

121945-6

THE EFFECTS OF STRATEGY
TRAINING ON SPEAKING
PROFICIENCY IN ENGLISH
AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Özlem ERSÖZ
(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)

Eskişehir 1997

**THE EFFECTS OF STRATEGY TRAINING ON
SPEAKING PROFICIENCY IN ENGLISH
AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE**

**YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE'DE STRATEJİ
EĞİTİMİNİN KONUŞMA BAŞARISINA ETKİLERİ**

Özlem ERSÖZ

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts
in the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language

Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Hülya Özcan

Eskişehir

Anadolu University Social Sciences Institute

January, 1997

ANADOLU ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MERKEZ KÜTÜPHANESİ

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hülya Özcan, my thesis supervisor, for her patience, invaluable guiding and understanding in making this thesis a reality.

I would also like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Handan Kopkallı, Assoc. Prof. İlknur Keçik and Assoc. Prof. Ümit Deniz Turan for their helpful contributions.

I am especially grateful to Rengin Özarı who helped me with evaluating the pre and post-tests and supported me morally throughout the study.

I owe my deepest thanks to Vedat and Nilay Yılmaz for their helpful suggestions and useful contributions throughout the study.

My special thanks go to my students who took part in this study. Without them, this thesis would not become a reality.

I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Embiya Ağaoğlu and his assistant Berna Balcıoğlu for helping me with the analysis of the statistical data.

I should also acknowledge Haluk Aktaş whose tact and common sense have been invaluable throughout.

ÖZET

Dil öğrenme stratejileri, öğrencilerin, ikinci ya da yabancı dillerini kullanırken, bilgileri depolayıp, özümseme, ya da gerektiğinde kullanmak üzere harekete geçirme süreçlerini geliştirmek için uyguladıkları özel hareketler, davranışlar, adımlar ya da teknikler olarak tanımlanabilir (Oxford, 1993). Öğrencileri dil öğrenme stratejileri hakkında bilinçlendirmek, ve kullanımını teşvik etmek, onların dil öğrenmedeki başarılarını arttırabilir. Bu çalışma, dil öğrenme stratejilerinin öğretilmesinin, yabancı dil olarak, İngilizce konuşma becerisi üzerindeki etkilerini ortaya çıkarmak amacıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bunun için 'işlevsel planlama', 'kendi kendini değerlendirme', 'diğer öğrencilerle ya da öğrenilen yabancı dili iyi bilen kişilerle işbirliği yapma', ve 'anlamı belirginleştirici sorular yöneltme' olmak üzere dört strateji seçilmiştir. Araştırma, Anadolu Üniversitesi, İletişim Bilimleri Fakültesi Hazırlık Programı öğrencilerinden oluşan 25'er kişilik iki sınıfla (Kontrol ve Deney grubu) yürütülmüştür. Seçilen stratejiler deney grubuna bir ay süresince öğretilmiş, ve çalışma öncesi ve sonrası verilen İngilizce konuşma sınavlarıyla kontrol ve deney gruplarının başarı düzeylerindeki değişimler gözlenmiştir. İstatistiksel sonuçlara göre, deney grubunun İngilizce konuşmadaki başarı düzeyinde dikkate değer bir artış görülmüştür. Sonuç olarak, dil öğrenme stratejilerini öğrencilere aktarmanın, onları bu konuda bilinçlendirmenin, yabancı dil öğrenme süreçlerini kolaylaştırdığı söylenebilir.

ABSTRACT

Language learning strategies are specific actions, behaviours, steps, or techniques that students employ to improve their own progress in internalising, storing, retrieving and using the second or foreign language (Oxford, 1993). To raise students' consciousness on language learning strategies and encourage them to use these strategies may increase their success on language learning. This study has been accomplished in order to reveal the effects of teaching language learning strategies on the proficiency level of speaking English as a foreign language. For this purpose, four strategies have been selected as 'functional planning', 'self-evaluation', 'co-operating with peers or people who know the new language well', and 'asking questions for clarification'. 50 students -25 in Control group and 25 in Experimental group- of Intensive Language Teaching Program of Communication Sciences Faculty at Anadolu University took place in the study. The selected language learning strategies have been taught for one month to Experimental group and the change in Control and Experimental groups proficiency level in speaking English has been observed via the English speaking examinations administered before and after the study. Statistical results of the study suggest that there is a reasonable change in the speaking proficiency level of Experimental group. As a result, it can be suggested that teaching language learning strategies to language learners and raise their consciousness on the topic may facilitate their language learning process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	v
CHAPTER I	
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Purpose and the Scope of the Study	4
1.2. The Strategies to be Trained.....	6
CHAPTER II	
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	9
2.1. Theoretical Background on Learning Strategies	9
2.2. Types of Strategy Training.....	14
2.2.1. Consciousness-raising.....	14
2.2.2 One-Time Strategy Training	16
2.2.3. Long-Term Strategy Training..... ^e	16
2.3. Empirical Studies on Strategy Training.....	17
CHAPTER III	
METHODOLOGY.....	26
3.1. Subjects.....	26
3.2. Research Design.....	27
3.2.1. General Procedures.....	27
3.2.2. Data Collection	29
3.2.3. Data Analysis.....	31

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	33
-----------------------------	----

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.....	43
-----------------------------	----

5.1 Summary	43
-------------------	----

5.2 Conclusion	44
----------------------	----

5.3. Suggestions for Further Studies.....	46
---	----

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	47
-------------------	----

APPENDICES

A. Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Listesi	50
---	----

B. Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Listesi Cevap ve Puanlama Cetveli	53
---	----

C. Scale for the Averages.....	54
--------------------------------	----

D. The Pre-test and Post-test Given to the Subjects.....	55
--	----

E. Speaking Evaluation Scale Used in The Study.....	57
---	----

F. Self-Evaluation Form for Determining Language Learning Goals and Objectives.....	59
---	----

G. The Scores of Control Group in Pre-test Given by Evaluator 1&2.....	61
--	----

H. The Scores of Experimental Group in Pre-test Given by Evaluator 1 & 2.....	63
---	----

I. The Scores of Control Group in Post-test Given by Evaluator 1 & 2.....	65
---	----

J. The Scores of Experimental Group in Post-test Given by Evaluator 1 & 2.....	67
--	----

K. Control Group's Strategy Frequencies.....	69
--	----

L. Experimental Group's Strategy Frequencies	70
--	----

M. Lesson Plans for the Experimental and the Control Groups	71
---	----

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1.1. Definitions of the Language Learning Strategies Trained in the Study.....	6
4.1. The Frequency of Language Learning Strategies of the Control and the Experimental Group.....	33
4.2. The mean scores in pre-test and post-test of the Control (CG) and the Experimental (EG) Groups.....	38

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the late 1970s and 1980s, language teachers faced increased options in the selection of methods and materials with the explosion of methodologies. Parallel to this, language learning has been considered from the learner's point of view and the focus of classroom has been shifted from a teacher-centered one to a learner-centered one (Rubin, 1987; Haggstorm, 1993). But later, teachers and researchers have realized that no single research finding, and no single method of language teaching would escort the success in teaching a second or foreign language. They have also seen the importance of individual variation in language learning, and that certain learners seemed to be more successful in spite of methods or techniques of teaching (Brown, 1987). Therefore, the emphasis has been directed to define how learners control their own learning and to clarify how teachers can assist students become more autonomous (Rubin, 1987).

