflect upon and modify their instructional patterns" (Ely & Pease-Alvarez, 1996, p.336). The training programs involve lesson preparation, presentation and feedback on the lessons prepared. The main focus of the programs are on development of independent and analytical thoughts related to cognitive (psychological and linguistic) and affective thought processes of learner and teachers (Ely & Pease- Alvarez, 1996). Harris (2001) supports such kind of active, experiential approach in training programs as they enable teachers to discover their own strategies, consider new ones, learn how to model and teach them, have many opportunities to practice strategy-based instruction into the curriculum. Such a training is similar to students' strategy training as they need to reflect on how well they are learning and managing the learning strategies, teachers need to be clear about how well they are facilitating strategy training.

After summarizing the thoughts of a number of researchers who highlights the importance of professional preparation programs in which teachers are equipped with knowledge and skill in this area, it will be useful to exemplify it with a current study. Researchers worked with teachers who implemented LLSs in their classrooms (National Capitol Language Research Centre, 2000). Before the implementation of LLSs, teachers were enlightened on the effectiveness of teacher training and on the impact of strategy training on their students through workshops and interviews. The paper reported teachers' perception on strategy training. The research questions that were aimed to be answered were 1) What type of teacher development can support strategy instruction for language immersion classrooms? 2) Do teachers believe that strategy instruction improve their students' language learning? It was concluded that the initial training workshop was very beneficial as teachers had the chance to observe their peers while implementing new strategies. In these workshops, teachers were provided with rationale on the importance of LLSs, suggestions and materials in the target language to introduce the concept of strategy to their students. Moreover, teachers' ownership of strategies is very important. One of the teachers taking part in the study reported that:

> I think strategy instruction helps the students if we really believe in it. If we don't believe in it and really use it ourselves, tell them to keep using it, it is not really going to help them. But if we really believe in it then maybe they will use it as a part of their learning. That is what I think is the whole business (National Foreign Language Resource Centre, p.6).

As well as giving teachers an understanding of LLSs in training programs, it is also important that teachers need to be convinced on the effectiveness of strategy training as research on the differences between the views of language learners and teachers show that conflicting perceptions may help or hinder language learning, and on how differently they may actually perceive what is happening in their shared classrooms (Hawkey, 2006). The teachers who took part in the study above also reported that strategy training improved their students' motivation, made them aware, active, efficient and responsible learners, gave students a better understanding of the target language and made them more capable of working independently. Here is an

example checklist provided by Cohen and Macaro (2007) in order to help teachers evaluate their success in teaching learning strategies:

1. What were your goals?
2. What were your evaluation criteria to know you have reached your goal?
3. What teaching strategies will you use to accomplish your goal(s)?
4. How much time will you need to accomplish your goal(s)?
5. What problems arose while presenting the strategic knowledge?
6. Identify any problem sources (your goals, your teaching strategies, your emotions, amount of time for presentation)
7. Identify all problem solutions (adjust goal(s), teaching strategies, pace, your emotions, amount of time)
8. Type of revisions you will make next time you teach strategic knowledge (p. 159).

2.6 Learner Training on LLSs

The idea that good language learners make use of identifiable strategies and these strategies can be taught in the classroom has led to great interest among teachers and course book writers who looked for ways to improve their learners' repertoire of language learning strategies. In that way, students can become more self-reliant in their learning. ELT methodology has moved towards the view that language learners, especially adults are capable of organizing and undertaking language learning. Brown (1994) has called this strategic investment by learners in their own learning. This section takes up the topic of LLSs in terms of learner strategy training.

Learner strategy training aims to help learners use the learning opportunities of the language classroom more effectively by applying a range of strategies to the tasks they are engaged with their teachers and peers. All the learners coming to the task of language learning may not be all-equipped. The role of the teacher must be to raise learners' awareness of what is involved in learning a foreign language, to prepare them in effective strategies. That is how they can become more active and

responsible in their own learning and how they can develop and strengthen their strategies for language learning.

A group of learner training activities that can be introduced progressively by the teacher aims to increase students' knowledge of useful ways to learn and develop the strategies they need. Some of these are cognitive strategies which used to be expected to come from teachers. However, instead of expecting teachers to explain the meanings of new words, students can be trained to apply some strategies such as using clues in a text to guess meaning, using knowledge of affixation, checking in a dictionary to establish meaning for themselves. The use and development of other cognitive strategies can be encouraged by getting students to use textbook materials as a resource, searching for language data and analysing them to find patterns and analyze rules (Hedge, 2005).These activities were also suggested by Naiman et al (1978). He stated that the characteristics of 'good language learners' as; "the learner must be active in his approach to learn and practice and come up to grasp the language as a system, (p. 103)".

As well as cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies can also be trained to increase students' knowledge of useful ways to learn and develop the strategies they need. Hedge (2005) suggests that it can be productive to ask students to share ideas about possible metacognitive strategies at the beginning of a course. These are responses of two students to a written activity:

> "I have got a very good grammar book with some explanation about the English grammar in my own language. What I do is read the English rules and try to understand them and then I read the part which is in French."
> "Every day I learn ten new words that I write in a small copy book with the meaning and the translation in my own language."

Metacognitive strategies deal with pre-assessment and pre-planning, on-line planning and evaluation and post evaluation of language learning activities. Such strategies allow learners to control their own cognition by planning, organizing and evaluating the learning process (Oxford, 1990). Teachers can suggest a range of metacognitive strategies and help students identify those which will work best for them. Some other activities to train learners on strategy use are about helping learners reflecting on

their own learning, monitor and assess their own progress and the role of self-access centres (Hedge, 2005).

To incorporate strategy teaching into lessons, several proposals exist such as CALLA proposed by O'Malley and Chamot (1990), SSBI proposed by Cohen (1998), Australian Migrant English Program (AMEP), proposed by Willing (1989) and so on. However, according to the results of strategy discovery research, strategy use can vary between individuals, so there is a danger in incorporating specific strategies into teaching. Consequently, many materials for introducing a strategic approach concentrate on discovering the learners' beliefs and preferred modes of action and adapting them rather than prescribing remedies (McDonough, 1995). Teachers who are concerned about learners' strategy training can take up some of the ideas in this section and apply them in their own educational settings. Only then can it be possible to increase students' knowledge of useful ways to learn and develop the strategies they need.

2.7 A Social Psychological Model of Strategy Use by MacIntyre

The reason for the increased interest in language learning strategies emerges from the numerous research findings that strategies promote language learning and these strategies are teachable (Griffiths&Parr, 2001). However, many researchers concluded that students are not aware of the available strategies and do not use as many strategies as they could (Cohen, 1990; Ehrman and Oxford, 1989; Oxford and Crookal,1989; cited in MacIntyre, 1994). Factors affecting the use of language learning strategies are presented above. In the model proposed by MacIntyre (1994), he claims that social psychological variables play an important role in the use of language learning strategies. According to this social-psychological model, three general factors primarily affect strategy use which are 1. Knowledge of the strategy, 2. Having a reason to use it and 3. Not having a reason not to use it.

MacIntyre (1996) highlights the importance of awareness in LLSs as "Knowledge refers to the observation that strategies are tactics or plans that are employed in an attempt to aid language learning (p.374)". Therefore, it is necessary to be aware of a

strategy and understand it in order to use it appropriately. It is when it can be considered as a 'strategy'. He adds that knowledge of a strategy depends on such variables as learners' intelligence, aptitude and language learning experience. The second variable, having a reason to use it, refers to the condition that there must be an expectation that a strategy will be useful in learning the language. This expectation may be fostered by students' willingness towards learning the language, having a previous success with the strategy item and motivation level. The third variable, not having a reason not to use it, refers to the idea that there is nothing that prevents the use of the strategy. If a learner finds a specific strategy difficult to use, he or she may reject to use it no matter how effective it is. MacIntyre gives the example of guessing the meaning from the context instead of using a dictionary. Although it is a well-known strategy, students may prefer not to use it as they may find it difficult.

In order to examine the specific motivational factors that correlate with the use of different types of language learning strategies, MacIntyre (1996) used Gardner's (1985) general motivational model as well as specific strategy use model developed by himself. Gardner's model is based on 'integrative motivation' that is composed of three components: Attitudes toward the Learning Situation (ALS), integrativeness and motivation. ALS refers to "...the learners' evaluation of the language course and the instructor and is defined as the degree to which the student possesses a positive attitude toward both" (Gardner, 1996, p.375, cited in MacIntyre, 1996). Integrativeness is about the learner's positive attitude towards the members of the target language, interest in foreign languages. Motivation is about the drive to learn a language.

MacIntyre developed a test of the social-psychological model in which 50 strategies taken from the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL by Oxford, 1990) are rated for their frequency of use, knowledge, effectiveness, anxiety and difficulty of use. An example item (item 50) is presented below:

Table 1. Item 50 from SILL : "I try to learn about the culture of the people who speak the second language."

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Know it very well
Never use it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Use it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Consider it very effective
Not anxious about using it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Feel very anxious using it
Very difficult to use	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very easy to use

(MacIntyre, 1996, p.377)

Results of the study showed that the social-psychological model could predict successful strategy well as "…knowing a strategy well, perceiving it as effective and not considering it too difficult to use predicts the majority of the variance in strategy use (MacIntyre,1996, p.384).

The reason for including MacIntyre's social psychological model is that the researcher is going to use the variables in the rating provided above in combination with Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) in order to examine the perspectives of EFL teachers working at Başkent University on incorporating language learning strategies in their lessons. With the help of the variables developed by MacIntyre (1994), the researcher is going to investigate the awareness levels of the EFL teachers, their beliefs on the effectiveness of strategies on language learning and do they find it difficult or easy to incorporate strategies into their English lessons as MacIntyre (1994) suggests, it is necessary to be aware of a strategy and understand it , there must be a positive expectation that a strategy will be useful in learning the target language and the difficulty level of the strategy item should be moderate in order to use a strategy item appropriately.

2.8 Conclusion

To sum up, this literature review suggests that language learning strategies facilitate the learning of the target language although some factors such as age, proficiency level, motivation, learning style, etc affect the way in which language learners make use of these strategies. A great deal of research has focused on potential effect of strategy training on learners' language performance. On the other hand, there are not

enough studies concerning teachers' own perception about incorporating language learning strategies into their teaching. In fact, it is the teachers' role to bring about the learners' self-awareness, to empower them by providing structured directions on when and how to use a strategy and to give feedback, evaluate their performance and provide support if needed. Examining factors affecting teachers' decisions related to incorporation of strategy training into their lessons and their own experiences while dealing with these strategies in their courses will help us promote the learning process since studies on learning strategies show that teachers' orientation and expertise in language learning strategies play a critical role in successful learning strategy instruction.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study is to investigate the EFL teachers' and learners' perception in order to explore how language learning theory relates to practice. In order to investigate this relationship, firstly awareness levels of language learning strategies (LLSs) of teachers at Başkent University and their perspectives on incorporating LLSs into their teaching were explored. Certain psycho-social variables examined regarding the teachers' use of strategy instruction at Başkent University are: 1. Level of awareness of language learning strategies 2. Belief in the effectiveness of language learning strategies 3. Ease of strategy instruction. The study was also designed to examine whether teachers in the English Language Department with more teaching experience differ in their frequency of strategy use compared to the ones with less experience. The other sub-variables examined were age, gender and the highest degree of education obtained. These results were compared with the students' reported use of LLSs.

The study aimed to answer the following research questions:

1. Do language teachers at Başkent University teach language learning strategies in their language classrooms? If so, what is the frequency of their reported teaching of LLSs?

2. What are the teachers' awareness levels, beliefs in the effectiveness of language learning strategies and reported level of ease of strategy instruction?

3. How do the teachers' awareness levels, beliefs in the effectiveness of language learning strategies and reported level of ease of strategy instruction relate to their reported use of strategy instruction in their language classrooms?

4. How do teaching experience, age and the amount of teaching hour to a specific group of students relate to the teachers' perspectives on and reported use of strategy instruction in their language classrooms?

5. Which groups of LLSs do the students studying general English at Başkent University use to improve their language proficiency?

6. What is the relationship between teachers' perceptions on how they teach LLSs and students' perception of which strategies improve their language proficiency?

In this chapter, the methodological procedures for this study are presented. First, the background of the methodology for this study is mentioned. Then, the participants of the study and the setting in which the study was conducted are described. Finally, the data collection instruments and the ways the data were collected and analyzed are presented.

3.2 Setting and Participants

70 teachers working at the English language department (Preparatory school) of Başkent University took part in this study. The participants were EFL teachers at Başkent University, which is a Turkish-medium university. However, English is compulsory for both the preparatory year and for departments so that students can deal with the literature in their departments and use learning skills and strategies to promote further independent learning for their future careers as well. Although Başkent is a Turkish-Medium University, the students are required to take an English Proficiency test when they are first admitted to the university. Students who get a score of 60 or above are accepted to their departments. The rest of the students receive a one-year preparatory English Language Education and are supposed to reach Intermediate level before taking the proficiency exam in June. The general English courses in English Language Department focus on all skills integratively.

When permission related to the implementation of the questionnaire was obtained from the administrative council of the English Language Department, the questionnaire was distributed to English teachers during the weekly-held peer

coaching meeting after they were informed about the purpose of the study. Oxford (1990), the inventor of the questionnaire, suggests about 20 minutes for the completion of the instrument. However, as a number of social-psychological variables were added to the inventory, 30 minutes were allocated for the completion of it. The questionnaires were collected soon after they were completed. The participants were assured about the confidentiality of the information they provided on the cover page of the instrument. The participants' names were not asked but some of the participants were requested randomly for the interview afterwards. Since the researcher had been working at the same institution for more than six years, she was well-informed about the demographics of her colleagues and was able to do random sampling among the participants. The teachers' questionnaire of this study was administered during the first term, in the 11th week of instruction and the interview sessions were held in the 13th and 14th weeks.

For the learners' questionnaire, the data were collected randomly from 100 students who were at elementary and pre-intermediate levels of English language instruction and had been studying at prep school for about four months. The questionnaires were implemented in the 15th week of instruction. Learner participants were given an EFL version of SILL developed by Oxford (1989) that was translated into Turkish by the researcher. The learner participants were also assured about the confidentiality of the information they provided on the cover page of the instrument as their names were not required in the questionnaire.

3.3 Instruments

In order to address the research questions, three instruments were made use of; two questionnaires (an adapted version of SILL to EFL teachers' perspectives, an EFL version of SILL for students of English as a foreign language) and a follow up semi-structured interview for teachers at the English language department (preparatory school) of Başkent University. In that way, both qualitative and quantitative instruments were incorporated in this study to uncover the possible factors that might affect the teachers' and learners' perceptions in order to explore how language learning theory relates to practice.

3.3.1 Survey Questionnaire for Teachers

In order to investigate the perceptions of English teachers working at Başkent University of incorporating language learning strategies into their lessons, a survey questionnaire was utilized. As well as investigating the EFL teachers' awareness on language learning strategies, some specific factors affecting their decision were also identified such as teaching experience, age, gender and the highest degree of education obtained. The advantage of using a questionnaire is highlighted by O'Malley and Chamot (1990) as it is easier and more practical to gather data from a large population since they have a high range of coverage. The researcher used 50 language learning strategy items from Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). The variables used in the questionnaire were taken from MacIntyre's (1994) social psychological model that examines certain factors affecting language learning strategies in terms of frequency of use, knowledge, effectiveness, anxiety and difficulty level. Lee (2006) made use of SILL by Oxford (1990) and the variables suggested by MacIntyre. Besides this, she adapted the questionnaire to teachers' perspectives. In this study, Lee's (2006) adaptation of this learner questionnaire into teachers' perspectives was used with a change in format and by rewording some items.

Before the piloting process, some of the items in the inventory were reworded in order to prevent any possible misunderstanding since the original questionnaire was designed for learners of English and the adapted version of the questionnaire was implemented in Korea. In terms of rewording the items, "19. Look for similar words in Korean that are similar to new words in L2" was reworded as "19. look for words in Turkish that are similar to new words in L2", "31. Notice my mistakes and use …" was converted into "32. notice their mistakes and use…", "40. Encourage myself to speak when afraid of making a mistake" was reworded as "40. encourage themselves to speak when afraid of making a mistake", "46. Ask native speaker to correct me." was changed into "46. ask native speaker to correct them."

The instrument had been evaluated for its reliability and validity before. Nevertheless; it was piloted at Başkent University by teachers similar to the actual participants of the study to check for the clarity of instructions and ease of implementation. After the piloting process, a few minor changes were made to the instrument. First of all, the sample question provided it the introductory part of the questionnaire was found inadequate and confusing by some of the participants during the piloting process. To make it clearer, all four variables were provided under the sample question with an example signing because some of the participants asked whether to answer one of the variables or all of them each time.