Research on how learners approach the task of learning a second or foreign language might be considered as one of the subjects of cognitive view. Hunt (cited in Wenden, 1987a: 4) describes this new psychological discipline - how learners approach the task of learning- as "a systematic inquiry into our thinking selves... a discipline devoted to exploring how our minds work..." Hunt also asks the following questions:

'Do we learn what we learn primarily as a result of mere repetition ---- or of comprehension ---- or of the linkage of new material to previously known material?... What enables us to see, at some point, that certain things can be grouped into a coherent category, or that a general rule can be extracted from a series of experiences? What are the processes we use consciously or unconsciously when solving problems both great and small and can the individual's problem solving ability be improved by training? What do highly creative people do that ordinary people don't do?'
(cited in Wenden, 1987a: 5)

In the light of the above questions, teachers and researchers have observed that *some* students approach the language learning task in more successful ways than others. In other words, considering all other things being equal, such as having the same teacher and the same textbook, intelligence, background knowledge, etc., some students will learn a second or foreign language more successfully than others (Rubin, 1975). Therefore, there should be some other factors which facilitate learning. These factors are considered to be particular sets of cognitive and metacognitive behaviors which learners engage in. These behaviors are referred to as learning strategies. So, what can we, as teachers, do to help these 'other learners of languages who are less successful' to become more successful at learning a second or foreign language?

Research and theory in second and foreign language learning strongly suggest that good language learners use different strategies to assist them in gaining power over new language skills (Wenden, 1987b). The learning strategies of good language learners, once identified and effectively taught to less competent learners, could have a considerable

potential for enhancing the development of second and foreign language skills.

The literature on language learning strategies in second or foreign language learning has focused on identifying the characteristics of effective (good) language learners (O'Maley and Chamot, 1990; Reiss, 1985). Effective language learners use more and better learning strategies than poor language learners do (Oxford, 1989). Rubin (1975) suggests that the good (effective) language learner is a willing and accurate guesser; has a strong drive to communicate; gives emphasis on form by looking for patterns; takes advantage of any kinds of practice opportunities; monitors his or her own speech as well as that of others; and pays attention to meaning. Naiman, Todesco and Frohlich (1975) have identified six strategies reported by students observed in language learning situations that appear to contribute to learning. For them, a good student selects language situations that allow learner's preferences to be used; actively involves in language learning; sees language as both a rule system and a communication tool; extends and revises his/her understanding of the language; and addresses the affective demands of language learning (cited in Oxford, Lavine, and Crookall, 1989: 30).

Many students who are learning a second or foreign language, however, do not innately share the cognitive, strategy-related, and personality characteristics of 'good' language learners. They may also not be conscious of the power of language learning strategies to facilitate their learning. Most of them know little about language learning process (Oxford, 1993b) and therefore, frequently have unrealistic expectations such as speaking fluently in a very short period or comprehending a text easily. Poor language learners, on the other hand, either do not use

strategies or they do not know how to use them sufficiently. Stern (cited in Rubin, 1987: 29) notes that,

The poor learner's language does not develop into a well-ordered system or network. It remains an untidy assemblage of separate items. He makes no attempt to relate items to each other. Because his approach is passive, unsystematic, and fragmented, he will complain that he has no memory for language.

In addition to these views, Rubin (1987) suggests that training the strategies to poor learners might assist their language learning process. The notion that special learning techniques and strategies might assist second or foreign language learning is actually quite new. Politzer (1965) notes, in describing the relationship between teaching methods and learning, "the successful language learner is essentially the pupil who has devised a successful self-teaching method" and argues that the learner may systematically apply strategies to different learning activities such as comprehension, oral production, or vocabulary learning (cited in O'Maley, Chamot, Manzanares, Kupper and Russo, 1985a). That the 'good language learner' might be doing something special and different to be successful at learning was suggested by Rubin and Stern (1975), which is completely in contrast with the idea that some people have an 'ear' for language or some individuals have an inherent ability for language learning (cited in O'Maley and Chamot, 1990).

1.1. Purpose and the Scope of the Study

Despite the knowledge of the importance of language learning strategies, and recent advancements in the field, there are still questions which remain to be answered. The questions of the teachability of

language learning strategies and effects of training in language learning strategies have recently come into consideration.

Previous research and theory on learning strategies in second and foreign language learning leave a number of questions unanswered. For example, some further research is needed on how strategies which were introduced explicitly in a formal setting influence implicit linguistic knowledge and the language proficiency of the students (O'Maley and Chamot, 1990). The purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of teaching language learning strategies on students' success. However, we should not disregard students' present use of language learning strategies, thus the first question to be asked is:

1. To what extent do elementary level university students employ language learning strategies in their foreign language?

The fact that teachers cannot follow the learning path of each of their students, and are not always around to direct them leads us to find some other ways to make students aware of and evaluate their own learning. Hence, since determining how each student learns best may be difficult for teachers, students must be train to help themselves in order for students to reach up a higher level of proficiency in speaking after a period of strategy training as well as other skills. So, we ask the question;

2. Will training language learning strategies in speaking be effective on the elementary level students' speaking proficiency level in English in a foreign language context?

Furthermore, the studies held in strategy training so far are mostly in second language context. Therefore, conducting research in the field of foreign language learning context may provide us some valuable data.

1.2. The Strategies to be Trained

In this study, four metacognitive and socio-affective strategies will be considered. These include functional planning, self evaluation (metacognitive), co-operating with peers and people who know the new language well, and asking questions for clarification (socio-affective).

The definitions of the selected language learning strategies are given on Table 1.1

Table 1.1
Definitions of the Language Learning Strategies Trained in the Study

<u>Learning Strategy</u>	<u>Definition</u>
Metacognitive Strategies	
Functional Planning	Planning ^o for and rehearsing linguistic components necessary to carry out an upcoming language task
Self-Evaluation	Checking the outcomes of one's own language learning against an internal measure of completeness and accuracy
Socio-Affective Strategies	

Co-operation	Working with one or more peers to get feedback, pool information, or model a language activity
Question for Clarification	Asking for repetition, paraphrasing, examples, and/or explanation

The choice of these strategies are due to the following observations:

During a four-semester experience of teaching speaking to beginners, the researcher observed that students tend to speak without organizing their thoughts. As a result, they seemed to have difficulty in expressing what they think. That is, it was often observed that students were likely to hesitate in conveying their messages. One of the reasons for this may be that they were not aware of the ways to plan their ideas. Therefore, the 'functional planning strategy' was selected.

Similarly, students seemed to avoid co-operating with each other and their teachers in and out of class to practice existing knowledge about their foreign language. In order to encourage the students to co-operate, they were given the strategy of 'co-operating with peers and people who know English well'.

Another problem was that the students did not seem to attempt to ask questions to the speaker when they did not get the message. In order to get rid of this obstacle, the strategy of 'asking questions for clarification' was given to the students.

Finally, students seemed to have unrealistic expectations on speaking English such as speaking fluently like one of their teachers. This is, of course, a good intention, however, this should be one of their long-term objectives. Thus, it can be said that students lack the ability to evaluate themselves in their learning period. Strategy of 'self-evaluation' was selected to have them gain this ability and see where they were in their learning period so that they could determine better objectives for themselves.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Theoretical Background on Learning Strategies

Language learning strategies may refer to three different things: In the first part, language learning strategies refer to language learning behavior that learners actually engage in to learn a second or foreign language. These language learning behaviors have been called 'strategies'. Second, learning strategies include what learners know about the strategies they use, i.e. their strategic knowledge. And finally, the term learning strategies also includes what learners know about aspects of their own language learning other than the strategies they use (Rubin, 1987).

In the literature, there has been a confusion concerning the term strategy, since it has been used to refer to different skills by different researchers. The term 'strategies' has been referred to as 'techniques', 'tactics', 'potentially conscious plans', 'consciously employed operations', 'learning skills' or 'cognitive abilities' (Wenden, 1987a). Reiss (1985), for example, defines 'strategy' as a conscious approach used by an individual to facilitate learning. Chamot an Kupper (1989), on the other hand, defines it as techniques which students use to comprehend, store, and remember new information. Another definition given by Oxford, Lavine and Crookall (1989), is that language learning strategies are

actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques employed by learners to enhance learning. And they add that these strategies may be used consciously and with effort, but they can become habitual and automatic with practice.

Rigney is one of the researchers who has defined learning strategies. Rigney (1978) defines (cited in Oxford and Crookall, 1989) learning strategies as steps taken by the learner to aid the acquisition, storage, and retrieval of information. Rigney uses the term 'strategies' to refer to learning techniques, behaviors, or actions; or learning to learn, problem solving, or study skills. Brown (1987), on the other hand, defines strategies as those specific 'attacks' that people make on a given problem both mother tongue and second or foreign language. According to Oxford (1993a), language learning strategies are specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques that students employ, often consciously, to improve their own progress in internalizing, storing, retrieving and using the second or foreign language.

Rubin classifies language learning strategies in two primary groups as direct and indirect strategies. Direct strategies are clarification/verification, monitoring, guessing, memorization, inductive and deductive reasoning, and practice and are considered to affect language learning directly. Indirect strategies are creating practice opportunities and using production tricks like communication strategies (Oxford, 1990; O'Maley and Chamot, 1990).

More recently, Oxford (1989) has compiled an extensive list of strategies. She has classified language learning strategies as direct and indirect strategies affecting language learning proficiency. Direct strategies consist of *memory strategies* (techniques to help learner store

new information in memory and retrieve it later); *cognitive strategies* (the manipulation or transformation of the language learning material); *compensation strategies* (enable learners to use the new language for either comprehension or production despite limitations in knowledge). Indirect strategies include *metacognitive strategies* (which go beyond cognitive devices and are used to provide a control over the learning process through centering, arranging, planning, and evaluating); *affective strategies* (techniques help learners to have a better control over their emotions, attitudes, and motivations); *social strategies* (actions involving other people in the language learning process) (Oxford, 1990; Oxford and Crookall, 1989; Chamot and Kupper, 1989).

The relationship between the use of 'good' and 'bad' strategies - strategies that 'effective' (good) and poor students use - with language proficiency in general, leads us to ask a more fundamental question about language learning strategies. Do learners implement learning strategies because they have them innately? Or, do more proficient learners acquire their learning skill because they have ascertained how to use productive strategies at some time in their language learning period? Rost and Ross (1991) answer these questions: If the latter is reasonable, it would be possible that these strategies should also be 'teachable'. Research on language learning strategy suggests that once the range of possible learner strategies is identified, the teacher would provide an environment which facilitates the identification by students of those strategies which work best for them. Another role of the teacher would be to suggest alternative strategies for organizing and storing information and to encourage students to consider which strategies work best for them in their learning process.

Oxford (1990, 1993a) emphasizes that the success of teaching language learning strategies depends upon the integrity of the strategy teaching program and students' attitudes, beliefs and stated needs; that is, affective factors should be considered in strategy training. Otherwise, the attempt of strategy training would fail. Another thing to be considered is to teach a combination of learning strategies in order to see a raise in proficiency.

These claims lead to the idea that learners need to learn how to learn and teachers need to learn how to facilitate this process. Although learning is a part of the human condition, *conscious* skill in self-directed learning and in strategy use must be sharpened necessarily in the area of second or foreign language teaching. Language learning requires active self direction on the part of learners; they cannot be spoon-fed if they want and expect to reach an acceptable level of communicative competence (Oxford, 1990).

Besides, as a result of training, learners become not only more efficient at learning and using their second and foreign language, but also more capable of self-directing these attempts (O'Maley, 1987). Thus; strategy training will be effective in improving the performance of students in various tasks. The general objectives of strategy training are to assist making language learning more meaningful, to encourage a collaborative spirit between the learner and the teacher, to learn about choices for language learning and to learn and practice strategies that facilitate self-reliance. However, strategy training should not be abstract or theoretical, but should be highly practical and useful for students. The aim of strategy training should be to show students some ways facilitating learners' learning process.

The strategy training studies that have been carried so far, however, are mostly on reading and vocabulary tasks. There is not much evidence on speaking or listening skills, especially in foreign language context. The studies done in this field are mostly limited to reading and vocabulary strategies, or language experts such as O'Maley have included speaking skill to their research besides other skills. There is not much research only restricted to speaking skill and the effects of teaching learning strategies on this skill.