Table2. The sample question with four variables

1. I try to say or write new words as often as possible.

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in the classroom

The phrase in the introductory part "…you are *using* the strategy" was changed into "…you are *teaching* the strategy". The font face was changed into Times New Roman and the font size was decreased to 10. In addition, a cover page explaining the purpose of the instrument was added and in order to attract attention to teachers' perception, the font size of the introductory phrase, "I teach my students" was increased to 16 and each sentence about specific strategy use was converted into phrases.

The instrument includes two sections. The first part of the questionnaire consists of 50 sentences on language learning strategies along with four variables such as 1) awareness of the strategy; 2) beliefs regarding the effectiveness of teaching a strategy 3) ease of teaching the strategy 4) frequency of teaching language learning strategies. A five point Likert-type scale was used to rank the responses. MacIntyre used five different anchors to rank each variable in his original test 1996):

Table 3. MacIntyre's five different anchors

"I try to learn about the culture of the people who speak the language."

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Know it very well
Never use it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Use it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Consider it very effective
Not anxious about using it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Feel very anxious using it
Very difficult to use	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very easy to use

(MacIntyre, 1996, p.377)

However, in Lee's adaptation of the variables into teachers' perspective, she changed the wording as follows: (The adapted parts are italized.) In this study, an adaptation of Lee's version was used.

Table 4. Lee's adaptation of SILL

"Try to learn about L2 culture of the people who speak the language."

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Know it very well
Never *teach* it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*Teach* it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to *teach in classroom*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Find it easy to teach in classroom

The second part of the questionnaire aims to gather some background information about the participants such as their age, gender, and experience in teaching and highest degree of education obtained. The names of the participants are not requested to keep it confidential and to obtain a trustable feedback.

3.3.2 A survey questionnaire for students

In order to find a relationship between teachers' and learners' perception about LLSs, to uncover the possible factors that may affect this relationship and to explore how language learning theory relates to practice, students were also incorporated in this study. Learner participants were given a 50-item, EFL version of SILL developed by Oxford (1989). The inventory was translated into Turkish by the researcher to

eliminate any possible misunderstanding that might occur on the part of the students. The Turkish version of the questionnaire was translated back into English by a colleague of the researcher who has been teaching English to Turkish learners for over 10 years. The data was collected randomly from 100 students studying at prep school on the 15th week of instruction. The learner participants for the questionnaire were chosen randomly without a classification of high or low achievers. The inventory was distributed to students studying at Başkent University preparatory school by their English teachers during lesson time. Oxford (1990), the inventor of the questionnaire suggests about 20 to 30 minutes for the completion of the instrument. After the learner participants were informed about the purpose and the need of the study by their teachers, the questionnaires were completed. The students were assured about the confidentiality of the information they provide on the cover page of the instrument as their names would not be required.

3.3.3 Semi-structured Interview

The third instrument used for the research was a semi-structured interview in which the researcher prepared the questions beforehand. However, the order of the questions could change in implementation. As stated in the literature, self-report questionnaires are seen to have three potential limitations; participants may not understand or interpret accurately the strategy description in each item, may claim to use the strategies they do not use or may fail to remember the strategies that they have used in the past (Cohen and Macaro, 2007). The aim in including a qualitative tool in this study was to gather context-specific information regarding the strategy use to develop an understanding of teachers' perception in the institution, to have a deeper understanding of strategy use that can be influenced by particular cultural, contextual and individual factors and give them the opportunity to explain their feelings and concerns related to strategy use in detail. Interviews give the opportunity for exploring and elaborating these issues.

The effectiveness of using semi-structured interviews for gathering information has also been highlighted by Oxford (1990) as it would be more complicated to categorize the themes under specific groups if the questions are not specified in

advance. On the contrary, when an interview is fully structured, it may not provide the necessary flexibility for gathering information. Ellis (1996) also points out that interviews call for retrospective accounts of the strategies participants employ. In other words; they require the participants to report on the learning strategies they use in general or in relation to a specific activity. In order to analyze the data gathered from the interviews, the data obtained from the participants were grouped under certain themes such as; 1) awareness level, 2) belief in strategy use, 3) factors affecting strategy instruction, 4) suggestions for teacher training on strategy instruction. The set of questions are stated in the appendices section (Appendix F). However, due to the nature of semi-structured interviews, there were some additional questions and comments in the flow of the process.

Before the actual interviews, the questions were piloted with teachers similar to the actual participants of the study. As a result of piloting, some of the questions were reworded, the order of some items was changed and the questions were increased to 10. The interviews were conducted in Turkish as it was assumed that it would be easier for the participants to express themselves in their native language. The recorded data obtained from the interview were translated into English by the researcher and proofread by a native speaker to avoid misinterpretations. It was anticipated that the interviewees might have difficulty in coming up with definitions of LLSs. Because of this reason, the first eight questions were formed aiming to find out teachers' awareness level and belief in LLSs and also help teachers form a conception of LLSs before asking them to come up with a definition. In a study carried out by Griffiths (2007), she summarizes the needs to construct a new questionnaire as the students reported some of the items of (SILL) as irrelevant to their context such as using rhymes and flashcards. Furthermore, some of the strategies the participants were observed to be using such as consulting a dictionary or making use of internet are not included in (SILL). Due to that observation, the researcher decided to add an item to the interview to find out the strategies the teachers might be teaching in their classes that are not included in the inventory.

The participants for the interview were chosen according to the diversity of the answers they provided related to their years of experience in teaching, age, gender

and the highest degree of education obtained. Since the aim of the study is to investigate teachers' perspectives on the chosen topic, most of the questions were about whether the participants include the strategies into their lessons and how they manage it.

3.4 Data Analysis Procedure

The results of the study were evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively. In order to analyze the items in the questionnaire, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used. For each item, means and standard deviations were obtained. To evaluate the relationship between the three variables; 1) awareness level of language learning strategies, 2) beliefs in the effectiveness of learning strategy instruction, 3) anxiety level regarding strategy instruction and the extent to which teachers' reported use of strategy instruction (the criterion variable), Pearson Correlation coefficient was calculated. All statistical analysis were performed under the six categories of SILL (Memory strategies (1-9); Cognitive strategies (10-23); Compensation strategies (24-29); Metacognitive strategies (30-38); Affective strategies (39-44); Social strategies (45-50).

In order to evaluate the sub variables of the study which are teaching experience, age, gender and the highest degree of education obtained, teachers were categorized accordingly. In order to find out the effect of gender on LLSs use, teachers were grouped as males and females. To find out the effect of age, teachers were grouped in two age categories, 35 years or less, and 36 years and older. As the institution where the study was conducted had not hired teachers for the previous four years, there was not a separate category for novice teachers and the categorization for the teaching experience was in four parts. The first group included teachers with at least 5 years of experience or less. The second group involved teachers with a teaching experience between 6 to 10 years. The third group included teachers with a teaching experience of 11 to 15 years. The last group included teachers with a teaching experience between 16 to 20 years. The last variable is about the highest degree of education received. There were four different groups for comparing teachers who hold Bachelors of Arts, Masters of Art, teaching certificate and PhD degrees. For the

variables about age and gender, T-test was used. Since there were four variables in teaching experience and degree of education, ANOVA (Analysis of variance) was used. For the statistical analysis, an alpha level of 0.5 was established as the confidence level.

All the interviews were recorded and transcribed by the researcher. The interviews were semi-structured in nature. A set of principal questions was prepared for the semi-structured interviews and follow-up questions were designed to probe for additional data. The reliability of the interview questions was assessed initially by conducting a pilot study with a sample of teachers at Başkent University in advance of the actual interviews. The pilot study was conducted to determine whether the questions were clear and unambiguous, and also to show whether the questions were easily and fully understood by a sample of subjects similar to the participants. Following the pilot interviews, a sample of analyzed responses was reviewed by a professional colleague and this peer review provided an external check for the research process. After the actual interviews, the analyses, interpretations and conclusions were provided to an independent third party to assess them for reliability of interpretation which helped validate the accuracy and credibility of the instrument.

Following the administering and subsequent scoring of the survey questionnaires, participants to be interviewed were selected. This selection was done by purposeful sampling, according to the diversity of the answers the teachers provided related to their years of experience in teaching, age, gender and the highest degree of education obtained. Eight participants were selected from among the participant teachers and interviewed separately and privately, and the confidentiality of the process was assured. The semi-structured interviews were recorded using detailed notes with an audiotape recording. A full and detailed record of each participant's responses was produced on completion of each interview.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

The aim of the study was to investigate EFL teachers' and learners' perceptions of language learning strategy instruction. The participants of the study were 70 teachers who were teaching general English and 100 students studying in the English Language Department of Başkent University in Ankara, Turkey. The study was conducted in the 2008-2009 academic year, fall semester. As a first research tool, 70 teachers were distributed questionnaires, 67 of which were returned. 3 of the questionnaires were excluded from data analysis as they were incomplete and 67 of the questionnaires were analyzed by using SPPS. The results of the questionnaires were analyzed quantitatively by calculating the frequencies and percentages for each strategy in the 50-item strategy inventory. As a second means of data collection, 100 students were asked to complete the EFL version of SILL that was translated into Turkish by the researcher. The last means of data collection was a semi-structured interview in which eight teachers were selected according to the diversity of answers they gave in the second part of the teachers' questionnaire and interviewed individually. This part of the study consists of analysis of the research questions through descriptive statistics and interpretation of the data obtained from the interviews.

4.2 Reliability of Survey Items

Although minor changes were made on the adapted teacher version of SILL, after being implemented, it was analysed using Cronbach's Alpha for internal consistency or reliability in order to determine if the parts of the test are consistent internally. In

the data analysis, a significance level of 0.05 (p< 0.05) was set. SPSS version 15 for windows was used to perform the reliability analysis. Table 5 shows the reliability analysis result of the teachers' questionnaire which indicates the approximate reliability coefficient score that ranged from 0,950 to 0,930 which is regarded as high reliability coefficient in literature.

Table 5. Reliability statistics of the teachers' questionnaire

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of items
Awareness	,950	50
Belief	,942	50
Ease of Instruction	,937	50
Frequency of strategy use	,930	50

The student version of SILL was translated into Turkish to minimize misunderstanding. After implementation, the student questionnaire was also analyzed for internal consistency and reliability. Table 6 shows the reliability analysis result of the students' questionnaire which indicates the approximate reliability of .922 which is regarded as an acceptable reliability coefficient in literature.

Table 6. Reliability statistics of the students' questionnaire

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,922	50

4.3 Analysis of the Questionnaires

In order to investigate teachers' perspective on LLSs, 70 questionnaires were distributed to participants but 67 of them were returned as fully completed. Table 7 shows the frequency and distribution of participants' demographics.

Table 7. Frequency and Distribution of Participant Demographics

Variables	Number	Percent
Gender		
Male	11	16.4
Female	56	83.6
Age		
35 and less	46	68.7
36 and more	21	31.3
Years of Teaching		
5 years and less	4	6.0
6 to 10 years	28	41.8
11 to 15 years	29	43.3
16 to 20 years	6	9.0
Highest degree of Education Obtained		
Bachelors of Arts	32	47.8
Teacher Certificate	6	9.0
Masters of Art	26	38.8
PhD	3	4.5

As many English teaching environments, Başkent University English language department is female dominant, %83 percent of teachers are female. The institution includes a young population; nearly %69 percent of the participants are less than 35 years old. Since the institution has not hired new instructors for three years, there are only four teachers with an experience of at least 5 years. The majority of teachers have experience between 6 to 15 years which forms %85 of the whole participants. Only 6 teachers reported at least 16 years of experience. In terms of educational background, nearly 48 of the participants hold BA and a similar percentage (% 38.8) belongs to teachers holding MA. There are only 6 teachers having a teacher certificate and 3 participants hold a PhD degree. The possible effect of these variables on strategy instruction was analyzed in the 4th research question below.

4.3.1 Research Question 1

Do the language teachers at Başkent University teach language learning strategies in their language classrooms? If so, what is the frequency of their reported teaching of LLSs?

Teachers rated the frequency of using language learning strategies. Table 8 presents the descriptives grouped under six categories of SILL.

Table 8. Frequency of Reported Use of LLSs

Category	Mean	Std. Deviation
Social Strategies	3.59	0.74
Metacognitive Strategies	4.06	0.65
Cognitive Strategies	3.71	0.65
Compensation Strategies	3.82	0.57
Affective Strategies	3.39	0.74
Memory Strategies	3.65	0.71

On a five-point Likert-type scale; 1.00 to 1.80 suggests very low score, 1.81 to 2.60 suggests a relatively low score, 2.61 to 3.40 suggests a moderate score, 3.41 to 4.20 suggests a relatively high score and lastly 4.21 to 5.00 suggests a very high score. The total mean score of teachers' reported use of LLSs is 3.73 which is relatively high on a five-scale questionnaire. In terms of category type, teachers reported using metacognitive strategies most often with a mean score of 4.06. It means the teachers at Başkent University give more emphasis to planning and evaluation of language learning activities. It is followed by compensation and cognitive strategies. However, affective strategies were reported to be used the least often with a mean score of 3.39. Affective strategies aim to help learners regulate emotions, motivations and attitudes and such as lowering your anxiety, encouraging yourself and taking your emotional temperature. The second least reported strategy type is social strategies (3.59).

The most frequently used three metacognitive strategies are; "Try to find ways to improve language learning (item 33 with a mean score of 4.41)", "Pay attention when someone is speaking L2 (item 32 with a mean score of 4.29)" and "Think about progress in learning L2 (item 38 with a mean score of 4.26)".

Out of 50 items in the inventory, the most frequently reported one is an affective strategy:" Encourage yourself to speak when afraid of making a mistake (item, 40 with a mean score of 4.50)". Although affective strategies were reported to be taught the least frequently with a mean score of 3.39, it is surprising to see an affective strategy item to be the most frequent one. It shows that unlike other affective strategies, teachers pay utmost attention to fluency rather than accuracy in speaking. Besides this, speaking is not one of the skills that is assessed in the proficiency exam of Başkent University. The teachers still believe in the importance of conveying your message to the listener fluently in order to be proficient in the language.

When we look at the three items that received the least frequency in the whole inventory, we can see that they are parallel with the findings. The least frequently reported item is an affective strategy; "Write down feelings about learning L2 in a diary (item 43 with a mean score of 2.31)". The second item is a memory strategy; "Use rhymes to remember new L2 words (item, 5 with a mean score of 2.47)". The third item that was reported to be used least frequently is a compensation strategy; "Make up new L2 words (item 26 with a mean score of 2.52)".

As it is stated by MacIntyre (1994), one of the factors that affect knowledge of a strategy use is learning experience. The findings of the present study suggest that the teachers involved in the study did not expressed their findings related to learning a foreign language in a diary or did not use rhymes to remember new words while learning English. It may explain why they do not prefer to teach these strategies to their learners either.

4.3.2 Research Question 2

What are the teachers' awareness levels, beliefs in the effectiveness of language learning strategies and reported level of ease of strategy instruction?

4.3.2.1 Awareness level

In order to teach a strategy, it is necessary to be aware of it. Table 9 shows the descriptive statistics of the EFL teachers' awareness level in terms of six strategy categories stated in SILL.

Table 9. Awareness levels of LLSs

Category	Mean	Std. Deviation
Metacognitive Strategies	4.34	0.62
Compensation Strategies	4.06	0.62
Social Strategies	4.05	0.84
Cognitive Strategies	4.04	0.74
Memory Strategies	4.01	0.60
Affective Strategies	3.85	0.80

The average awareness score for the 50 item strategy questionnaire is 4.06, which suggests a relatively high score on a five-scale questionnaire. Out of the six strategy categories, the teachers reported the highest awareness level for metacognitive strategies. Affective strategies, on the other hand, were reported to be the least aware of. These findings totally correspond with the mean scores of reported frequency use of LLSs. In metacognitive strategies, the most commonly used three items are; "Try to find ways to improve language learning (item 33 with a mean score of 4.66", "Pay attention when someone is speaking L2 (item 32 with a mean score of 4.51" and "Have clear goals for improving L2 skills (item 37 with a mean score of 4.43)" respectively. The teachers reported three strategies to be the least aware of; "Make up new L2 words (item 26, a compensation strategy with a mean score of 2.79)", "Use rhymes to remember L2 words (item 5, a memory strategy with a mean score of 2.96)" and "Write down feelings about learning L2 in a diary (item 43, an affective strategy with a mean score of 2.99)".

As there is a strong relationship between the findings obtained from frequency of strategy use and awareness level, it is possible to say that the teachers do not use the strategies that they are not aware of and vice versa.

4.3.2.2 Belief in strategy use

Another social psychological variable suggested by MacIntyre (1994) is having a reason to use or not to use a strategy. The following table presents the descriptive statistics related to teachers' belief on LLSs.