Speaking, in particular, is one of the problematic skills for language learners especially if they are in a foreign language context. These learners are less likely to have the chance of practicing the new language than language learners who learn the new language in a country where that language is spoken. Foreign language learners do not have many opportunities to practice their foreign language. Even if they catch some opportunities to practice, they just do not have the ability to perform what they already know. It is partly because they do not know or –are not conscious of– which strategies they may use in the situation they are in.

Some students develop better strategic ways or techniques (strategies) carrying them to success and which are distinct than the techniques of others students.

This study, aims at training selected language learning strategies (i.e. functional planning, self evaluation, co-operating with peers or people who know the new language well, and asking questions for clarification) to students and to reveal the effects of strategy training on

speaking in English in a foreign language context so that we can provide some valuable insights to the teachers of English as a foreign language.

Training language learning strategies may save students in many cases and may provide them more realistic conversations. In school settings, using these strategies, students may pull their proficiency level up to a higher level which is a result of feeling more comfortable and self-confident in speaking examination which is one of the most frightening examinations for students since they have to perform their knowledge of foreign language orally.

2.2. Types of Strategy Training

Language learning strategies can be taught in three different ways: awareness training, one-time strategy training, and long-term strategy training.

2.2.1. Consciousness-raising

Consciousness-raising is also known as 'awareness training' or 'familiarization training' (Oxford, 1990). One of the most controversial issues in second or foreign language learning is the role of conscious and unconscious process that the learners apply (Schmidt, 1990). Rey (1983) attests that one of the most effective arguments against any role for consciousness in behavior and learning is originally generated by behaviorists. The basic behaviorist position is that consciousness is epiphenomenal, playing no casual role in human life; that is it is of secondary importance (cited in Schmidt, 1990:2). Common view among other researchers such as Freud or Chomsky for conscious processes is that they are simply less important and less interesting than unconscious

phenomena. Especially in the second language field, mostly influenced by Chomsky (Schmidt, 1990), what is acquired is an implicit (unconscious) mental process. In his paper, Smith (1981) explains that certain trends in language learning research suggest that promoting conscious awareness of language structure is at best a luxury and does not lead in any meaningful way to the attainment of the ultimate goal of spontaneous, unreflecting language use.

Nevertheless, there are many researchers who believe that conscious understanding of the target language system is necessary. Rubin (1987: 16) cites Cohen's arguments as "I believe that information gotten consciously can subsequently be put into the subconscious or made automatic." (Rubin, 1987; p: 16). It is assumed that conscious attention to the learning process is the first step to making language automatic for poor language learners. Smith (1981) argues that 'consciousness raising' facilitates language learning. From this standpoint, Schmidt (1990) claims that raising conscious use of learning strategies helps learner view the target language better. Smith (1981) affirms that 'consciousness raising is not a time-wasting procedure' (cited in Rubin, 1987; p: 16). It is assumed that making learning decisions conscious can lead both poorer and better learners to improve the obtaining, storing, retrieving, and using information. Fotos describes 'consciousness-raising' as a task type to solve a problem interactively so that the learner notices the important forms of the language and the same type of tasks can be used to teach language learning strategies to make the learners aware of their own learning (Fotos, 1993). Ellis (1990) supports the idea that once consciousness of a particular feature has been raised through formal instruction, learners continue to remain aware of the feature leading to

the eventual acquisition of that feature (cited in Fotos, 1993: 386, 387) In this type of training, students become aware of and familiar with the general idea of language learning strategies and the way these strategies can help them accomplish various language tasks. In awareness training, participants do not have to use the strategies in actual, on-the-spot language tasks.

2.2.2 One-Time Strategy Training

One-time strategy training involves learning and practicing one or more strategies with actual language tasks, usually those found in the regular language learning program. This kind of training gives the learner information on the value of strategy, when it can be used, how to use it, and how to evaluate the success of the strategy. In this type of strategy training students are given some language tasks which require them to use certain strategies. They become conscious of some strategies (selected by the teacher) and practice these strategies through some tasks for a limited period (one or two weeks).

2.2.3. Long-Term Strategy Training

Long-term strategy training, like one-time strategy training, covers learning and practicing strategies with actual language tasks (Oxford, 1990). Students learn the significance of particular strategies, when and how to use them, and how to monitor and evaluate their own performance. Like one-time strategy training, long-term training should be tied to the tasks and objectives of the language program. However, long-term training is more prolonged and covers a greater number of

strategies. Therefore, it is likely to be more effective than one-time training.

2.3. Empirical Studies on Strategy Training

Although the strategy studies were mostly carried out in other fields so far, the growing studies in the field of language learning strategies and strategy training have revealed that training of language learning strategies might be effective on the language learning proficiency (O'Maley, Chamot, Manzanares, Russo and Kupper, 1985a). Concerning possible advantages of strategy use, research results have generally been positive. Though all language learners use some kind of strategies, the more effective students use them more consciously, more purposefully, more appropriately, and more frequently than do less able students (Oxford, Crookall, Lavine, Nyikos, and Sutter, 1990).

O'Maley and his colleagues (1985a; 1985b,) carried out a two-phased study which consisted of a descriptive and a training phase. The subjects were 70 high school students from different schools enrolled in ESL classes. Most of them were from Spanish-language speaking countries. O'Maley and his colleagues aimed to clarify the range of learning strategies in second language learning and acquisition, to classify these strategies and to find out whether metacognitive, cognitive, and socio-affective learning strategies be taught successfully to second language learners in a formal instruction setting. In the study language learning strategies that students used were defined and classified first (phase 1) and then learners were trained to use certain learning strategies for 'vocabulary learning', 'speaking', and 'listening' skills in English (phase 2). The treatment groups of students were designed as a

metacognitive/ cognitive/ socio-affective strategy group and as a cognitive/socio-affective strategy group. A random control group received the same tasks but with no strategy training. Students received instruction and practice in the use of learning strategies for 50 minutes daily for eight days. This study may be put in the category of 'consciousness-raising' in terms of training period and 'one-time strategy training' in terms of the number of selected strategies to be taught.

This treatment caused a visible change on the proficiency level of the learners, but the change in speaking was more considerable than the change in listening. The researchers have observed a great increase in students' vocabulary use (O'Maley, Chamot, Manzanares, Russo and Kupper, 1985a).