Table 10. Effectiveness of LLSs

Category	Mean	Std. Dev.
Metacognitive Strategies	4.27	0.61
Compensation Strategies	3.97	0.61
Cognitive Strategies	3.91	0.69
Social Strategies	3.90	0.73
Memory Strategies	3.80	0.79
Affective Strategies	3.73	0.70

The average effectiveness score for the 50 item strategy questionnaire is 3.93 which suggests a relatively high score on a five-scale questionnaire. The strategy category that the participants believe to be the most effective is again metacognitive strategies. However, affective strategies are reported to be the least affective strategy category just like in the previous variables.

The five most effective strategy items reported by the participants are; "1. Encourage yourself to speak when afraid of making a mistake (item, 40, an affective strategy with a mean score of 4.69)", "2. Make guesses to understand unfamiliar L2 words (item, 24, a compensation strategy with a mean score of 4.64)", "3. Try to find ways to improve L2 learning (item 33, a metacognitive strategy with a mean score of 4.54)", "4. Review lessons often (item 8, a memory strategy with a mean score of 4.46)" and "5. Ask questions in L2 (item 48, a social strategy with a mean score of 4.40)". Only one of these items belongs to metacognitive strategies (item, 33).

The effect of the context where the language is taught and learnt can be observed from these findings. In Başkent university Preparatory school, more emphasis is given to reading and writing so that students can deal with the literature in their departments and express themselves clearly in academic writing both in university

education and in their further studies as well. Out of reading strategies, guessing the meaning is the most frequently used strategy item. Students at preparatory school are provided with revision materials before every mid-term exam. Reviewing lessons is another item that was reported as an effective strategy item by the participants.

The five least effective strategies reported by the participants are; "1. Make up new L2 words (item 26, a compensation strategy with a mean score of 2.78)", "Write down feelings about learning L2 in a diary (item 43, an affective strategy with a mean score of 2.93", Talk to someone else about feelings regarding learning L2 (item 44, an affective strategy with a mean score of 3.09)", "Use rhymes to remember L2 words (item 5, a memory strategy with a mean score of 3.12)" and "Try to talk like native speakers (item 11, a cognitive strategy with a mean score of 3.45).

Only two of the reported least effective strategies belong to affective strategy category (items 43 and 44). Just like in previous categories, similar strategy items were reported to be the least effective ones. However, it is the first time that a cognitive strategy item (11) has been reported as an ineffective strategy. There is an increasingly common phenomenon of "international English" which refers to the use of English as a lingua franca around the world. The recent debate in the field of ELT is to decide which English to teach. Unlike the idea that non-native speakers learn English to interact with the native speakers of the language, the reality is that people from China, India or Nigeria use the language to interact with each other and no one from the "inner-circle" are involved in this communication (Kachru, 1994). Due to this recent debate about 'World Englishes', the teachers may not be giving emphasize to speak the language just like the native speakers of the language.

4.3.2.3 Perceived ease of strategy use

As indicated by MacIntyre (1996), it is necessary to be convinced that a strategy is easy before using it. Table11 lists the descriptive statistics about ease of LLSs for strategy instruction.

Table 11. Ease of LLSs instruction

Category	Mean	Std. Dev.
Metacognitive Strategies	3.76	0.76
Compensation Strategies	3.58	0.75
Memory Strategies	3.58	0.76
Cognitive Strategies	3.57	0.71
Affective Strategies	3.33	0.75
Social Strategies	3.24	0.80

The average mean score for the perceived ease of instruction in the 50 item strategy questionnaire is 3.51, which suggests a relatively high score on a five-scale questionnaire. The strategy category that the participants believe to be the most effective is again metacognitive strategies. However, unlike the previous variables, social strategies are reported to be the least effective strategy category.

The five easiest strategy items reported by the participants are; "Review lessons often (item 8, a memory strategy with a mean score of 4.40)", " Encourage yourself to speak when afraid of making a mistake (item, 40, an affective strategy with a mean score of 4.13)", " Make guesses to understand unfamiliar L2 words (item, 24, a compensation strategy with a mean score of 4.06)", "Try to find ways to improve L2 learning (item 33, a metacognitive strategy with a mean score of 4.06)", Only one of these items belong to metacognitive strategies (item, 33).

There is a consistency with the participants' answers regarding the choice of strategies although the variables change. Similar items were reported to be the most effective ones although there is a significant decrease in mean scores. It can be said that compared to the effectiveness of strategies, teachers regarded ease of instruction more challenging. Unlike in the previous sections, reviewing lessons is the item that was reported as the easiest strategy by the participants. Students at the preparatory school are provided with revision materials before every mid-term exam. This application might have affected the teachers' preferences.

Five least effective strategies reported by the participants are; "Ask a native speaker to correct you (item 46, a social strategy with a mean score of 2.46", "Ask for help from native speakers (item 48, a social strategy with a mean score of 2.49)", "Make up new L2 words (item 26, a compensation strategy with a mean score of 2.60)", "Use rhymes to remember L2 words (item 5, a memory strategy with a mean score of 2.60)", Talk to someone else about feelings regarding learning L2 (item 44, an affective strategy with a mean score of 2.73)", "and "Try to talk like native speakers (item 11, a cognitive strategy with a mean score of 2.82).

The first two of the reported least effective strategies belong to social strategy category (items 46 and 48) which are about communicating to a native speaker. All the English instructors at Başkent University preparatory school are non-native speakers of the language. There are very few native speakers of English in the prep schools of other universities in Turkey as well. It is difficult to find a native speaker to practice English which makes it a rather difficult strategy to practice in our context.

4.3.3 Research Question 3

1. How do the teachers' awareness levels, beliefs in the effectiveness of language learning strategies and reported level of ease of strategy instruction relate to their reported use of strategy instruction in their language classrooms?

The Pearson Correlation test was used to examine how the teachers' awareness levels, beliefs in the effectiveness of language learning strategies and reported level of ease of strategy instruction relate to their reported use of strategy instruction in their language classroom. A correlation study was carried out to understand to what extent the dependent variable: participants' reported strategy instruction in the classroom related to three independent variables; 1. Awareness level, 2. Beliefs in the effectiveness LLSs and 3. Reported level of ease of instruction.

4.3.3.1 Correlation between awareness level and strategy instruction

Table 12 presents the descriptive statistics that shows the correlation between awareness level and teachers' reported strategy instruction.

Table 12. Correlation between awareness level and strategy instruction

Category	Pearson Correlations
Metacognitive Strategies	$r = .373^{**}$
Compensation Strategies	$r = .325^{**}$
Cognitive Strategies	$r = .315^{**}$
Affective Strategies	$r = .254^{*}$
Social Strategies	$r = .20$
Memory Strategies	$r = .11$

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

For all the variables stated in the table for the present study, there is a positive correlation between awareness level and strategy instruction as "r" > 0. It implies the fact that the more teachers know about these categories, the more frequently they teach them in the classroom. Correlation coefficient can be between -1.00≤ rxy≤1.00. If there is a correlation between 0.70 – 1.00, it shows a high correlation; 0.70 – 0.30 suggests a moderate correlation and 0.30 – 0.00 suggests a low correlation (Büyüköztürk, 2002). For metacognitive, compensation and cognitive strategies, the data indicates a moderate correlation between awareness level and strategy instruction. For affective strategies, the correlation is low but significant at the 0.05 level. There is no significant correlation between awareness level and strategy use in social and memory strategies.

Due to the significant and moderate correlation between metacognitive, compensation and cognitive strategies, it can be said that the frequency of teaching these categories may be affected with the degree of knowledge on these categories. The insignificant and low correlation between memory and social strategies, however, implies that although the participants know about these categories, they may not be teaching them in the classroom so often.

4.3.3.2 Correlation between belief level and strategy instruction

Table 13 presents the descriptive statistics that shows the correlation between belief level and teachers' reported strategy instruction

Table 13. Correlation between belief level and strategy instruction

Category	Pearson Correlations
Compensation Strategies	$r = .290*$
Cognitive Strategies	$r = .22$
Affective Strategies	$r = .22$
Memory Strategies	$r = .18$
Metacognitive Strategies	$r = .17$
Social Strategies	$r = -.05$

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

A significant correlation between belief and strategy use was only found within the items under compensation strategies part. However, the correlation is low (.290) and significant at the 0.05 level. The data imply that although the teachers perceived metacognitive strategies as the most effective strategies in language learning (Table 6), they prefer to teach compensation strategies instead. Compensation strategies are about helping learners use the language despite not having the necessary knowledge such as guessing or using synonyms. Insignificant and low correlation in the other strategy categories still indicates a positive correlation between the two variables but the correlation is low. The negative correlation between belief level and strategy instruction in the category of social strategies shows that although the teachers believe in the effectiveness of using these strategies, they may not be teaching them in the classroom so often due to some other concerns which were elaborated in the interviews

4.3.3.3 Correlation between perceived ease of LLSs and strategy instruction

Table 14 presents the descriptive statistics that shows the correlation between perceived ease of LLSs and teachers' reported strategy instruction

Table 14. Correlation between perceived ease of LLSs and strategy instruction

Category	Pearson Correlations
Metacognitive Strategies	$r = .350**$
Affective Strategies	$r = .306*$
Compensation Strategies	$r = .300*$
Cognitive Strategies	$r = .249*$
Social Strategies	$r = .06$
Memory Strategies	$r = .01$

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

For the first four categories in the table above, there is a positive and significant correlation between participants' perceived ease of LLSs and strategy instruction. However, there is no significant correlation between perceived ease of LLSs and strategy instruction in the items under social and memory categories. Compared to the previous sections, the data shows a slightly higher correlation indicating that if the teachers perceive a strategy item easy, they teach it more frequently in the classroom. The correlation, however, is still at moderate level. Metacognitive strategies has the strongest correlation compared to the other strategy categories which means that if teachers perceive a metacognitive strategy easy in terms of implementation, they teach it more frequently in the classroom. On the contrary, social and memory strategies were found to be insignificant and correlated at a very low level which suggests that these strategies were least affected by the participants' perceived ease of LLSs. The teachers must have other concerns in relation to implementing them in the classroom such as awareness or belief in the effectiveness of teaching these strategies.

4.3.4 Research Question 4

How do teaching experience, age, gender and the highest degree of education obtained a specific group of teachers relate to the teachers' perspectives on and reported use of strategy instruction in their language classrooms?

In order to find out the effect of individual characteristics of the teachers working at Başkent University on incorporating LLSs into their lessons, a number of sub-variables such as age, gender, teaching experience and highest degree of education obtained were analyzed by utilizing T-test and Anova.

4.3.4.1 The effect of gender on strategy instruction

There were 11 male and 56 female teachers that participated in this study. Results of the T-test comparison were presented below.

Table 15. T-test comparison of gender by strategy

Memory Strategies

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	p-value
Awareness	Male	11	3.98	0.53	-0.191	0.849
	Female	56	4.02	0.62		
Reported teaching of LLSs	Male	11	3.63	0.77	-0.104	0.917
	Female	56	3.65	0.70		
Perceived effectiveness	Male	11	3.64	0.85	-0.765	0.447
	Female	56	3.84	0.79		
Ease of LLSs	Male	11	3.64	0.82	0.265	0.792

Cognitive Strategies

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	p-value
Awareness	Male	11	4.11	0.59	0.371	0.712
	Female	56	4.02	0.77		
Reported teaching of LLSs	Male	11	3.86	0.59	0.876	0.384
	Female	56	3.67	0.65		
Perceived effectiveness	Male	11	3.95	0.80	0.236	0.814
	Female	56	3.90	0.67		
Ease of LLSs teaching	Male	11	3.72	0.84	0.799	0.427
	Female	56	3.53	0.68		

Compensation Strategies

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	p-value
Awareness	Male	11	4.19	0.57	0.818	0.416
	Female	56	4.02	0.62		
Reported teaching of LLSs	Male	11	3.86	0.60	0.284	0.777
	Female	56	3.80	0.57		
Perceived effectiveness	Male	11	3.87	0.81	-0.538	0.592
	Female	56	3.98	0.55		
Ease of LLSs teaching	Male	11	3.75	0.83	0.855	0.396
	Female	56	3.54	0.74		

Table 15 (Continued)

Metacognitive Strategies

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	p-value
Awareness	Male	11	4.32	0.56	-0.097	0.923
	Female	56	4.34	0.63		
Reported teaching of LLSs	Male	11	3.93	0.49	-0.688	0.494
	Female	56	4.08	0.67		
Perceived effectiveness	Male	11	4.22	0.55	-0.284	0.777
	Female	56	4.27	0.62		
Ease of LLSs teaching	Male	11	3.83	0.45	0.388	0.699
	Female	56	3.74	0.81		

Affective Strategies

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	p-value
Awareness	Male	11	3.71	0.70	-0.603	0.549
	Female	56	3.87	0.82		
Reported teaching of LLSs	Male	11	3.24	0.64	-0.716	0.477
	Female	56	3.41	0.75		
Perceived effectiveness	Male	11	3.54	0.54	-0.957	0.342
	Female	56	3.76	0.71		
Ease of LLSs teaching	Male	11	3.27	0.62	-0.280	0.781
	Female	56	3.34	0.77		

Social Strategies

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	p-value
Awareness	Male	11	4.09	0.75	0.188	0.852
	Female	56	4.03	0.85		
Reported teaching of LLSs	Male	11	3.33	0.52	-1.288	0.202
	Female	56	3.64	0.76		
Perceived effectiveness	Male	11	3.78	0.59	-0.529	0.598
	Female	56	3.91	0.76		
Ease of LLSs teaching	Male	11	3.83	0.45	-0.734	0.465
	Female	56	3.74	0.81		

A significance level of 0.05 was established as the confidence level for this analysis. All the p values for the predictive variables are greater than 0.05. It shows that there is no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs.

4.3.4.2 The effect of age on strategy instruction

The teachers that participated in this study were classified into two age groups. The first group consisted of teachers who were at the age of 35 or less and the second

group includes teachers who are at least 36 or older. Results of the T-test comparison were presented below.

Table 16. T-test comparison of age by strategy
Memory Strategies

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	p-value
Awareness	35 and less	46	4.05	0.59	0.838	0.405
	36 and more	21	3.92	0.61		
Reported teaching of LLSs	35 and less	46	3.68	0.65	0.710	0.481
	36 and more	21	3.55	0.81		
Perceived effectiveness	35 and less	46	3.83	0.79	0.477	0.635
	36 and more	21	3.73	0.79		
Ease of LLSs teaching	35 and less	46	3.64	0.71	1.030	0.307
	36 and more	21	3.43	0.85		

Cognitive Strategies

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	p-value
Awareness	35 and less	46	4.00	0.78	-0.558	0.579
	36 and more	21	4.11	0.63		
Reported teaching of LLSs	35 and less	46	3.71	0.65	0.167	0.868
	36 and more	21	3.68	0.65		
Perceived effectiveness	35 and less	46	3.90	0.68	-0.153	0.879
	36 and more	21	3.92	0.71		
Ease of LLSs teaching	35 and less	46	3.54	0.67	-0.262	0.794
	36 and more	21	3.59	0.77		

Compensation Strategies

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	p-value
Awareness	35 and less	46	4.02	0.64	-0.693	0.491
	36 and more	21	4.13	0.55		
Reported teaching of LLSs	35 and less	46	3.80	0.56	-0.219	0.827
	36 and more	21	3.84	0.59		
Perceived effectiveness	35 and less	46	3.97	0.55	0.214	0.831
	36 and more	21	3.94	0.69		
Ease of LLSs teaching	35 and less	46	3.59	0.70	0.291	0.772
	36 and more	21	3.53	0.87		

Metacognitive Strategies

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	p-value
Awareness	35 and less	46	4.29	0.66	-0.929	0.356
	36 and more	21	4.44	0.52		
Reported teaching of LLSs	35 and less	46	4.04	0.65	-0.317	0.752
	36 and more	21	4.10	0.64		
Perceived effectiveness	35 and less	46	4.24	0.64	-0.473	0.638
	36 and more	21	4.32	0.53		
Ease of LLSs teaching	35 and less	46	3.73	0.79	-0.383	0.703
	36 and more	21	3.80	0.71		

Table 16 (Continued)

Affective Strategies

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	p-value
Awareness	35 and less	46	3.80	0.80	-0.569	0.571
	36 and more	21	3.92	0.81		
Reported teaching of LLSs	35 and less	46	3.31	0.67	-1.143	0.257
	36 and more	21	3.53	0.85		
Perceived effectiveness	35 and less	46	3.70	0.68	-0.450	0.654
	36 and more	21	3.78	0.74		
Ease of LLSs teaching	35 and less	46	3.30	0.70	-0.426	0.672
	36 and more	21	3.38	0.84		

Social Strategies

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	p-value
Awareness	35 and less	46	4.00	0.85	-0.629	0.531
	36 and more	21	4.14	0.80		
Reported teaching of LLSs	35 and less	46	3.53	0.70	-0.955	0.343
	36 and more	21	3.72	0.80		
Perceived effectiveness	35 and less	46	3.87	0.72	-0.307	0.760
	36 and more	21	3.93	0.77		
Ease of LLSs teaching	35 and less	46	3.16	0.78	-1.146	0.256
	36 and more	21	3.40	0.84		

The researcher speculated that age could be a significant factor that might affect teachers' perception of incorporating LLSs into their lessons. A significance level of 0.05 was established as the confidence level for this analysis. All the p values for the predictive variables are greater than 0.05. The findings of the T-test indicate no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs in terms of age.