Another study on strategy training by Chamot and Kupper (1989) also presented a positive change on the proficiency level of the students and resulted in a refinement of the classification system of learning strategies and a conscious use of the strategies taught. The project lasted three years and aimed to investigate a number of aspects of learning strategy use by foreign language students and their teachers. The project consisted of three studies: (a) a Descriptive Study, which identified learning strategies used by foreign language learners, (b) a Longitudinal Study, which clarified differences in the strategy use between effective and ineffective language learners and the change in strategy use in time, and (c) a Course Development Study, in which foreign language instructors taught students how to apply these learning strategies. The participants in the study were 67 high school students of Spanish and Russian as foreign language. The strategy training included strategies for listening and reading comprehension, and speaking task.

Chamot (1993) carried out another study on the 'responses of students to language learning strategy instruction' and found that students believe the use and effect of learning strategies. The subjects were 79 beginning level foreign language students from different schools, levels, and nationalities in the Washington DC. area. A Learning Strategies Review Questionnaire was developed to gather information about students' reactions to strategy instruction. The questionnaire was administered to the students after the training period. For each strategy taught, students were asked to indicate whether or not they used it in class or at home. In addition, students were required to give reasons for using or not using the strategy. The questionnaires used in the study were slightly different from each other since only the strategies taught in that language were included in the questionnaire.

Huang and Van Naerssen (1987) designed and conducted a study to investigate the learning strategies in oral communication employed by Chinese students who had been learning English as a foreign language in the People's Republic of China. 60 (fourth year) students of English in a third class language institute were given an oral test as well as a learning strategies questionnaire. Based on the results of the oral test, the students in the class were divided to three different groups. In the study, it was hypothesized that successful Chinese learners of English employ certain strategies. Note that success here is defined in terms of oral communicative abilities. The study was conducted to gather information on the use of the learning strategies; not to teach these strategies to students. The selected strategies for this study were *formal practice*, *functional practice*, and *monitoring*.

The results supported the imported role of functional practice in language learning. The results indicate that differences between Group 1 (highest) and Group 3 (lowest) were highly significant for all groups of techniques such as watching TV and films. Huang and Van Naerssen have also found significant differences between Group 2 (middle) and Group 3 (lowest) in (a) speaking with other students, teachers, and native speakers, and (b) thinking in English. In contrast, no statistically significant difference was found in all three groups in terms of formal practice and monitoring as a general strategy.

Oxford, Crookall, Lavine, Nyikos, and Sutter (1990), compiled and analyzed six situational case studies of strategy training for language learners. The four countries they presented were Israel, Denmark, France and, the US. (three cases were conducted in America). All these case studies were longitudinal (at least a school year) and based on anecdotal observations. None of the researchers followed a systematic study.

The first case was a monthly study conducted by Cohen for learners of Hebrew in Israel. Cohen visited the Ulpan (a school with approximately 100-150 students of different ages) once a month for three days aiming to help language learners take greater responsibility for their own progress. Oxford calls this a 'wake-up call'. That is, Cohen tried to show the students of Ulpan how they can and should become more aware and responsible of their own language learning. During each monthly visit, Cohen gave two formal, hour-long talks concerning various aspects of strategy use and self-directed learning. In addition to these formal sessions, Cohen also gave informal talks about 'Everything you want to know about language learning but afraid to ask.' Cohen received positive

feedback from students. They reported that they began to learn their target language more systematically by using the strategies introduced in the talks.

Sutter conducted a study in Denmark with teachers of Danish. Their aim was encouraging the use of three types of strategy training. The students at their school were learning Danish as a second language. The three modes of strategy training were: integrated and overt training; non-integrated courses that teach specific strategies; and integrated and covert training. Integrated and overt training was conducted as part of the language instruction curriculum. In class, the need for changing attitudes and responsibilities towards the target language was discussed explicitly. The teachers' purposes included making students conscious of their existing strategies, highlighting benefits of those techniques, and praising students for using them. Separate training course, on the other hand were designed to prepare learners for college, but with strategy training included. Integrated and covert strategy training was offered as a basis of language learning course or project lasted six months. After this application, many students, who were rigidly stick to old learning techniques changed their attitudes toward language learning.

The third case study was designed and conducted by Crookall in France for students of English as a foreign language. He started the study aiming to encourage unmotivated students to take responsibility of their own language learning process, to give them learning-to-learn tools or strategies, and to bring the language alive. Crookall carried the study with simulations, games and group discussions. Half of the lesson consisted of a language activity, and the rest of the lesson involved talking about language learning issues that arose from the activity. In

addition, the study typically involved explicit discussion of useful learning strategies such as guessing, translation, self-monitoring, etc. For two years (although it was not the main focus), Crookall collected data on 198 students' reactions to simulation, gaming and strategy training. To sum up, learners showed a significantly more positive attitude toward active language instruction (Oxford et. al., 1990).

The fourth case study was conducted by Lavine at her university of Maryland in America. She carried out this strategy training program with her students, who were learning Spanish as foreign language, for two years. The training focused on vocabulary acquisition and listening comprehension. The study included memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social strategies. Strategy training continued during 15-week semester. Awareness of strategy use was especially enhanced by the requirement that students should regularly keep language learning diaries. As a result of the study, students liked sharing their ideas on learning strategies. Students found metacognitive strategies and social strategies as most useful. They developed an awareness of their own responsibilities and choices in language learning.

Oxford conducted the fifth case study as a program of integrated strategy training in two Russian classes at the University of Alabama in America. She studied with elementary level students. Strategy training was explicitly designed and integrated into Oxford's course syllabus. She demonstrated and practiced many kinds of strategies such as memory, social, compensation, and affective strategies with students. Though strategy training was new to most of the students, they easily accepted its value in the learning of Russian. Learners particularly interested in memory strategies which helped them to memorize vocabulary in

Russian and social strategies which helped them develop positive attitudes toward the target language.

The last case study was also conducted in America by Nyikos with students learning German as a foreign language at Purdue University. She gave all materials through learning strategies to her students. Students learned, as she claimed, 'how to learn' by visualizing, performing social tasks, and emulating native speakers. Five minutes of each class time was devoted to generate personally meaningful learning strategies. As a result of generating student based learning strategies, Nyikos provided high involvement of students. Learning strategies quickly turned the German class a unique, enjoyable, and therefore motivating experience.