4.3.4.3 The effect of teaching experience on strategy instruction

The teachers that participated in this study were classified into four groups. The first group consisted of 4 teachers with at least 5 years of experience or less. The second group include 28 teachers with an experience between 6 to 10 years. The third group consisted of 29 teachers with an experience between 11 to 15 years and there were 6 teachers in last group whose teaching experiences varied between 16 to 20 years. Results of Anova were presented below.

Table 17. Anova comparison of teaching experience of memory strategy

	Group	N	Mean	Std.	F-value	P-value
Awareness	5 years and less	4	3.89	0.33		
	6-10 years	28	4.00	0.67		
	11-15 years	29	4.02	0.56	0.095	0.962
	16-20 years	6	4.09	0.71		
	Total	67	4.01	0.60		
Reported teaching of LLSs	5 years	4	3.69	0.19		
	6-10 years	28	3.70	0.75		
	11-15 years	29	3.58	0.66	0.136	0.938
	16-20 years	6	3.69	1.04		
	Total	67	3.65	0.71		
Perceived effectiveness	5 years	4	3.83	0.41		
	6-10 years	28	3.77	0.95		
	11-15 years	29	3.82	0.71	0.030	0.993
	16-20 years	6	3.87	0.71		
	Total	67	3.80	0.79		
Ease of LLSs teaching	5 years and less	4	3.61	0.26		
	6-10 years	28	3.70	0.83		
	11-15 years	29	3.53	0.69	0.679	0.568
	16-20 years	6	3.24	1.00		
	Total	67	3.58	0.76		

For the items under the category of memory strategies, the findings of Anova indicated no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs in terms of teaching experience. Anova comparison of teaching experience by memory strategy

Table 18. Anova comparison of teaching experience of cognitive strategy

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	F-value	P-value
Awareness	5 years and	4	4.26	0.39		
	6-10 years	28	3.82	0.89	1.439	0.240
	11-15 years	29	4.20	0.56		
	16-20 years	6	4.10	0.78		
	Total	67	4.04	0.74		
Reported teaching of LLSs	5 years and	4	3.80	0.15		
	6-10 years	28	3.59	0.75	0.451	0.717
	11-15 years	29	3.78	0.56		
	16-20 years	6	3.79	0.72		
	Total	67	3.70	0.64		
Perceived effectiveness	5 years and	4	3.98	0.24		
	6-10 years	28	3.78	0.83	0.555	0.647
	11-15 years	29	3.99	0.57		
	16-20 years	6	4.03	0.66		
	Total	67	3.90	0.68		
Ease of LLSs	5 years and	4	3.48	0.53	0.386	0.763
	6-10 years	28	3.50	0.80		
	11-15 years	29	3.57	0.64		
	16-20 years	6	3.84	0.68		
	Total	67	3.56	0.70		

For the items under the category of cognitive strategies, the findings of Anova indicated no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs in terms of teaching experience.

Table 19. Anova comparison of teaching experience of compensation strategy

	Group	N	Mean	Std.Dev.	F-value	P-value
Awareness	5 years and less	4	4.37	0.45	1.058	0.373
	6-10 years	28	3.92	0.67		
	11-15 years	29	4.15	0.55		
	16-20 years	6	4.00	0.69		
	Total	67	4.05	0.61		
Reported teaching of LLSs	5 years and less	4	4.04	0.62	0.261	0.853
	6-10 years	28	3.77	0.63		
	11-15 years	29	3.82	0.52		
	16-20 years	6	3.86	0.59		
	Total	67	3.81	0.57		
Perceived effectiveness	5 years and less	4	4.16	0.36	0.252	0.860
	6-10 years	28	3.93	0.66		
	11-15 years	29	3.99	0.56		
	16-20 years	6	3.86	0.61		
	Total	67	3.96	0.59		
Ease of LLSs teaching	5 years and less	4	3.45	0.98	0.282	0.838
	6-10 years	28	3.62	0.73		
	11-15 years	29	3.60	0.74		
	16-20 years	6	3.33	0.91		
	Total	67	3.57	0.75		

For the items under the category of compensation strategies, the findings of Anova indicated no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs in terms of teaching experience.

Table 20. Anova comparison of teaching experience of metacognitive strategy

	Group	N	Mean	Std.Dev.	F-value	P-
Awareness	5 years and	4	4.44	0.50	1.046	0.379
	6-10 years	28	4.21	0.72		
	11-15 years	29	4.38	0.56		
	16-20 years	6	4.66	0.32		
	Total	67	4.34	0.62		
Reported teaching of LLSs	5 years and	4	4.02	0.29	0.897	0.448
	6-10 years	28	3.98	0.74		
	11-15 years	29	4.06	0.63		
	16-20 years	6	4.46	0.29		
	Total	67	4.06	0.64		
Perceived effectiveness	5 years and	4	4.08	0.36	0.450	0.718
	6-10 years	28	4.21	0.70		
	11-15 years	29	4.30	0.57		
	16-20 years	6	4.48	0.41		
	Total	67	4.27	0.60		
Ease of LLSs teaching	5 years and	4	3.08	1.26	1.175	0.326
	6-10 years	28	3.76	0.75		
	11-15 years	29	3.81	0.70		
	16-20 years	6	3.90	0.64		
	Total	67	3.75	0.76		

For the items under the category of metacognitive strategies, the findings of Anova indicated no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs in terms of teaching experience.

Table 21. Anova comparison of teaching experience of affective strategy

	Group	N	Mean	Std.Dev.	F-value	P-value
Awareness	5 years and less	4	4.00	0.49		
	6-10 years	28	3.73	0.86	0.532	0.662
	11-15 years	29	3.86	0.82		
	16-20 years	6	4.16	0.51		
	Total	67	3.84	0.80		
Reported teaching of LLSs	5 years and less	4	3.33	0.93		
	6-10 years	28	3.42	0.80	1.567	0.206
	11-15 years	29	3.24	0.66		
	16-20 years	6	3.94	0.41		
	Total	67	3.38	0.73		
Perceived effectiveness	5 years and less	4	3.70	0.41		
	6-10 years	28	3.66	0.82	0.314	0.815
	11-15 years	29	3.74	0.62		
	16-20 years	6	3.97	0.51		
	Total	67	3.72	0.69		
Ease of LLSs teaching	5 years and less	4	3.00	1.23		
	6-10 years	28	3.48	0.76	1.192	0.320
	11-15 years	29	3.18	0.67		
	16-20 years	6	3.52	0.59		
	Total	67	3.33	0.74		

For the items under the category of affective strategies, the findings of Anova indicated no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs in terms of teaching experience.

Table 22. Anova comparison of teaching experience of social strategy

	Group	N	Mean	Std.Dev.	F-value	P-value
Awareness	5 years and less	4	4.16	0.59		
	6-10 years	28	3.97	0.76	0.481	0.696
	11-15 years	29	4.02	0.96		
	16-20 years	6	4.41	0.60		
	Total	67	4.04	0.83		
Reported teaching of LLSs	5 years and less	4	3.83	0.60		
	6-10 years	28	3.57	0.62	1.279	0.289
	11-15 years	29	3.47	0.86		
	16-20 years	6	4.08	0.50		
	Total	67	3.59	0.73		
Perceived effectiveness	5 years and less	4	3.75	0.73		
	6-10 years	28	3.89	0.65	0.090	0.965
	11-15 years	29	3.89	0.85		
	16-20 years	6	4.00	0.58		
	Total	67	3.89	0.73		
Ease of LLSs teaching	5 years and less	4	2.91	1.15		
	6-10 years	28	3.26	0.69	0.551	0.649
	11-15 years	29	3.19	0.90		
	16-20 years	6	3.55	0.50		
	Total	67	3.23	0.80		

For the items under the category of social strategies, the findings of Anova indicated no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs in terms of teaching experience.

Although the researcher speculated that teaching experience could have a significant effect on teachers' incorporation of LLSs into their lessons, the findings of Anova indicated no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs in terms of teaching experience.

4.3.4.4 The effect of degree of education on strategy use

The last sub-variable that could have a significant effect on teachers' perception of incorporating LLSs into their lessons was the highest degree of education obtained by the participants. In order to investigate the relationship, a significance level of 0.05 was established as the confidence level for this analysis. Results of Anova were presented below.

Table 23. Anova comparison of degree of education of memory strategy

	Group	N	Mean	Std.Dev.	F-value	P-value
Awareness	Bachelor	32	3.92	0.64		
	Masters	26	4.18	0.54	1.235	0.304
	Teacher Cer.	6	3.81	0.61		
	Doctorate	3	3.88	0.33		
Reported teaching of LLSs	Bachelor	32	3.56	0.72		
	Masters	26	3.75	0.68	0.429	0.733
	Teacher Cer.	6	3.51	0.90		
	Doctorate	3	3.81	0.33		
Perceived effectiveness	Bachelor	32	3.69	0.85		
	Masters	26	4.00	0.64	1.062	0.372
	Teacher Cer.	6	3.48	1.09		
	Doctorate	3	3.88	0.44		
Ease of LLSs teaching	Bachelor	32	3.51	0.72		
	Masters	26	3.77	0.74	1.765	0.163
	Teacher Cer.	6	3.03	0.95		
	Doctorate	3	3.66	0.29		

For the items under the category of memory strategies, the findings of Anova indicated no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs in terms of the highest degree of education obtained.

Table 24. Anova comparison of degree of education of cognitive strategy

	Group	N	Mean	Std.Dev.	F-value	P-value
Awareness	Bachelor	32	3.92	0.82	1.495	0.224
	Masters	26	4.23	0.65		
	Teacher Cer.	6	3.66	0.54		
	Doctorate	3	4.26	0.50		
Reported teaching of LLSs	Bachelor	32	3.59	0.68	1.913	0.137
	Masters	26	3.90	0.56		
	Teacher Cer.	6	3.35	0.74		
	Doctorate	3	3.81	0.33		
Perceived effectiveness	Bachelor	32	3.76	0.71	4.528	0.006*
	Masters	26	4.21	0.46		
	Teacher Cer.	6	3.28	0.93		
	Doctorate	3	4.09	0.10		
Ease of LLSs teaching	Bachelor	32	3.41	0.72	3.513	0.002*
	Masters	26	3.84	0.56		
	Teacher Cer.	6	3.02	0.87		
	Doctorate	3	3.83	0.10		

The p value for the predictive variable; 'perceived effectiveness' is 0.006 and the p value for 'ease of instruction' is 0.002. They are both lower than the established significance level, 0.05. Since the variables are lower than the established significance level, Post Hoc tests were used to analyze the variable that caused that difference.

Table 25. Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene	df1	df2	p-value
Awareness	0.646	3	63	0.589
Reported teaching of LLSs	1.113	3	63	0.350
Perceived effectiveness	2.084	3	63	0.111
Ease of LLSs teaching	1.613	3	63	0.195

Table 26. Post Hoc Tests

Multiple Comparisons, Dependent Variable: Cognitive1, LSD

	(I) Education Level	(J) Education Level	Mean Difference	p-value	95% Confidence Upper	Lower
Perceived effectiveness	Bachelor	Masters	-.45(*)	0.009	-0.79	-0.11
		Teacher Cer.	0.47	0.100	-0.09	1.04
		Doctorate	-0.33	0.390	-1.10	0.43
	Masters	Bachelor	.45(*)	0.009	0.11	0.79
		Teacher Cer.	.92(*)	0.002	0.34	1.50
		Doctorate	0.11	0.761	-0.66	0.89
	Teacher Certification	Bachelor	-0.47	0.100	-1.04	0.09
		Masters	-.92(*)	0.002	-1.50	-0.34
		Doctorate	-0.80	0.078	-1.71	0.09
	Doctorate	Bachelor	0.33	0.390	-0.43	1.10
		Masters	-0.11	0.761	-0.89	0.66
		Teacher Cer.	0.80	0.078	-0.09	1.71
Ease of LLSs teaching	Bachelor	Masters	-.42(*)	0.018	-0.78	-0.07
		Teacher Cer.	0.39	0.193	-0.20	0.98
		Doctorate	-0.41	0.304	-1.22	0.38
	Masters	Bachelor	.42(*)	0.018	0.07	0.78
		Teacher Cer.	.81(*)	0.009	0.21	1.42
		Doctorate	0.01	0.980	-0.80	0.82
	Teacher Certification	Bachelor	-0.39	0.193	-0.98	0.20
		Masters	-.81(*)	0.009	-1.42	-0.21
		Doctorate	-0.80	0.092	-1.75	0.13
	Doctorate	Bachelor	0.41	0.304	-0.38	1.22
		Masters	-0.01	0.980	-0.82	0.80
		Teacher Cer.	0.80	0.092	-0.13	1.75

The results obtained from LSD tests indicate that the participants with a master degree are more likely to believe in the effectiveness of strategy use (with a mean difference of .45312) and reported that they found strategy instruction easier (with a mean difference of. 42823) than the ones with bachelor degree, teaching certificate.

Table 27. Anova comparison of degree of education of compensation strategy

	Group	N	Mean	Std.Dev.	F-value	P-value
Awareness	Bachelor	32	3.93	0.70		
	Masters	26	4.12	0.52	1.961	0.129
	Teacher Cer.	6	4.02	0.35		
	Doctorate	3	4.77	0.09		
Reported teaching of LLSs	Bachelor	32	3.73	0.65		
	Masters	26	3.85	0.52	0.750	0.527
	Teacher Cer.	6	3.88	0.38		
	Doctorate	3	4.22	0.34		
Perceived effectiveness	Bachelor	32	3.84	0.58		
	Masters	26	4.08	0.54	1.372	0.259
	Teacher Cer.	6	3.86	0.82		
	Doctorate	3	4.38	0.58		
Ease of LLSs teaching	Bachelor	32	3.47	0.78		
	Masters	26	3.71	0.64	1.339	0.270
	Teacher Cer.	6	3.27	1.03		
	Doctorate	3	4.11	0.34		

For the items under the category of compensation strategies, the findings of Anova indicated no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs in terms of the highest degree of education obtained.

Table 28. Anova comparison of degree of education of metacognitive strategy

	Group	N	Mean	Std.Dev	F-value	P-value
Awareness	Bachelor	32	4.17	0.73	1.953	0.130
	Masters	26	4.49	0.50		
	Teacher Cer.	6	4.29	0.21		
	Doctorate	3	4.81	0.23		
Reported teaching of LLSs	Bachelor	32	3.92	0.78	1.000	0.399
	Masters	26	4.20	0.52		
	Teacher Cer.	6	4.16	0.30		
	Doctorate	3	4.14	0.23		
Perceived effectiveness	Bachelor	32	4.14	0.71	1.242	0.302
	Masters	26	4.44	0.47		
	Teacher	6	4.16	0.48		
	Doctorate	3	4.37	0.44		
Ease of LLSs teaching	Bachelor	32	3.59	0.78	1.349	0.266
	Masters	26	3.98	0.77		
	Teacher Cer.	6	3.66	0.62		
	Doctorate	3	3.70	0.42		

For the items under the category of metacognitive strategies, the findings of Anova indicated no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs in terms of the highest degree of education obtained.

Table 29. Anova comparison of degree of education of affective strategy

	Group	N	Mean	Std.Dev.	F-value	P-value
Awareness	Bachelor	32	3.72	0.86	0.655	0.583
	Masters	26	3.94	0.77		
	Teacher Cert.	6	3.86	0.49		
	Doctorate	3	4.27	0.85		
Reported teaching of LLSs	Bachelor	32	3.35	0.73	0.180	0.909
	Masters	26	3.42	0.79		
	Teacher Cert.	6	3.50	0.68		
	Doctorate	3	3.16	0.44		
Perceived effectiveness	Bachelor	32	4.14	0.71	0.864	0.465
	Masters	26	4.44	0.47		
	Teacher Cert.	6	4.16	0.48		
	Doctorate	3	4.37	0.44		
Ease of LLSs teaching	Bachelor	32	3.23	0.73	0.810	0.493
	Masters	26	3.50	0.77		
	Teacher Cert.	6	3.16	0.78		
	Doctorate	3	3.11	0.48		

For the items under the category of affective strategies, the findings of Anova indicated no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs in terms of the highest degree of education obtained..