O'Maley (1987) designed a study to identify the range, type, and frequency of learning strategy use by beginning and intermediate level students of English in second language context and to determine the types of language tasks with which strategies tend to be associated. The subjects were 70 high-school students enrolled in English as a second language classes during Spring 1983, and 22 teachers providing instruction in these classes. Students at beginning and intermediate levels in English proficiency were interviewed in small groups to determine strategies used to assist in learning each language tasks which were pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, following directions, listening, making a brief presentation in class, social communication, and functional communication. In addition, teachers were interviewed in order to figure out their knowledge of strategies that their students used in class. Findings indicated that strategies could be classified into three broad categories-metacognitive, cognitive, and socio-affective strategies;

students tended to use strategies mostly with less complex language tasks; strategies which students used required little cognitive processing of the learning materials, and teachers were generally unaware of students' strategies and rarely introduced strategies while teaching.

Although many attempts to teach students to use learning strategies have indeed produced positive results, not all second language strategy training studies have been successfully processed. Oxford (1993a) suggests that strategy training in second language has been effective in certain skills such as reading, listening, and vocabulary learning, but not in others such as speaking and writing (see for example, Chamot and Kupper, 1989). Oxford suggests that the reason for this may be because of the methodology of research and because the learner is not considered a "whole learner" who uses intellectual, social, emotional, and physical resources and is, therefore, not merely a cognitive/metacognitive information processing machine. A solution to this problem may be harmonizing strategy training into regular second or foreign language activities over a long period of time (a semester or a year) rather than taught as a separate, and short obstruction (Oxford, 1993a; Oxford et. al., 1990; Oxford, 1990; O'Maley and Chamot, 1990).

Training research, on the other hand, on language learning strategies with second or foreign languages has been limited almost exclusively to cognitive strategy applications with vocabulary tasks and other skill areas remain to be studied (O'Maley and Chamot, 1990). Recently, there have been some attempts to teach reading and listening strategies, but strategies in speaking still remain to be studied. O'Maley and Chamot (1990) suggest that a combination of different strategies should be taught so that the target language will become more

contextualized. In addition, studies in the field of strategy training held so far have been limited mostly to second language learning situations. There is not much evidence in foreign language learning context which requires research in the field of foreign language learning.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Subjects

This study was carried out with preparatory students in the Intensive Language Teaching Program of the Communication Sciences Faculty. The level of these students was determined by Michigan Placement Test given at the beginning of the academic year 1995-1996, when this study was administered. Then the students registered were divide into four groups: Groups A and B consisted of students who had higher level of English, pre-intermediate students. Group C and Group D consisted of the beginners with very little or zero English background. In this study, Groups C and D were selected as the subjects of this study, because it was assumed that lower level students have a very limited use of learning strategies.

There were 25 students in each Group C and Group D. There were 11 female and 14 male students in Group C while there were 14 female and 11 male students in Group D. The ages of the students in each group ranged from 17 to 21. Group C was chosen as the Experimental group and Group D was chosen as the Control group. The Experimental group was chosen randomly; that is, no criteria were applied to the two groups in order to decide on the Experimental group. Both groups had 4 hours of reading, 4 hours of listening, 8 hours of grammar, 4 hours of writing,

2 hours of fun (a kind of vocabulary development course) and 3 hours of speaking instruction.

3.2. Research Design

3.2.1. General Procedures

This study is an experimental study. In terms of strategy training types, this study follows both 'consciousness-raising' and 'one-term training' (cf. Chapter II; sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2) types since the aim is to raise subjects' awareness (consciousness) of the existence of language learning strategies and to teach them more than one strategy within a month.

At the very beginning, the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) which was developed by Oxford (1990) (see Appendix A) was administered to two groups of students in order to see whether they already use language learning strategies, and if they do, to what extent they use these strategies. This inventory consists of 50 statements about the techniques that language learners use while learning a second or foreign language. Subjects respond on a 5 point scale, ranging from 1 to 5 ("Never or almost never true of me; Occasionally true of me; Sometimes true of me; Usually true of me; and Always or almost always true of me).

The SILL was translated into Turkish by Vedat Yılmaz, who is an instructor of English at the faculty of Communication Sciences, in order to facilitate its administration, and better comprehension by the students. Thus, the aim was to get more reliable results. That is why this Turkish translation of the SILL was given to the students.

Subjects wrote their answers on the SILL Answer Sheet (see Appendix B). The Answer Sheet involves six columns as Part A, Part B, etc., which represent different strategy groups.

Then, a pre-test (see Appendix D) was given to both the Control and the Experimental groups to see whether the groups have equal speaking proficiency (i.e. to what extent they can achieve fluency, vocabulary, and task achievement). The students were given the exam as pairs and were asked to have a conversation based on the situations and roles assigned to them. After the pre-test, the Experimental group was taught speaking with some explicit language learning strategies, such as 'functional planning', 'self-evaluation', 'asking questions for clarification', and 'co-operating with peers or people who know English well (in this case, teachers)'. On the other hand, the Control group was taught speaking through the activities in their book 'Plenty to Say' (Ramsey, 1989) and some supplementary activities without any exposure to learning strategies. Both groups were instructed for a month. At the end of the month, the two groups were given the post-test (see Appendix D) where they were required to have a conversation on the same situation and with the same roles given in the pre-test. Both in the pre-test and in the post test, students' performances were tape recorded and then evaluated by two instructors independently based on the 'Evaluation Scale' adapted from 'Cambridge Oral Examination Scale' (see Appendix E).

The evaluation scale has four components including 'Fluency', 'Vocabulary', 'Task Achievement', and 'Grammatical Accuracy'. However, 'Grammatical Accuracy' was eliminated in this study, because

of the low level of the students and it was not focused on how grammatical the students speak in particular.

3.2.2. Data Collection

Both Experimental and Control groups were taught three hours per week for four weeks during the first semester. During these four weeks, the Experimental group was exposed to four language learning strategies that can help them to improve their speaking skill. Two of these four strategies belong to 'metacognitive strategies': 'functional planning and self evaluation', and the other two are included in 'socio-affective strategies': 'asking questions for clarification and co-operating with peers and people who know the target language well'.

For 'functional planning', subjects were given at least five minutes before each activity to understand what to do for achieving the task. During this five-minute thinking period, subjects were required to answer the following questions:

- What am I going to talk about?
- What structure should I use?
- Should I use informal or formal language?
- Which vocabulary can be used to achieve the activity?

These questions were discussed and answered by students in pair or groups. This way, the strategy of co-operating with peers was practiced too. After thinking on these questions, students were grouped either into pairs or groups, according to the nature of the activity. While performing the activity, students were always free to request additional time for thinking and organizing their thoughts. After the activity, the

necessity of planning in our lives, and thus during speaking, were discussed and the students were ensured that they were always free to think before beginning to speak.