Table 30. Anova comparison of degree of education of social strategy

	Group	N	Mean	Std.Dev.	F-value	P-value
Awareness	Bachelor	32	3.83	0.97		
	Masters	26	4.22	0.68	1.306	0.280
	Teacher Cert.	6	4.30	0.19		
	Doctorate	3	4.22	1.07		
Reported teaching of LLSs	Bachelor	32	3.46	0.79		
	Masters	26	3.76	0.71	1.328	0.273
	Teacher Cert.	6	3.75	0.44		
	Doctorate	3	3.11	0.53		
Perceived effectiveness	Bachelor	32	3.67	0.82		
	Masters	26	4.18	0.55	2.716	0.052
	Teacher Cert.	6	3.97	0.26		
	Doctorate	3	3.61	1.00		
Ease of LLSs teaching	Bachelor	32	3.10	0.76		
	Masters	26	3.51	0.78	2.066	0.114
	Teacher Cert.	6	2.80	0.95		
	Doctorate	3	3.05	0.63		

For the items under the category of social strategies, the findings of Anova indicated no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs in terms of the highest degree of education obtained..

Most of the p values for the predictive variables are greater than 0.05 except for the two variables (perceived effectiveness and ease of strategy use) in cognitive strategies. The p value for the predictive variable; 'perceived effectiveness' is 0.006 and the p value for 'ease of instruction' is 0.002. They are both lower than the established significance level, 0.05. Since the variables are lower than the established significance level, Post Hoc tests were used to analyze the variable that caused that difference. The results obtained from LSD tests indicate that the participants with a master degree are more likely to believe in the effectiveness of strategy use (with a mean difference of .45312) and reported that they found strategy instruction easier (with a mean difference of. 42823) than the ones with bachelor degree, teaching certificate.

The rest of the findings for the other five strategy categories indicate no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs in terms of the highest degree of education obtained.

4.3.5 Research Question 5

Which groups of LLSs are believed to be used by the students studying general English at Başkent University to improve their language proficiency?

Students rated the frequency of using language learning strategies. Table 19 presents the descriptives grouped under six categories of SILL.

Table 31. Frequency of using language learning strategies of students

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Affective	2,72	0,81
Cognitive	2,82	0,63
Compensation	3,08	0,73
Memory	2,91	0,62
Metacognitive	3,30	0,78
Social	3,16	0,81

On a five-point Likert-type scale; 1.00 to 1.80 suggests very low score, 1.81 to 2.60 suggests a relatively low score, 2.61 to 3.40 suggests a moderate score, 3.41 to 4.20 suggests a relatively high score and lastly 4.21 to 5.00 suggests a very high score. The total mean score of students' reported use of LLSs is 2.99 which suggest a moderate score on a five-scale questionnaire. In terms of category type, students reported using metacognitive strategies the most often with a mean score of 3.30. It means the students at Başkent University give more emphasize to planning and evaluation of language learning activities. It is followed by social and compensation strategies. Whereas, affective strategies were reported to be used the least often with a mean score of 2.72 which aim to help learners regulate emotions, motivations and attitudes and such as lowering your anxiety, encouraging yourself and taking your emotional temperature. The second least reported strategy type is cognitive strategies (2.82).

The most frequently used five strategies are; " Pay attention when someone is speaking L2 (item 32 with a mean score of 4.17), "Make guesses to understand unfamiliar L2 words (item 24 with a mean score of 3.79)", "Think of relationship between native language and the target language (item, 1 with a mean score of 3.72)", "Ask the other person to slow down when having trouble understanding in L2 (item, 45 with a mean score of 3.70)" and "Try to find ways to improve language learning (item 33, with a mean score of 3.63)".

Out of the 5 most frequently used strategy items in the inventory, the first and the fifth ones belong to metacognitive strategy. It is surprising to see a strategy item related to speaking skills to be the most frequent one since speaking is not one of the skills that is assessed in the proficiency exam of Başkent University. In spite of that, the students still believe in the importance of production in order to be proficient in the language.

The five items that received the least frequency in the whole inventory are: "Write down feelings about learning L2 in a diary (item 43 with a mean score of 1.52)", "Use flashcards to remember new L2 words (item 6 with a mean score of 1.83)", "Act out L2 words (item 7 with a mean score of 2.37)", "Use rhymes to remember new L2 words (item 5, with a mean score of 2.39)" and "Make summaries of information heard or read in L2 (item 23, with a mean score of 2.39).

The first item that was reported as the least reported use strategy belongs to affective strategies, which is parallel with the findings. However, 3 of the least used strategy items belong to memory strategies (items 5, 6, 7) which is reported in the third rank of the least used strategy categories.

4.3.6 Research Question 6

What is the relationship between teachers' perceptions on how they teach LLSs and students' perception of which strategies improve their language proficiency?

There were 67 teachers and 100 students completed the questionnaires. Two groups were compared by utilising T-tests in order to find out the relationship between the

teachers' and students' reported use of LLSs. Results of the T-test comparison are presented below.

Table 32. T-test comparison of students' and teachers' reported strategy use

		Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
Affective	Reported frequency of strategy use	Teacher	67	3.39	0.74	5.40	0.000*
		Student	100	2.72	0.81		
Cognitive	Reported frequency of strategy use	Teacher	67	3.71	0.65	8.87	0.000*
		Student	100	2.82	0.63		
Compensation	Reported frequency of strategy use	Teacher	67	3.82	0.57	7.04	0.000*
		Student	100	3.08	0.73		
Memory	Reported frequency of strategy use	Teacher	67	3.65	0.71	7.09	0.000*
		Student	100	2.91	0.62		
Metacognitive	Reported frequency of strategy use	Teacher	67	4.06	0.65	6.60	0.000*
		Student	100	3.30	0.78		
Social	Reported frequency of strategy use	Teacher	67	3.59	0.74	3.43	0.001*
		Student	100	3.2	0.8		

A significance level of 0.05 was established as the confidence level for this analysis. All the p values for the predictive variables are smaller than 0.05. It shows that there is a statistical significant difference in teachers' and students' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs. When we look at the overall mean scores for both groups in terms of frequency of strategy use, the total mean score for teachers is 3.73 and the total mean score is 2.99 for students. Teachers appear to be much more active in dealing with LLSs.

However, there is a great similarity between the two parties in terms of frequency of strategy use in the most and least preferred strategy categories. Both groups reported metacognitive strategies as the most frequently used category. The mean score of teachers for metacognitive strategy is 4.06 and it is 3.30 for students. It shows that both teachers and students give utmost importance to planning and evaluation of

language learning activities. Affective strategies that are about regulating emotions, motivations and attitudes are reported as the least frequently used strategies by both parties, with a mean score of 3.39 for teachers and 2.72 for students.

The most frequently used strategy for teachers is "Encourage yourself to speak when afraid of making a mistake (item 40, an affective strategy with a mean score of 4.51)" and for students; "Pay attention when someone is speaking L2 (item 32, a metacognitive strategy with a mean score of 4.17)". Although the most frequently used strategy belongs to different categories for the two parties, it is very significant that both strategy is related to speaking skill. For the most frequently used five strategies; "Make guesses to understand unfamiliar L2 words (item 24) and "Try to find ways to improve language learning (item 33)" are reported by both teachers and students.

Both teachers and students reported the same item as the least frequently used one in the whole inventory: "Write down feelings about learning L2 in a diary (item 43)". In the least frequently used five strategies, "Use rhymes to remember new L2 words (item 5)" was reported by both teachers and students.

4.4 Analysis of the Semi-structured Interview

In order to analyze the interview data that were collected, they were translated from Turkish into English and to check the reliability of the translation, a peer review was conducted to obtain a second opinion on the findings. Established qualitative analysis techniques were adopted to analyze the interview data. A content analysis was performed on the data examining topics, categories of topics, and patterns across questions. First of all, using interview questions to develop initial coding categories, data from the transcribed semi-structured interviews were coded and charted for each participant. Next, an across-group content analysis was conducted and the results were charted in order to discover major themes. Thirdly, all data were analyzed and described according to codes and themes. Finally, the data were interpreted and analyzed by the researcher (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2006).

Interview questions were used to categorize teachers' responses under the headings such as; 1) awareness level, 2) belief in strategy use, 3) factors affecting strategy

instruction, 4) suggestions for teacher training on strategy instruction. For the unexpected themes within the individual participants, they were analysed separately and interpreted by the researcher.

The interviews were conducted two weeks after the implementation of the questionnaire. The participants were chosen according to diversity of demographics on their educational background, age, gender and teaching experiences. Eight participants agreed to take part in interviews. Table 21 presents the demographics of the participants to the interviews.

Table 33. Interview Participant Demographics

Name	Gender	Age	Years of Teaching	Degree of Education
Teacher 1	Female	34	12	PhD in Educational Sciences
Teacher 2	Male	40	18	BA in ELT
Teacher 3	Female	28	3	MA in Literature
Teacher 4	Female	38	14	BA in Literature
Teacher 5	Male	34	12	PhD in Educational Technology
Teacher 6	Male	30	8	BA in ELT
Teacher 7	Female	44	20	MA in ELT
Teacher 8	Male	31	8	BA in ELT

In terms of using data in a study, Yıldırım & Şimşek (2006) indicate that when it is necessary to refer a particular institution or participants, it is necessary to take their approval, in a written document preferably. They also add that the name of the participants must be confidential. It is possible to use nick names instead of their real names when it is essential to refer to these people. Due to that reason, the interviewees were given numbers instead of their real identities. Although some of their demographics were presented in the table, it is not possible to identify these people among 170 English instructors in the institution by just looking at their gender, teaching experience or educational background.

The interviews were conducted in the participants' native language (Turkish). All the interviews were recorded and transcribed by the researcher. Eight participants were selected from among the participant teachers and interviewed separately and privately, and the confidentiality of the process was assured. Each interview lasted

for about 30 minutes. In order to put the interviewees at ease, the researcher started with a kind of warm-up in which she explained the aim of the study and reminded them of the questionnaire they completed two weeks before. This was followed by the actual list of questions, the order and number of which changed from participant to participant.

4.4. 1 Awareness level

To apply or teach a language term is only possible by being aware of it. That is why the first couple of questions aimed to find out whether the teachers were aware of LLSs. The teachers participated in the interview reported moderate to high awareness of LLSs. The researcher tried to learn the teachers' awareness levels of LLSs by asking them to compare their high achiever learners applying learning strategies more effectively with low achievers and wanted them to exemplify their characteristics. There are numerous studies in literature suggesting that good language learners can be differentiated from less efficient ones by the way they use strategies in language learning.

> When I think of my relatively low achiever students, I can say that they are not really aware of the learning process and their only concern is to be successful in exams, they are more like exam-oriented, I mean. When I was presenting 'guessing the meaning out of context' as a reading strategy in the classroom, one of my students called the strategy as 'fabricating'. They assume that predicting a vocabulary item is fabricating (Teacher 1).

> I'm not sure if you call them strategies but my successful students are more willing to communicate in the classroom and they can form grammatically correct, full sentences. They also have a larger vocabulary input because they listen to foreign songs or go to movies in English more often. They look for ways to improve their language as much as possible (Teacher 4)

Teacher 1 helps us to understand perspectives of less efficient learners who perceive a strategy as an aimless effort. However, good language learners are effective in guessing and making inferences. She suggests that this problem can be overcome by providing students with LLSs from the very beginning. From Teacher 4's example,

we can see that good language learners pay attention to form, attempt to communicate in the classroom, not afraid of making mistakes, makes the most learning opportunities. These characteristics are parallel with the traits of good language learners suggested by Rubin (1975). Even though there is a debate in literature about being conscious in applying learning strategies (Cohen, 1990; Ellis, 1996), the teachers refer to successful students applying LLSs as conscious learners. One of the teachers approached the topic from a different perspective.

> I cannot say that slow learners do not use LLSs. Both good learners and slow learners make use of learning strategies. When they feel an urgent need to use the language, before the exams for example, as our students are exam oriented, they try to learn specific vocabulary items by writing them in flashcards or by analyzing the structures in revision materials. However, they differ from good language learners from the reason and way of applying LLSs. Good learners use the strategies more effectively (Teacher 6).

Recent studies show that although all kinds of learners apply LLSs to some extend, more proficient learners use more effective strategies (Marrie and Nettan, 1991). Some other teachers mentioned about students who are motivated, autonomous, self-confident and conscious and can evaluate the process of their learning. They focused on metacognitive and affective strategies that they think good students possess. On the other hand, all the participants were not so aware of LLSs:

> My motto in language learning is 'Practice makes Perfect' so whether you call it strategy or not, I try to prepare as many practice materials as possible including cloze tests, vocabulary matching exercises and so on and expect my students to pay attention to these exercises. Better learners are more responsible for their learning and take these efforts seriously. You cannot reach unsuccessful learners whatever you do. They put a barrier against learning the language. In language teaching, 30% should be attributed to the teacher, the rest is up to the learner (teacher 3).

Although paying attention to form is one of the traits of good language learners, language learning should not be restricted to focus on form. In summary, the teachers participated in the interview reported from moderate to high awareness of LLSs. Instead of asking them to come up with definitions of LLSs from scratch, the

researcher tried to learn the teachers' awareness levels of LLSs by asking them to compare their high achiever learners applying learning strategies more effectively with low achievers and wanted them to exemplify their characteristics. Towards the end of the interview, after the teachers formed a conception on strategy instruction, the researcher asked them to define the term "language learning strategies". Here are some of their definitions:

> Strategy training is the way that leads to language learning (Teacher 5).
> Learning strategies is a process in which learners discover how to learn the language better and being self-directed in language learning (Teacher 4).
> Rather than defining, I can say that teachers must take into account learners' characteristics while conducting strategy training (Teacher 2).
> Learning strategies are set of rules in order to overcome the difficulties in language learning process (Teacher 8).

Language learning strategies were perceived as a process set of rules or a language behaviour that enhances language learning in general.

4.4.2 Belief in strategy use

Although some of the teachers were unaware of LLSs or did not have a clear conception of the term, they held a positive attitude towards LLSs after helped to form a conception and provided with a few examples on strategies. All eight teachers who participated in the interviews reported that they believe in the effectiveness of incorporating LLSs into their classrooms. However, none of the teachers mentioned about daily planned integration of strategy instruction. Most of the training consisted of impromptu use of LLSs when a sudden need occurred in the overall process of teaching. Although the teachers believed in the effectiveness of using LLSs, they did not take a full advantage of using them thoroughly in their lessons. The reason for this mismatch might be due to the belief that having a large repertoire of learning strategies is one of the innate traits of good language learners. However, research has proved that it was not only a language aptitude or motivation that caused a learner to excel in language but students' own active participation in the learning process

through the application of individualized learning techniques or learning strategies (Rubin, 1975).

When teachers were asked about the possible impact of strategy training on students, while one of the teachers approached the question as it has a positive impact, most of them indicated that LLSs instruction help learners to be autonomous and independent learners who are responsible for their own learning and conscious of the language learning process and learn how to study to learn the language. Some teachers mentioned about affective factors as three of the participants stated that LLSs instruction helps to prevent inhibition. Since one of the reasons of not being so active in a language class may not be due to lack of knowledge but students are concerned about what other students think when they make mistakes. Six of the participants mentioned about becoming autonomous, independent learners when armed with strategy instruction. One of the teachers stated that strategy instruction improves motivation:

> When you provide students with strategies, it leads to intrinsic motivation and students start to say; "I can learn this language". With strategy instruction, learners learn to learn the language and this motivation leads to self confidence and they start to use these strategies outside the classroom environment as well. I don't want my students to be dependent on me but to be autonomous learners (Teacher 6).

Another teacher stated that strategy training helps learners to be 'risk-takers':

> I try to convince my students that they will learn from their mistakes. I try to help them to be risk-takers and gain a disposition in that way. For example, while speaking in the target language, I want them not to worry about other students' attitudes when they make mistakes. Strategy training should also help learners form the right attitude in learning a language (Teacher 1).

In her classroom, Teacher 1 encourages students to speak even if they make mistakes. Another participant stated that the impact of LLSs is difficult to observe in short term. It might take some time to observe the impact of strategy training. Six of the participants stated that strategy training help learners develop a particular

language skill. To improve vocabulary, teacher 7 tells her students to divide a word into parts to understand it. Teacher 5 encourages his students to relate the English words to images or pictures to remember it later. Teacher 3 mentioned about reviewing lessons often. To improve listening, teacher 5 suggests going to movies in English or watch TV programs spoken in English. To improve reading, teacher 1offers to read the classics in English. Most of the teachers including Teacher 8 suggest skimming an English text first and going back and reading it more carefully. He also suggests guessing the meaning out of context.

All in all, the possible impact learning strategies may have on learners can be summarized as they help learners become autonomous learners, lower inhibition, increase motivation and self-directed learning, encourage risk-taking and learn a specific language skill. Although the teachers believe in the effectiveness of using LLSs, they do not take a full advantage of using them thoroughly in their lessons, the reasons of which will be elaborated in the next session.