On the part of 'self evaluation', subjects were given a self evaluation form (see Appendix F), adapted from Oxford's Questionnaire of Determining Goals and Objectives for Learning the New Language (Oxford, 1990). Subjects' answers to these questions were discussed in the class in terms of short or long term goals. Following these talks, students shared their thoughts and feelings about English. Subjects practiced the strategy of 'asking questions for clarification' through activities done in the class. Since they always studied in pairs or groups, they asked questions to each other.

For the strategy of 'co-operation with peers and/or people who know English well', subjects were required to work in groups or in pairs. They were always supported to share their ideas. In addition, they were requested to try to speak in English in and out of class (during break times or when they meet their teachers on the street for example).

In the Control group, on the other hand, the regular syllabus was followed; the activities were carried out without extra time for the students to think about the purpose of the task, language, vocabulary, etc. They were not allowed to do pair or group work to accomplish the activity. They were also not encouraged to self-evaluate themselves or speak in the target language with the teachers. In addition to these, discussion sessions which were conducted by the teacher and students in the Experimental group were not included in the speaking lessons in the Control group.

At the end of the study, a post-test was given to the students to determine whether there is a significant change in their performance and proficiency in speaking. The test was applied by the same teachers.

3.2.3. Data Analysis

The data collected by the application of the SILL (the language learning inventory) were analyzed by calculating the mean frequency of language learning strategy use per student. As it was mentioned in the section 3.2.1 General Procedures, there are six parts in the inventory, and students graded the statements in each part from '1' to '5'. The total scores for each part were divided to the number of statements of that part. For example, if a student gets '18' from the first part (representing memory strategies), this score is divided to '9', the number of statements in the first part, we get the mean frequency of '2'. This means that this student generally does not use memory strategies according to the evaluation scale given in Appendix C. This calculation was done for each part. In order to find out the total frequency of use of language learning strategies, all scores graded for all six parts were added up and then divided by 50 (total number of the statements in the inventory).

The mean frequency of the use of the strategies for the Control and the Experimental group (the results of the SILL) was determined by the use of two-tail t-tests, employing the StatView 512+ statistical software. The results were accepted as either significant, near significant, or non-significant according to the 95% probability level.

In order to determine the level of speaking proficiency of the students before and after the treatment, an evaluation scale (see Appendix E) was used which was prepared for the purpose of measuring how well

ANADOLU ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MERKEZ KÜTÜPHANESİ

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the results of the study are presented. First, we try to answer the following question:

“To what extent do elementary level university students employ language learning strategies in their foreign language?”

To determine the amount of language learning strategies used by the students, we gave a language learning strategies inventory. Table 4.1 shows the results of the language learning strategies inventory which was administered to both the Control and the Experimental groups as the first step of the study.

Table 4.1
The frequency of language learning strategies of the Control and the Experimental groups

Type of learning strategy	Control Group			Experimental Group		
	N	frequency	%	N	frequency	%
Memory	225	2.82	56.4	225	2.43	48.6
Cognitive	350	2.54	50.8	350	2.38	47.6
Compensation	150	2.70	54	150	2.96	59.2
Metacognitive	225	3.65	73	225	3.19	63.8
Affective	150	2.94	58.8	150	2.53	50.6
Social	150	3.25	65	150	2.93	58.6
Total	1250	2.98	59.6	1250	2.76	55.2

Each subject rated 50 statements in the inventory. Therefore, a total of 1250 statements for each group was elicited ($50 \times 25 = 1250$). Among these, 225 statements (9×25) were about memory strategies, 350 statements (14×25) were about cognitive strategies, 150 statements (6×25) were about compensation strategies, 225 statements (9×25) were for metacognitive strategies, 150 statements (6×25) about affective strategies and 150 statements (6×25) were about social strategies.

When we look at the results, we see that at the beginning of the study, mean value of the frequency of the use of language learning strategies is 2.98 for the Control group. That is, the students in the Control group are medium users of language learning strategies. The mean frequency of the use of language learning strategies for the Experimental group is 2.69, which means that they are also medium users of strategies. Even though it seems that there is a slight difference between the two groups, they both are accepted as medium users of language learning strategies according to the evaluation scale of Oxford's inventory: according to this scale, the overall score is '5' and from 2.4 to 3.4 is considered as 'medium', that is, the students participated in the study sometimes use language learning strategies (see Appendix C).

Then, we look at the mean frequency of different types of language learning strategies. The mean frequency of the use of memory strategies is 2.82 for the Control group (Table 4.1). This means that they are medium users of memory strategies. The Control group reached a mean frequency of 2.7 for compensation strategies, which means that they are medium users of these type of strategies; 3.65 for metacognitive strategies, that is, students in the Control group are high users of metacognitive strategies; 2.94 for affective strategies, which indicates

that they are medium users of these type of strategies, and 3.25 for social strategies, that is they are medium users of social strategies, too. These figures show that students in the Control group use metacognitive strategies more frequently than the other types of strategies.

The mean frequency of the use of memory strategies is 2.43 for the Experimental group. That is, the students in the Experimental group are medium users of memory strategies. The Experimental group reached a mean frequency of 2.38 for cognitive strategies showing that cognitive strategies are generally not used by the subjects in the Experimental group. However, the difference between the two groups is slight. The Experimental group had a mean frequency of 2.96 for compensation strategies, which means they are medium users of these type of strategies; 3.19 for metacognitive strategies; 2.53 for affective strategies and 2.93 for social strategies indicating that the subjects in the Experimental group are medium users.

Then, we statistically compare the frequency of language learning strategies between the Control and the Experimental groups. Statistical calculations revealed that there is no significant difference between the Control and the Experimental groups in terms of the subjects' use of memory strategies ($t = 1.864$; $p = 0.684$). Also, there is no significant difference between the two groups in terms of the frequency of cognitive strategy use ($t = 0.995$; $p = 0.344$); compensation strategy use ($t = 0.241$; $p = 0.810$), and social strategy use ($t = 1.349$; $p = 0.183$), and in using affective strategies ($t = 1.985$; $p = 0.529$), yet this result is statistically non-significant. However, there is a significant difference between the Control and the Experimental groups in terms of the use of metacognitive strategies at the level of 0.05 ($t = 2.157$; $p = 0.036$).

The results of the inventory rely on students' honesty and sincerity in giving a degree to the statements of the inventory. Even though it was explained that this inventory was given for research, and that the results would not affect their course grades, they might not be honest while rating the statements. They should have responded how they thought they should be, or what other people do. Yet it is most probable that the students did not know what a strategy of language learning is. This might be the first time for them. Remembering the theory that successful learners use learning strategies more than unsuccessful learners do (Oxford, 1989; O'Maley and Chamot, 1990; Rubin, 1975), we can say that these results are contradictory when we consider that they are elementary level students of English. If they were real medium users of learning strategies, their level of English would be higher as Rubin's (1987) suggestions that good language learners use more language learning strategies than poor language learners. Since the language learning strategies inventory given at the beginning of the study was specific to language learning, it is less likely for them to transfer these strategies from another skill such as physics, or using a computer.