4.4.3 Factors affecting strategy instruction

Compared to the positive findings obtained from the previous themes, the teachers reported some concerns related to the ease of strategy instruction. A similar conclusion was drawn from the descriptive statistics as well. When the correlation between belief and strategy instruction was calculated, a low correlation was found. It indicates that although the teachers believe in the effectiveness of using LLSs, they may not be teaching them in the classroom so often due to some other concerns.

When the participants were asked about the factors that affect strategy instruction, all the teachers participated to the interviews attributed the difficulty of incorporating LLSs into their lessons to external factors. None of them mentioned about the inability or lack of expertise of the self in teaching LLSs. The external factors reported by the teachers that affect LLSs instruction are: 1) students' lack of motivation, personality factors, curriculum constrains, rapport with students, effect of background experience both as a teacher and as a learner.

To exemplify the effect of lack of motivation and personality factors in teaching LLSs, Teacher 1 mentioned a group of students who were very successful in applying LLSs. She stated the reason as they were eager to learn and had positive attitude towards learning. She compared them with another group of students who refuses to talk and participate into the lesson. Teacher 6 mentioned about the effect of his background experience as a learner:

> As a language learner, I used to be corrected several times by my English instructors. That's why I pay special attention in order not to interrupt my students especially in oral production. After they finish their speech, I try to correct their mistakes gently by using the correct form in my follow-up questions by giving more emphasize on that part. Even if it is a serious mistake, I still wait them to finish their conversation. In addition, although I am a quick-tempered person in my private life, I try to be easy-going in the classroom and want to form a good relationship with my students (Teacher 6).

Teacher 8 mentioned about the curriculum constraints and divided them into four sub-groups as pacing, level of the book, level of the task and exam orientation.

> In terms of strategy instruction, I feel myself in a dilemma. The aim of strategy instruction is to make language learning more self-directed, so I need to help my learners take more initiative in the learning process. However, the level of the book might be over than the students' proficiency. In order to provide the students with more input, I have to do spoon-feeding from time to time. How much strategy training can I implement in these circumstances? (Teacher 8)

Hence, the level of the book is another factor affecting the quality of LLSs: The same concern is valid for the level of the task as well. If a reading passage is filled with unknown words, students may not have enough contexts to guess the meaning of some specific items. In terms of exam orientation, he stated that students are passive in listening and speaking lessons as the proficiency exam they are going to take at the end of the year does not include these skills. The curriculum may determine the amount of time teachers can spend on strategy training. If the curriculum is too detailed, it may not give teachers the flexibility to include strategy training into the pacing and even strategy training can be assumed as an extra curricular activity. To overcome some of the destructive effects of some of these factors, the participant

teachers suggested that the students should be encouraged that they can be successful in language learning if they apply strategies effectively.

4.4.4 Suggestions for teacher training on strategy instruction

Before convincing our learners that strategy training is worthwhile, we should find ways to persuade and involve the teachers who will incorporate these strategies in their classes. The factors that affect classroom teachers' decisions in incorporating LLSs into their lessons were grouped as teaching style, teacher beliefs and lack of knowledge in promoting strategies by the participant teachers.

The effect of teachers' preferred teaching style is expressed by one of the participants as follows:

> Teachers utilising a deductive approach and in favour of a more teacher-centered approach may face with problems in strategy instruction because they perceive language learning as what to learn rather than how to learn. In order to overcome these problems, teachers should be exposed to seminars and read in order to help them gain awareness on LLSs (Teacher 8).

Another variable that was stated by the teachers is lack of knowledge about LLSs. After analyzing the student version of SILL, one of the teachers suggested implementing the inventory every term and added:

> To know the basic trends or approaches in language teaching doesn't mean using them indeed. In order to gain consciousness on LLSs, training workshops would be beneficial as we would be provided with suggestions and materials to introduce the concept of strategy to our students (Teacher 2).

Teachers 4 and 5 stated that strategy training is an ongoing process and observing peers would be beneficial while implementing strategy instruction. Teacher 6 believes that we, as teachers, should convince ourselves about the importance of strategy instruction before training or actual implementation.

Teachers were also asked if they make use of any different strategy that is not stated in the inventory. Four of the participants mentioned about making use of means of technology in language learning such as the internet for research purposes,

All things considered, the teachers who took part in the interviews above reported that strategy training is effective and helps to improve their students' motivation, makes them aware, active, efficient and responsible learners, gives students a better understanding of the target language and makes them more capable of working independently.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.1 Discussion of the Findings

5.1.1 Overview of the Study

According to the social-psychological model, knowing a strategy well, perceiving it as effective and not considering it too difficult to use predicts the majority of the variance in strategy use (MacIntyre, 1996). In the present study, the variables in the rating provided above in combination with Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) were used in order to examine the perspectives of EFL teachers working at Başkent University on incorporating language learning strategies in their lessons. With the help of the variables developed by MacIntyre (1994), the researcher investigated the awareness levels of the EFL teachers, their beliefs on the effectiveness of strategies on language learning and perceived ease of strategy instruction.

5.1.2 Relationship between Teacher Perspectives and use of LLSs

It is necessary to be aware of a strategy and understand it. The total mean score of teachers' awareness level of LLSs is 4.06, which is a high score on a five-point scale. When the mean score is compared with the interview findings, it is possible to say that majority of the teachers working at the English language department of Başkent University are aware of learning strategies. During the interviews, the researcher tried to learn the teachers' awareness levels of LLSs by asking them to compare their high achiever learners applying learning strategies more effectively with low achievers and wanted them to exemplify their characteristics. The explanations the participant teachers provided about the traits of their high achiever students utilising LLSs effectively were quite parallel with the traits of good language learners

suggested by Rubin (1975).They stated that good language learners pay attention to form, attempt to communicate in the classroom, are not afraid of making mistakes, and makes the most learning opportunities.

There must be a positive expectation that a strategy will be useful in learning the target language. The total mean score of teachers' belief on LLSs is 3.93. It still indicated a relatively high score on a five-point scale. In order to explain and support the descriptive analysis about teachers' belief on the effectiveness of LLSs with the interview findings, the teachers were asked to comment on the possible impact of LLSs on students. Most of the participants indicated that LLSs instruction help learners to be autonomous and independent learners who are responsible from their own learning and conscious of the language learning process and learn how to study to learn the language. Some teachers mentioned about affective factors as LLSs instruction helps to prevent inhibition. They also indicated that strategy instruction help to increase motivation and self-directed learning encourage risk-taking and help to learn a specific language skill.

The last variable was about teachers' perceived ease of strategy instruction since the difficulty level of the strategy item should be moderate in order to use a strategy item appropriately. The total mean score for the perceived ease of LLSs instruction is 3.51. Compared to participants' high awareness level and belief in the effectiveness of LLSs, their responses to ease of strategy instruction was at a moderate value. Although the participants were aware of the strategies and found them effective to incorporate into their classroom, they found some of the items stated in the strategy inventory difficult to implement in the classroom.

There is a consistency with the participants' answers regarding the choice of strategies even though the variables change. Similar items were reported to be the most effective strategy categories. For awareness and belief of strategy instruction, the teachers reported that they were mostly aware of metacognitive strategies. However, affective strategies were reported as the least preferred category. For the perceived ease of strategy instruction, metacognitive strategies were ranked at the top again but social strategies were reported as the most difficult strategy to teach in the

classroom. In spite of the consistency in the preferred categories, there is a significant decrease in mean scores. It can be said that compared to awareness and effectiveness of strategies, teachers regarded some of the strategies difficult to apply in classroom.

In order to find out the relationship between the three predictive variables; teachers' awareness levels, beliefs in the effectiveness of language learning strategies and reported level of ease of strategy instruction and the dependent variable; their reported use of strategy instruction in their language classrooms were compared.

The correlation statistics between awareness level and strategy instruction suggest that for metacognitive, compensation and cognitive strategies, the data indicates a moderate correlation between awareness level and strategy instruction. For affective strategies, the correlation is low but significant at the 0.05 level. There is no significant correlation between awareness level and strategy use in social and memory strategies. Due to the significant and moderate correlation between metacognitive, compensation and cognitive strategies, it can be said that the frequency of teaching these categories may be affected with the degree of knowledge in these categories. The insignificant and low correlation between memory and social strategies, however, implies that although the participants know about these categories, they may not be teaching them in the classroom so often.

The correlation statistics between belief level and strategy instruction show that a significant correlation between belief and strategy use was only found within the items under compensation strategies part. However, the correlation is low (.290) and significant at the 0.05 level. The data imply that although the teachers perceived metacognitive strategies as the most effective strategies in language learning (Table 6), they prefer to teach compensation strategies instead. Insignificant and low correlation in the other strategy categories still indicates a positive correlation between the two variables but the correlation is low. The negative correlation between belief level and strategy instruction in the category of social strategies shows that although the teachers believe in the effectiveness of using these

strategies, they may not be teaching them in the classroom so often due to some other concerns which were elaborated in the interviews.

The correlation between perceived ease of LLSs and strategy instruction shows a significant correlation for metacognitive, affective, compensation and cognitive strategies However, there is no significant correlation between perceived ease of LLSs and strategy instruction in the items under social and memory categories. Compared to the previous sections, the data shows a slightly higher correlation indicating that if the teachers perceive a strategy item easy, they teach it more frequently in the classroom. The correlation, however, is still at moderate level. Metacognitive strategies has the strongest correlation compared to the other strategy categories which means that if teachers perceive a metacognitive strategy easy in terms of implementation, they may teach it more frequently in the classroom. On the contrary, social and memory strategies were found to be insignificant and correlated at a very low level which suggests that these strategies might have been least affected by the participants' perceived ease of LLSs.

The results of the descriptive statistics above suggest that for most of the items in the strategy inventory, if the teachers are aware of learning strategies, believe in the effectiveness of LLSs instruction and find them easy to apply in the classroom; they may use it more in their classes. The same generalization , however, cannot be made about social strategies in the correlation between belief level and strategy use.

As stated before, the reported frequency of strategy use for teachers is 3.73 which indicate a moderate score. When the participants were asked about the factors that affect strategy instruction, most of the teachers participated to the interviews attributed the difficulty of incorporating LLSs into their lessons either to teacher related factors or external factors. The factors that affect classroom teachers' decisions in incorporating LLSs into their lessons were grouped as teaching style, teacher beliefs and lack of knowledge in promoting strategies by the participant teachers. The external factors reported by the teachers that affect LLSs instruction are; students' lack of motivation, personality factors, curriculum constrains (which were further divided into four sub-groups such as pacing, level of the book, level of

the task and exam orientation), rapport with students, effect of background experience both as a teacher and as a learner.

In the light of the discussion above, a successful training of strategy use necessitates training of the teachers first of all. Hence, for strategy training to become an integral part of second and foreign language education, it is necessary to convince teachers of the benefits of the learning strategy training and to develop their instructional techniques to help students become more autonomous learners. In order to gain further insight into teachers' perceptions of LLSs, it is necessary to focus on preservice and in-service teacher education. According to the implications the researcher gained from the literature related to the development and growth of the language teacher, a reflective approach should be adopted that places the teachers at the centre. In such an approach, teachers develop their own theories of teaching; examine their own decision process and teaching practices. Reflective teaching provides the groundwork for continuous self-development (Velez-Rendon, 2002). Teachers should be given opportunities to acquire the theoretical knowledge on LLSs and gain the skills necessary to form a connection between theory and practice.

A similar study that inspired the present research was conducted among Korean teachers by Lee (2006). While investigating the correlation between EFL teachers' awareness, belief and perceived ease of LLSs instruction to the frequency of strategy use, higher correlations were achieved. The teachers in Korea were not only aware of LLSs and believe in the effectiveness of strategy instruction, they were intensively implementing these strategies in their classroom. The difference in application between the two groups of teachers might be attributed to the different educational contexts they work in. The participants in Lee's study were either from private language institutions or language centres. Learner portfolio of a private language school and a university are quite different. Students in a language centre are expected to be more motivated and ready to learn the language. The teachers must be more flexible in terms of the material they implement and pacing that they follow. In the present study, however, the teachers mentioned some teacher related and external factors affecting strategy instruction in a negative way.

From the analysis of data obtained both from questionnaires and from interviews, it was found out that most of the participants in this study showed a relatively high awareness and believed in the effectiveness of LLSs. However, none of the teachers mentioned about daily planned integration of strategy instruction. Most of the training consists of impromptu use of LLSs when a sudden need occurs in the overall process of teaching. According to the research in L2 learning, it has been indicated that the most effective strategy training is explicit. Learners are explicitly told that a particular behaviour or strategy is helpful and they are trained to use it and transfer it to other settings. Students cannot realize the potential benefit of strategy use if they are not informed about it. According to most research, strategy training succeeds best when it is integrated into regular class activities (Oxford, 2002).

5.1.3 The effect of specific variances on teachers' perceptions of LLSs

In order to find out the effect of individual characteristics of the teachers working at Başkent University on incorporating LLSs into their lessons, a number of sub-variables such as age, gender, teaching experience and highest degree of education obtained were analyzed by utilizing T-test and Anova. Variance analysis provided no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions and reported frequency of use of LLSs in terms of age, gender and teaching experience. The only significant difference was found in the highest degree of education obtained for the two variables (perceived effectiveness and ease of strategy use) in cognitive strategies. The results indicated that the participants with a master degree are more likely to believe in the effectiveness of strategy use (with a mean difference of .45) and reported that they found strategy instruction easier (with a mean difference of . 43) than the ones with bachelor degree, teaching certificate or PhD.

Although the rest of the findings for the other five strategy categories indicated no statistical significant difference in teachers' perceptions of LLSs, the results are still striking. At the end of variance analysis, it can be said that the only variable that makes a difference in teachers' perceptions of LLSs is degree of education. Teacher may not gain this awareness by being mature or getting experienced in teaching the language but through further education.

5.1.4 A comparison of teachers' and students' perceptions of LLSs

Exploring students' perceptions of LLSs and comparing the findings with teachers helped to relate the theory into actual practice. It would not be possible to plan a LLSs training without taking students' perceptions into consideration. For the present study, both teachers and students were asked to complete the strategy inventory (SILL). Teachers ranked the items in the inventory on a five-point Likert-type scale and they were asked about their perceptions of language learning strategies they taught to students in their EFL classrooms. Students were given the same inventory and were asked to rank the strategies that they used from the most frequent to the least frequent one on a five-point Likert-type scale. Their responses were compared with T-tests and analyzed.

When the results of the two questionnaires were compared, a statistically significant difference in teachers' and students' perceptions and reported frequency of the use of LLSs was found. When we look at the overall mean scores for both groups in terms of frequency of strategy use, the total mean score for teachers is 3.73 and the total mean score is 2.99 for students. Teachers appear to be more active in dealing with LLSs.

However, there is a great similarity between the two parties in terms of frequency of strategy use in the most and least preferred strategy categories. Both groups reported metacognitive strategies as the most frequently used category' reported use of LLSs. The teachers reported teaching metacognitive strategies more frequently than the other strategies (with a mean score of 4.06). The student participants also reported using metacognitive strategies more often (M. 3.30). The same parallel was drawn for the least frequently used strategy category as well. Both teachers and students reported affective strategies as the least frequently used group in the whole inventory (with a mean score of 3.39 for teachers and 2.72 for students). It shows that both teachers and students give utmost importance to planning and evaluation of language learning activities. However, they do not seem to be concerned about regulating their emotions in language learning a lot. There is a great similarity between the two parties in terms of the most preferred strategy item as well. The most frequently used

strategy for teachers is "Encourage yourself to speak when afraid of making a mistake (item 40, an affective strategy with a mean score of 4.51)" and for students; "Pay attention when someone is speaking L2 (item 32, a metacognitive strategy with a mean score of 4.17)". Although the most frequently used strategy belongs to different categories for the two parties, it is very significant that both strategy is related to speaking skill. Furthermore, both teachers and students reported the same item as the least frequently used one in the whole inventory: "Write down feelings about learning L2 in a diary (item 43)".

The most frequently used strategy category in all variables for both teachers and students was metacognitive strategies. Research indicates that high-performing L2 learners prefer metacognitive strategies over other categories (Oxford, 2002). Moreover, according to non-L2 research, successful learners often use metacognitive strategies such as organising, evaluating and planning their learning. However, social and affective strategies were ranked at the bottom for most of the variables in the present study. In literature, these strategies are indicated to be cited less frequently. Oxford (2002) explains the reason as: "…perhaps because L2 researchers fail to ask about affective and social strategies in detail and perhaps because even skilled learners mistakenly hesitate to consider these as real strategies (p.126). This general tendency may explain the reason for the teachers' and students' strategy preferences.

In order to understand the reason why social and affective strategies were ranked at the bottom for most of the variables in the present study, it might be helpful to approach the issue by taking the contextual factors into consideration as well. While outlining the factors affecting attitudes toward learning a foreign language in Turkey, Bear (1985) stated the impact of society and culture. He indicated that Turkish students tend to identify language as an important dimension of their cultural identity. He indicated that this identification resulted from the linguistic nationalism fostered by Ataturk's nation-building approach. For Ataturk, the creator of modern Turkey and the architect of the Turkish language reform, there is an inseparable link between national culture and national language. Bear suggested that the strategies that foster national identity should be developed so that it would be possible to balance the impact of such factors in learning a foreign language.

Other factors that may explain the reason for some of the strategies being reported as least preferred might be learning experience and contextual realities. As it is stated by MacIntyre (1994), one of the factors that affect knowledge of a strategy use is learning experience. The findings of the present study suggests that the teachers involved in the study did not expressed their findings related to learning a foreign language in a diary or did not use rhymes to remember new words while learning English. It may explain the reason that they do not prefer to teach these strategies to their learners as well. Furthermore, two of the reported least effective strategies under social strategy category (items 46 and 48) are about communicating to a native speaker. All the English instructors at Başkent University preparatory school are non-native speakers of the language. There are very few native speakers of English in the prep schools of other universities in Turkey as well. It is difficult to find a native speaker to practice English which makes it a rather difficult strategy to practice in our context.

However, it is necessary to consider the strategies as a whole to be successful in language learning, not just the commonly preferred ones. That is why; we should help our students understand the whole spectrum of strategies, including affective and social ones as well.

There is a slight discrepancy in the total mean score of teachers and students. For the frequency of strategy use, the total mean score for teachers is 3.73 and the total mean score is 2.99 for students. Teachers appear to be more aware of LLSs. It is quite normal to expect a greater range of strategy use from the teachers as they are trained for teaching the language. On the other hand, we should look for ways to increase students' strategy use. Rees-Miller (1994) lists the factors that teachers must take into account while conducting strategy training as learners' cultural backgrounds, age, educational background, life experience, affective factors, and learners' and teachers' beliefs about language learning. Learners vary in the frequency of making use of learning strategies and specific strategy types they prefer to use. Strategy instruction should be geared to learners' individual and situational or group needs. Consideration of the effect of such inhibitors is crucial before planning a LLSs training.

A similar study was conducted by Griffiths and Parr (2001) in which students ranked the LLSs and the findings were compared with teachers' perceptions of students' ratings of LLSs use. At the end of the study, there was a mismatch between the two parties preferences. Students reported using social strategies the most often and memory strategies the least. On the contrary, the teachers speculated that their students made use of memory strategies the most often but affective strategies the least. Similar discrepancies were observed by Nunan (1988). He explored students' and teachers' perceptions of the importance of the selected learning activities. At the end of the study, it was discovered that there was only one match between students' and teachers' rankings. A similar conclusion regarding differences in perceptions between students and teachers was reached by O'Malley et al. (1985). In that study, students and teachers were interviewed and LLSs were noted. It was found out that students reported using a variety of learning strategies, whereas the teachers were unaware of their students' strategies. There must be several reasons for the discrepancies in perception of teachers and students as stated in the studies above. The reasons of such mismatches should be found out before planning a LLSs training. Even though a similarity was found between teachers' and students' frequency of LLSs use in the present study, the moderate level of strategy use reported by students should be concerned before planning further implementation of learning strategies.

All things considered, from the analysis of data obtained both from questionnaires and from interviews, a number of preliminary determinations can be drawn. Foremost, participants in this study showed a relatively high awareness and believed in the effectiveness of LLSs. Language learning strategies were perceived as a process, set of rules or a language behaviour that enhances language learning in general. They also indicated that strategy training is effective and helps to improve their students' motivation, makes them aware, active, efficient and responsible learners, gives students a better understanding of the target language and makes them more capable of working independently. It was found out that the only variable that makes a difference in strategy instruction is the degree of education obtained by the teachers. Finally, a significant parallel was drawn between the teachers' and students' reported frequency of strategy use. For the lower mean score of students'

strategy use compared to their teachers, it was suggested that strategy instruction should be geared to learners' individual and situational or group needs before planning a LLSs training.

5.2 Pedagogical Implications

Teachers' approaches to lessons are shaped by their individual belief systems. These beliefs and values serve as the background to much of the teachers' decision making in the teaching process (Richards, 1996). Identifying the view of language teachers may offer new perspectives in teacher development and implications for teacher education. In the present study, teachers' perspectives regarding the use of LLSs were identified through their self-report on their teaching and the findings were compared with their students' actual practice of these strategies. Although the teachers and students reported that they believe in the effectiveness of implementing learning strategies in their classes, they reported some concerns related to application. It may not be possible to generalize this study to other EFL contexts. However, the design and the findings, to a certain extent, can provide researchers, and anyone interested, with ideas to ponder about teachers' and students' perceptions on the benefits of strategy instruction.

The findings of this study raise some areas of concern that needs to be sort out before planning a possible learning strategy training.

1. Compared to awareness and effectiveness of strategies, teachers regarded some of the strategies difficult to apply in the classroom.
2. Both teachers and students ranked metacognitive strategies at the top of the spectrum. However, affective and social strategies were reported as less frequently used ones compared to the other four categories. It is necessary to consider the strategies as a whole to be successful in language learning, not just the commonly preferred ones.
3. Significant but low correlation between strategy categories indicates the fact that although the teachers believe in the effectiveness of using these

strategies, they may not be teaching them in the classroom so often due to some other concerns.

4. None of the teachers mentioned about daily planned integration of strategy instruction. Most of the training consists of impromptu use of LLSs when a sudden need occurs in the overall process of teaching. According to the research in L2 learning, it has been indicated that the most effective strategy training is explicit.

In the light of the discussion above, it is crucial to give more emphasis to teacher education so that they can help learners use learning strategies more effectively. Teacher research stems from teachers' own desires to make sense of their classroom. Thus, it is necessary to convince teachers of the benefits of the learning strategy training and to develop their instructional techniques to help students become more autonomous learners. Although all teaching that takes place in the classroom does not necessarily cause student learning, there is clearly a relationship of influence between what teachers learn, how they organize their classroom activities, and what students learn from engaging in those activities (Freeman & Johnson, 2005).

There is a shift from top-down teacher professional development models, in which innovations are imposed on teachers with little attention to how to integrate them into existing classroom practices to alternative models. Such alternative professional development structures allow for self-directed, collaborative, inquiry-based learning that is directly relevant to teachers' classroom lives. The reflective teaching movement helped to legitimize teachers' ways of knowing and ways of coming to know by highlighting the importance of reflection on and inquiry into teachers' experiences as mechanisms for change in classroom practices (Johnson, 2006). Reflective teaching provides the groundwork for continuous self-development (Velez-Rendon, 2002). Teachers should be given opportunities to acquire the theoretical knowledge on LLSs and gain the skills necessary to form a connection between theory and practice.

In addition to teacher training, the curricular team should work on a framework that will enable progression from teacher direction to student independence in effective

94

use of learning strategies. The development, implementation and evaluation of a curriculum that incorporates strategy instruction would help those who want to make strategy instruction an integral part of their teaching and can make informed decisions about incorporating learning strategies into their lessons.

5.3 Limitations of the Study

The major limitations of the present study can be categorized as the scale, context and lack of sample representatives to make generalization about the perspectives of teachers' and students' on implementing LLSs

The techniques that are used for this study are structured five-point surveys and interviews. Such techniques depend on participants' willingness and ability to describe their internal behaviours. However, reliability of such methods are questioned since there is a danger that these methods gather the strategies that the participants use through their self-reports (Ellis, 1996). Although many learning strategies are internal and invisible to observer as stated by Oxford (2002), it might still give an idea to employ observational methods to find out teachers' and students' perception on learning strategies.

Another limitation is about the length of the survey questionnaire given to teacher participants. The strategy inventory for learning strategies developed by Oxford (1990) includes 50 items. In addition to the inventory, four different variables were added under each strategy item. Some of the participants complained about the length of the instrument. The participants might have been given a longer period to complete the questionnaire instead of one single sit.

The last limitation is related to the number of teachers participated in the study. Sixty-seven English instructors that are working in the English language department of Başkent University and 100 students studying at the same department took part in this study. Thus, it is not possible to make generalizations about strategy use beyond this group. Teachers who work in other universities in Turkey may differ in their

strategy use. It would then be possible to make generalizations about the perception of strategy use in other contexts in Turkey as well.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

Teachers' and students' perspectives were analyzed for the purpose of using the information gained to make adjustments to the area of learning strategy design and materials development. The results obtained from this study suggest possible explanations for some of the social psychological variables that predict strategy use. The effects of readiness and motivation on the use of LLSs were presented. The next step forward would be more research into other possible variables like affective factors, learner characteristics, socioeconomic status, motivation, and learning styles that may increase the efficacy of strategy instruction.

In spite of the many similarities between teachers and students that were explored in this study in terms of preferred strategy categories, students reported a lower frequency of strategy use. As a solution it was suggested that strategy instruction should be geared to learners' individual and situational or group needs. It is not possible to look at LLSs in isolation from students' learning style. Cohen (2000) suggests that teachers should be aware of students' learning styles and the wide variety of strategies that are used for these styles. Teachers must teach students how to self-assess their learning styles and strategy usage. For further research, the links between learners' use of strategies and their preferred learning styles can be explored.

In an age of technology, it is not possible to isolate language teaching from computer assisted language learning (CALL). Students spend more time reading online as opposed to the traditional hard copy reading and they utilise different strategies in the new learning environment. Further research should be carried out on how learners use strategies while engaged in CALL tasks. The differences in the use of language learning strategies when students deal with the language through CALL environments versus traditional classroom settings can be compared so that the

findings can provide insights for educators who want to form a link between technology and language learning.

Finally, further research needs to be conducted to see the development, implementation and evaluation of a curriculum that incorporated strategy instruction so that anyone who wants to make strategy instruction an integral part of their curriculum can make informed decisions.

5.5 Conclusion

Some people meet their English-speaking partners for lunch to improve their conversation skills. Some others regularly read Newsweek, New York Times, or the classics in English. Another person practises song lyrics in English. Some students go to live with an English or American family to learn the culture and the language. Research indicates that appropriate use of language learning strategies which includes much more behaviours than the ones stated in the strategy inventory (SILL), results in improved L2 proficiency in general and for specific language skills as well. The discussion on 'strategy instruction' flourished around the 'good language learner' initiated by Rubin more than thirty years ago. In this globalization age, we should rethink the traits of good language learners since their needs, beliefs and expectations are not the same as it was thirty years ago.

This study aimed to investigate the EFL teachers' perceptions about incorporating LLSs into their classrooms with a comparison of students' reported LLSs use. The results implied that there is an agreement between teachers' perceptions and students' practices in terms of strategy use. It is an encouraging discovery as it implies a good accord between students and teacher which ultimately leads to positive consequences in terms of classroom dynamics. However, all the strategy categories were not reported to be used so often. It is the teachers who can help their students recognise the power of consciously using LLSs as a whole to which make learning quicker, easier and more effective. A successful training of strategy use necessitates training of the teachers first of all. Learners also vary in the frequency of making use of learning strategies and specific strategy types they prefer to use.

Strategy instruction should be geared to learners' individual and situational or group needs. Consideration of such factors is crucial before planning a LLSs training.

Teachers can help their students find out their current strategy repertoires through surveys, interviews and many other techniques. Then, they can integrate strategy training into their classroom teaching in an explicit way and help students transfer these skills to new tasks. Teachers who want to improve their instructional effectiveness will benefit from what the research has already found and will gain further advantage from future investigations.

REFERENCES

Anderson, N. J. (2005). 'L2 Learning Strategies' in Hinkel, E. (ed.): *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning.* (pp. 757-771). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bear; J. (1985). Historical factors influencing attitudes toward foreign language learning in Turkey. *Journal of Human Sciences.* IV/1: 27-36

Bialystok, E. (1981). The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency. *Modern Language Journal.* 65:24-35

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by Principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.* Englewood Cliffs. N.J.: Prentice Hall Regents

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2002). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı.* Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.

Chamot, A., L. Kupper and M. Impink-Hernandez. (1988). *A study of learning strategies in foreign language instruction. Findings of the longitudinal study.* McLean, Va: Interstate research associates

Chamot, A., & Küpper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals.* 22: 13-24.

Chamot, A. U. (2005). Language Learning Strategy Instruction: Current issues and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25: 112-130.

Cohen, A. (1996). *Language Learning Insights for learners, Teachers and Researchers.* New York: Newbury House.

Cohen, A. (1998). *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language.* London: Longman.

Cohen, A. and Weaver, S. (1998). Strategies-based instruction for second language learners. *Learners and Language Learning.* Anthology series 39.

Ellis, R. (1996). *The study of Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ely, C. M., & Pease-Alvarez, L. (1996). Learning styles and strategies in ESOL: introduction to the special issue. *TESOL Journal. 6* (1), 5-6.

Finkbeiner, C. (2008). "Culture and Good Language Learners". In C. Griffiths (ed.): *Lessons from the Good Language Learner* (pp. 131-141). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (2005). 'Response to "Language Teacher Learning and Student Language Learning: Shaping the Knowledge Base' in D. J. Tedick (ed.), *Language teacher education: International perspectives on research and Practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum (pp. 25–32).

Grenfell, M. and Harris, V. (1999). *Modern Languages and Learning Strategies: In Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Griffiths, C. and Parr, J. M. (2001). Language Learning Strategies: Theory and Perception. *ELT Journal*. 55/3.

Griffiths, C. (2003). *Language learning strategy use and proficiency*. (Retrieved from: http:// www.umi.com/umi/dissertations/).

Griffiths, C. (2007). Language learning strategies: Students' and Teachers' perception. *ELT Journal*. 61/2.

Hedge, T. (2005). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: OUP

Hawkey, R. (2006). Teacher and learner perceptions of language learning activity. *ELT Journal*. Vol. 60/3

Ikeda, M. and O. Takeuchi (2000). Tasks and strategy use: Empirical implications for questionnaire studies. *JACET Bulletin*, 31, 21-32.

Johnson, K. (2006). The Sociocultural Turn and Its Challenges for Second Language Teacher Education. *TESOL Quarterly*. 40/1.

Kachru, Y. (1994). Monolingual Bias in SLA research. *Tesol Quarterly*. 28/4: 795–800.

Kwo, O. (1996). 'Learning to teach English in Hong Kong classes: Patterns in Reflection', in D. Freeman and J. Richards (ed.): *Teacher learning in language teaching* (p.295-319). New York: Cambridge University Press

Lee, M., Y., (2006). *EFL Teachers 'perspectives on incorporating language learning strategies into their EFL classes in Korea*. (Retrieved from: http:// www.umi.com/umi/dissertations/).

McDonough, S.N. (1995). *Strategy and Skill in Learning a Foreign Language*. London: Arnold

MacIntyre, P. (1994). Towards a social psychological model of strategy use. *Foreign Language Annals*. 27: 185-195.

MacIntyre, P. & Noels, K. (1996). Using social psychological variables to predict the use of language learning strategies. *Foreign Language Annals*. 29: 373-386.

Messick, S. (1989). *Validity in R. L. Linn (Ed.), Educational Measurement*. (3rd ed., p.13-103). New York: MacMillan.

Mochiziki, A. (1999). Language learning strategies used by Japanese University students. *RELC Journal.* 30: 101-113

Naiman, N., Fröhlich, H. H. Stern, and A. Todesco. (1978). *The Good Language Learner*. Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

National Capitol language Research Centre (2000). Immersion teachers' perception of learning strategies instruction. *US Department of Education. Educational Resources information Centre (ERIC)*

Okada, M., Oxford, R., and Abo, S. (1996). 'Not all alike: Motivation and learning strategies among students of Japanese and Spanish', in Oxford, R. (ed.): *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century:* Manoa: University of Hawai's Press

O' Malley, J., Chamot, A., Stevner-Manzaranes, G., Rupper, L., & Russo, R. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. *Language Learning*, 35, 21-26.

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

Oxford, R. (1989). Use of English Language Strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. *System.* 17: 235-247.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What every Teacher Should Know*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House

Oxford, R. (1996). Employ a questionnaire to assess the use of language learning strategies. *Applied Language Learning*. 71/2: 25-45.

Oxford, R. (2002). 'Language learning strategies in a nutshell: Update and ESL Suggestions', in Richards, J. C. and Renandya, W. A. (ed.): Methodology *in language teaching*. CUP: Cambridge.

Peacock, M. and Ho, B. (2003). Student language learning strategies across eight disciplines. *Applied Linguistics*. 13/2: 179-200.

Phakiti, A. (2003). A closer look at the relationship of cognitive and metacognitive strategy use in EFL reading achievement test performance. *Language Testing*.   20,26.

Riley, L. D., & Harsch, K. (1999). Enhancing the learning experience with strategy journals: Supporting the diverse learning styles of ESL/EFL students. Proceedings of the HERDSA Annual International Conference, Melbourne, Australia. http://herdsa.org.au/vic/cornerstones/pdf/Rikley.PDF

Reiss, M. (1985). The good language learner: Another look. *Canadian Modern Language Review*. 41: 511-523

Richards; J. (1996). Teacher Maxims in Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*. 30/2: 281-296.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the good language learner can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly.* 9: 41-55.

Sadık, S. (2005). *Effects of strategy instruction focus acativities on students' reading strategy use*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ankara: Bilkent University

Sallı, A. (2002). *Teachers' perception of strategy training in reading instruction.* Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ankara: Bilkent University

Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions Concerning the Role of Grammar Instruction and Corrective Feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85. p.245

Skehan, P. (1991). Individual differences in second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 13: 275-298

Thompson, I., & Rubin, J. (1996). Can strategy instruction improve listening comprehension? *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 331-342.

Tumposky, N. 1982. 'The learner on his own', in M. Geddes and G. Sturtridge (ed.): *Individualisation*. London: Modern English Publications, pp. 4-7.

Velez- Rendon , G. (2003). Second language teacher education: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals.* Vol. 35, No. 4

Victori, M. and Tragant, E. (2003). 'Learner strategies: A cross sectional and longitudinal study of primary and high school EFL teachers', in Garcia Mayo*,* M. P. and M. L. Garcia Lecumberri (ed.): *Age and the acquisition of English as a foreign language,* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Vieira, F. (2003). 'Addressing constraints on autonomy in school contexts: Lessons from working with teachers in Palfreyman', in D. and R. C. Smith (ed.): *Learner autonomy across cultures: Language education perspectives,* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Vogely, A. (1995). Perceived strategy use during performance on three authentic listening comprehension tasks. *Modern Language Journal*, 79/11: 41-56

Wenden, A & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning.* Cambridge: Prentice-Hall

Willing, K. 1989. *Teaching How to Learn: earning Strategies on ESL-An Activity Worksheets.* California: Alta Book Centre.

Yetgin, E. (2003). *Evaluation of reading strategy instruction in an EFL reading textbook and teachers' perceptions of that reading strategy instruction.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ankara: Bilkent University

Yıldırım, A. and Şimşek, H. (2006). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri.* Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık

Young, R. (1987). The cultural context of TESOL-a review of research into Chinese classrooms. *RELC Journal*, 19(2), 15-30

Zalioğlu, Ş. (2000). *An investigation into the teacher and learner perspectives on the knowledge of reading strategies in ELT classrooms.* Unpublished Master's Thesis, Bursa: Uludağ University

APPENDIX A

TEACHER SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I. Language Learning Strategies. In this section, we ask about your perceptions of language learning strategies you teach to students in your EFL classrooms. For each of the strategies described, please select the appropriate response by circling the number. The higher the score on the scale, the more favourable your personal evaluation of each strategy is. For instance, choosing '5' on the second category (never use it/use it very often) indicates that you are using the strategy more often than choosing '4' on the scale.

Sample question

1. I try to say or write new words as often as possible.

Don't know it at all   1 2 3 4 5   Know it very well

I teach my students to;

1. think of relationships between the native language and the target language

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

2. use new L2 words in a sentence

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

3. relate the sound of a new L2 word to an image or picture of the word.

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

4. make a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

5. use rhymes to remember new L2 words

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

6. use flashcards to remember new L2 words

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

7. act out L2 words

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

8. review lessons often

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

9. remember new L2 words by remembering their location on the page or on the board.

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

10. say or write new L2 words several times

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

11. try to talk like native speakers

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

12. practice the sounds of L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

13. use L2 words in different ways

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

14. start L2 conversations with other people

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

15. watch L2 media (e.g. TV, movies, etc)

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

16. read for pleasure in L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

17. write notes, messages, letters in L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

18. read over the L2 passage quickly than go back and read carefully

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

19. look for words in Turkish that are similar to new words in L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

20. find patterns in L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

21. find the meaning of L2 word by dividing it into parts

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

22. try not to translate word for word

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

23. make summaries of information heard or read in L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

24. make guesses to understand unfamiliar L2 words

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

25. use gestures when not being able to think of a word during an L2 conversation

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

26. make up new L2 words

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

27. read L2 without looking up every unknown word

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

28. try to guess what the other person will say next in L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

29. use synonyms when not being able to think of L2 words

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

30. try to find many ways to use L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

31. notice my mistakes and use that information to learn L2 better

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

32. pay attention when someone is speaking L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

33. try to find ways to improve language learning

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

34. plan study time for L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

35. look for people to talk in L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

36. look for opportunities to read as much as possible in L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

37. have clear goals for improving L2 skills

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

38. think about progress in learning L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

39. try to relax when using L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

40. encourage myself to speak when afraid of making a mistake

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

41. give self-rewards for doing well in L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

42. note when feeling nervous studying or using L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

43. write down feelings about learning L2 in a diary

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

44. talk to someone else about feelings regarding learning L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

45. ask the other person to slow down when having trouble understanding in L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

46. ask a native speaker to corrects me

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

47. practice L2 with others

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

48. ask for help from native speakers

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

49. ask questions in L2

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

50. try to learn about the L2 culture

Don't know it at all	1	2	3	4	5	Know it very well
Never teach it	1	2	3	4	5	Teach it very often
Consider it completely ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Consider it very effective
Find it difficult to teach in classroom	1	2	3	4	5	Find it easy to teach in classroom

Section II. General Information. In this section, we are interested about general information about respondent which will help us interpret your answers to the previous questions.

1. **What is your gender?**

   ___ Male

   ___ Female

2. **How old are you?**

   _____ years old

3. **How long have you been teaching English overall?**

   _____ years

4. **Which of the following categories describes your education level?**

   ___ Bachelor   (major:_____)

   ___ Masters   (major:_____)

   ___ Teacher Certification (major:_____)

   ___ Doctorate   (major:_____)

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

Dear colleagues,

This questionnaire is designed as part of a research study for the MA Program at METU. The purpose of this questionnaire is to examine your perceptions of language learning strategies you teach to students in your EFL classrooms. You do not need to put your name on the questionnaire; in this way, complete confidentiality can be guaranteed. I would greatly appreciate your cooperation.

Hülya ŞEN

Middle East Technical University

MA 2008

STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING (SILL)

EFL VERSION

© R.OXFORD, 1989

Directions

This form of the STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING (SILL) is

for students of English as a foreign language. You will find statements about

learning English. Please read each statement. On the separate worksheet, write the

response (1, 2, 3, 4 or 5) that tells HOW TRUE OF YOU THE STATEMENT IS.

---

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. *Always or almost always true of me*

---

1. NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE OF ME means that the statement is <u>very rarely</u> true of you.

2. USUALLY NOT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true <u>less than half the time</u>.

3. SOMEWHAT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you <u>about half the time</u>.

4. USUALLY TRUE OF ME means the statement is true <u>more than half the time.</u>

5. ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true <u>almost always</u>.

Please answer in terms of <u>how well the statement describes you</u>. Do not answer how you think you should be, or what <u>other</u> people do. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Put your answers on the separate worksheet. Please try to answer in 20-30 minutes. If you have any questions, please let the teacher know immediately.

> *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. Always or almost always true of me*

PART A

1. I think of relationships between what I already know and new things I learn in English.

2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.

3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.

4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.

5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.

6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.

7. I physically act out new English words.

8. I review English lessons often.

9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board or on a street sign.

PART B

10. I say or write new English words several times.

11. I try to talk like native English speakers.

12. I practice the sounds of English.

13. I use the English words I know in different ways.

14. I start conversations in English.

15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.

16. I read for pleasure in English.

17. I write notes, messages, letters or reports in English.

18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.

19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.

20. I try to find patterns in English.

21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.

22. I try not to translate word-for-word.

23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.

PART C

24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.

25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.

26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.

27. I read English without looking up every new word.

28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.

29. If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.

PART D

30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.

31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.

32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.

33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.

34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.

35. I look for people I can talk to in English.

36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.

37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.

38. I think about my progress in learning English.

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. Always or almost always true of me

39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.

40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.

41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.

42. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.

43. I write down my feelings in a language-learning diary.

44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.

PART F

45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.

46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.

47. I practice English with other students.

48. I ask for help from English speakers.

49. I ask questions in English.

50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.

DİL ÖĞRENİMİNDE STRATEJİ ENVANTERİ

© R.OXFORD, 1989

YÖNERGELER

Sevgili Öğrenciler,

Bu "DİL ÖĞRENİMİNDE STRATEJİ ENVANTERİ" formu İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrenciler içindir. Bu ankette İngilizce öğrenimi ile ilgili ifadeler bulacaksınız. Lütfen her cümleyi dikkatlice okuyun ve size en uygun kutuya "X" işareti koyun.

Örnek:

	Hiç doğru <u>değil</u>	Genellikle doğru <u>değil</u>	Bazen doğru	Genellikle doğru	Her zaman doğru
	1	2	3	4	5
İngilizce öğrenirken İnternetten yararlanırım.			X		

Cümleyi, <u>sizi ne kadar iyi ifade ettiğini</u> dikkate alarak cevaplayın. Cevaplarınızı verirken olması gerektiğini düşündüğünüz şekilde ya da diğer insanların yaptığı şekilde yanıt vermeyin. Ankette doğru veya yanlış cevaplar yoktur. Lütfen 20-30 dakika arasında cevaplandırmaya çalışın. Her hangi bir sorunuz olursa öğretim elemanına sormaktan çekinmeyin.

Katkılarınız için teşekkürler.

Hülya ŞEN

Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi

 2008

	Hiç doğru **değil**	Genellikle doğru **değil**	Bazen doğru	Genellikle doğru	Her zaman doğru
	1	2	3	4	5
1. İngilizcede bildiklerim ve yeni öğrendiklerim arasında bağlantı kurarım.					
2. Yeni İngilizce kelimeleri cümle içinde kullanırım ki onları hatırlayabileyim.					
3. Yeni bir İngilizce kelimeyi hatırlayabilmek için kelimenin okunuşunu bir imge veya resimle ilişkilendiririm.					
4. Yeni bir İngilizce kelimeyi, o kelimenin kullanılabileceği bir durumun zihinsel görüntüsünü oluşturarak hatırlarım.					
5. Yeni İngilizce kelimeleri hatırlayabilmek için kafiye kullanırım.					
6. Yeni İngilizce kelimeleri hatırlayabilmek için el resimleri kullanırım					
7. Yeni İngilizce kelimeleri fiziksel olarak canlandırırım.					
8. İngilizce derslerini sıklıkla tekrar ederim.					
9. Yeni İngilizce kelimeleri ya da ifadeleri bulundukları sayfa, tahta ya da bir sokak tabelasındaki konumlarıyla hatırlarım.					
10. Yeni İngilizce kelimeleri defalarca söylerim ya da yazarım.					
11. Anadili İngilizce olan kişiler gibi konuşmaya çalışırım.					
12. İngilizcedeki seslerin pratiğini yaparım.					
13. Bildiğim İngilizce kelimeleri değişik şekillerde kullanırım.					
14. İngiliceyi kullanabileceğim konuşmalar başlatırım.					
15. İngilizce konuşulan Televizyon programları izler veya İngilizce konuşulan filimlere giderim.					
16. Zevk için İngilizce okurum.					
17. İngilizce notlar, mesajlar, mektuplar veya raporlar yazarım.					
18. İngilizce metni ilk önce gözden geçirir (metni hızlıca okur) sonra geri dönüp dikkatli bir şekilde okurum.					
19. Yeni İngilizce kelimelerin benzerlerini kendi dilimde ararım.					
20. İngilizcede kalıplar bulmaya çalışırım.					
21. İngilizce bir kelimeyi anlamlı parçalara bölerek anlamını bulurum.					
22. Kelime kelime çeviri yapmamaya çalışırım.					
23. Duyduğum ya da okuduğum ingilizce bilgilerin özetini çıkarırırm.					
24. Bilmediğim İngilizce kelimeleri anlamak için tahmin yürütürüm.					
25. İngilizce konuşma esnasında kelime aklıma gelmediğinde mimikler kullanırım.					
26. Doğru İngilizce karşılıklarını bilmediğim zaman yeni kelimeler uydururum.					
27. Her yeni kelimenin anlamını sözlükten bakmadan İngilizce okurum.					
28. İngilizcede diğer kişinin bir sonraki ifadesini tahmin etmeye çalışırım.					

	Hiç doğru **değil**	Genellikle doğru **değil**	Bazen doğru	Genellikle doğru	Her zaman doğru
	1	2	3	4	5
29. İngilizce kelime aklıma gelmezse, aynı anlama gelen başka bir kelime ya da ifade kullanırım.					
30. İngilizcemi kullanabileceğim bir çok farklı yol bulurum.					
31. İngilizce hatalarımı fark eder ve bu bilgiyi İngilizcede daha iyi olabilmek için kullanırım.					
32. Birisi İngilizce konuşurken dikkat ederim.					
33. Daha iyi bir İngilizce öğrencisi olabilmenin yollarını ararım.					
34. Zamanımı planlarım, böylece İngilizce çalışmak için yeterince vaktim olur.					
35. İngilizce konuşabileceğim insanlar ararım.					
36.Mümkün olduğunca fazla İngilizce okuyabileceğim fırsatlar ararım.					
37. İngilizcemi geliştirmekle ilgili net hedeflerim vardır.					
38. İngilizce öğrenme gelişimimi gözden geçiririm.					
39. İngilizceyi kullanmaktan korktuğum zaman rahatlamaya çalışırım.					
40. Hata yapmaktan korktuğumda dahi kendimi İngilizce konuşmak için cesaretlendiririm.					
41. İngilizcede başarılı olduğumda kendimi ödüllendiririm.					
42. İngilizce çalışırken ya da kullanırken gergin ya da tedirgin olduğumu fark ederim.					
43. Hislerimi dil öğrenme günlüğüne yazarım.					
44. İngilizce öğrenirken hissettiklerimi birisiyle paylaşırım.					
45. İngilizcede bir şey anlamadığımda karşımdakinden yavaşlamasını ya da tekrar etmesini rica ederim.					
46. İngilizce konuşanlara, konuşurken beni düzeltmelerini rica ederim.					
47. Diğer öğrencilerle İngilizce pratik yaparım.					
48. İngilizce konuşanlardan yardım isterim.					
49. İngilizce soru sorarım.					
50. İngilizce konuşanların kültürünü öğrenmeye çalışırım.					

APPENDIX E

Gönüllü Katılım Formu

Bu çalışma, Hülya ŞEN tarafından öğrencilerin dil öğrenme stratejilerine bakış açılarını belirlemek üzere yürütülmektedir. Çalışmanın amacı, Başkent Üniversitesi hazırlık bölümü okutmanları ve öğrencilerinin dil öğrenme stratejilerine bakış açıları, arasındaki ilişkiyi ortaya çıkarmaktır. Çalışmaya katılım tamimiyle gönüllülük temeline dayanmaktadır. Ankette, sizden kimlik belirleyici hiçbir bilgi istenmemektedir. Cevaplarınız tamimiyle gizli tutulacak ve sadece araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir; elde edilecek bilgiler bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır.

Anket, genel olarak kişisel rahatsızlık verecek soruları içermemektedir. Ancak, katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden ötürü kendinizi rahatsız hissederseniz cevaplama işini yarıda bırakıp çıkmakta serbestsiniz. Böyle bir durumda anketi uygulayan kişiye, anketi tamamlamadığınızı söylemek yeterli olacaktır. Anket sonunda, bu çalışmayla ilgili sorularınız cevaplanacaktır. Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz. Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için Başkent Üniversitesi Hazırlık Bölümü öğretim elemanlarından Hülya Şen (Oda: D-111; Tel: 2341010-1464, e-posta: hsen@baskent.edu.tr) ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum ve istediğim zaman yarıda kesip çıkabileceğimi biliyorum. Verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlı yayımlarda kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum. (Formu doldurup imzaladıktan sonra uygulayıcıya geri veriniz).

İsim Soyad   Tarih   İmza   Alınan Ders

----/----/-----

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Think of your high achiever students applying LLSs effectively. What can they do better compared to low achievers?

2. Do you present any techniques or strategies in your lessons? If yes, how do you present them; explicitly or implicitly, planned or impromptu?

3. What kind of impact might learning strategies have on language learners?

4. Do you think learning strategy instruction help learners become more effective language learners?

5. What factors affect you in incorporating or not incorporating LLSs into your English lessons?

6. Have you made use of LLSs yourself when you learnt English?

7. Do you teach any other strategies except for the ones stated in the inventory?

8. Which language area necessitates more frequent strategy training in your context?

9. In the light of our discussions so far, can you define LLSs in your own words?

10. What would you suggest to improve teachers' repertoire on LLSs?