When we look at the results of the inventory, we see that the Control and the Experimental groups use metacognitive strategies at most. This result is in parallel with the results of the study held by O'Maley et. al. (1985a, 1985b). In their study, O'Maley et. al. found that language learners mostly use metacognitive strategies. They also found that successful learners use more metacognitive strategies than unsuccessful ones do. Yılmaz (inprep) also found that students of the faculty of Communication Sciences use metacognitive strategies at most which is a supporting consequence for our result. However, statistical

data indicated that the Control group use metacognitive strategies more frequently than the Experimental group. But this difference is so small that we cannot say that the Control group is more successful than the Experimental group. Then, social strategies follow metacognitive strategies. Again, this result is supported by the study of O'Maley and his colleagues (1985a, 1985b). After the identification and the classification of the strategies used by language learners, they revealed that students tended to use social strategies such as co-operation with others. However, this study were in a second language context where learner could find many opportunities to practice their target language. In this sense, in our study, the high frequency of social strategy use is also contradictory when we consider the fact that Turkish students do not naturally communicate in the language they are learning. In addition to this, the researcher observed that, although students are usually willing to cooperate with each other and to their teachers, they avoid speaking in the foreign language because they are afraid of being wrong and funny, so that they will be laughed at. While the Control group has its lowest mean score in using cognitive strategies, the Experimental group is weak in using memory and cognitive strategies. This result shows us that the students do not internalize the new learned vocabulary or rule. They do not apply and adapt the new information in different situations.

The second question which we will try to answer in this chapter is:

"Will teaching language learning strategies in speaking be effective on the students' speaking proficiency level?"

To be able to respond this question, we administered a pre-test and a post-test to the subjects. In the pre-test and the post-test, the subjects

were given a speaking exam (Appendix D) in order to define their level in speaking. Table 4.2 shows the mean scores of the groups.

Table 4.2
The mean scores in pre-test and post-test of the Control (CG) and the Experimental (EG) groups in speaking

	Fluency		Vocabulary		Task Achieve.		Total Proficiency	
	pre-t	post-t	pre-t	post-t	pre-t	post-t	pre-t	post-t
CG	35.44	59.60	33.42	56.16	38.30	59.10	35.68	58.10
EG	44.16	65.42	39.58	63.54	42.20	67.68	41.88	65.49

We first look at the pre-test scores. We delineate the pre-test scores in terms of the components of the speaking proficiency exam. Table 4.2 indicates that the mean score of the Control group was 35.44 in terms of fluency, and the Experimental group reached a mean value of 44.16. Even if it seems that there is a difference between the groups, there is no statistically significant difference ($t = -1.83$; $p = 0.07$) between the Control and Experimental groups.

For the use of vocabulary, the Control group had a mean value of 33.42 while the Experimental group got 39.58. Again, statistical analysis support our claim that these two groups were equal in terms of vocabulary use at the beginning of the study ($t = -1.28$; $p = 0.20$).

In terms of task achievement, there is a similar situation. The mean score of the Control group is 38.3, and it is 42.2 for the Experimental group. As it is seen, these scores are very close to each other and the difference between the score of the Control and the Experimental groups is not statistically significant ($t = 0.72$; $p = 0.47$).

The results given above belong to the components of the speaking proficiency exam. To figure out the subjects' speaking proficiency level in pre-test, we should look at the total proficiency of each group. We see that the Control group reached a mean value of 35.68, and the Experimental group succeeded a mean value of 41.88. The difference between these groups is not statistically significant ($t = -1.25$; $p = 0.21$).

These results indicate that the Control and the Experimental groups were approximately equal in terms of the level of speaking proficiency at the beginning of the study. However, when we look at the pre-test scores of both groups, in general, the mean scores of the Control group seems lower than the scores of the Experimental group. Nevertheless, the difference between the Control and the Experimental groups was due to two students in the Control group who did not speak in the exam at all; and each of whom got '1' from each evaluator (see Appendix G). This is the reason why the averages of the Control group seem lower.

When we compare the performance of mean scores of the Control group, we see that the students in the Control group showed an improvement in all three components of the exam and consequently in the speaking proficiency. While they got 35.44 in fluency at the beginning of the study, their mean score from the post-test was 59.60 at the end of the study. Statistical results revealed that the subjects in the Control group improved their fluency significantly ($t = -16.59$; $p = 0.001$). The students in the Control group also took their score of the usage of vocabulary from 33.42 (pre-test) to 56.16 (post-test), and statistical results support this significant difference ($t = -15.58$; $p = 0.001$). For task achievement, mean score in the pre-test was 38.30, and

it is 59.10 in the post-test. Furthermore, there is a highly significant difference between the mean scores of the Control group in the pre-test and the post-test ($t = -16.42$; $p = 0.001$). And finally, depending on these results, their level of proficiency in speaking improved from 35.68 to 58.10. Statistically, too, this difference is highly significant ($t = -16.32$ $p = 0.001$).

The Experimental group, too, showed an improvement in the post-test. In other words, after the training period, comparing their mean scores in the pre-test, they reached a higher level of proficiency in speaking. In terms of fluency, the Experimental group took their mean score from 44.20 to 65.42 which is statistically highly significant ($t = -25.16$; $p = 0.001$). For the usage of vocabulary, while their pre-test score was 39.58, it was 63.54 at the end of the treatment. Statistically, this improvement is also highly significant ($t = -21.38$; $p = 0.001$). The group's task achievement was 42.20 at the beginning of the treatment, but after the treatment it was 67.58 which is also highly significant ($t = -21.41$; $p = 0.001$) statistically. And depending on these results, their level of proficiency in speaking improved from 41.88 to 65.49. Statistical analysis revealed that this result is also highly significant ($t = -22.59$; $p = 0.001$).

When we look at the performance of the Control and the Experimental groups, these figures prove that there is a statistically significant difference in fluency, vocabulary, task achievement and their level of speaking proficiency. Both the Control and the Experimental groups achieved a better proficiency level at the end of the teaching period. This is quite reasonable since both groups kept on having other skills such as listening, reading, and writing. Moreover, the Control

group, too, had a speaking course which continued during the study. In order to figure out whether the Experimental group succeeded a better proficiency, we should compare their post-test results.

We, now, first compare the post-test of the Experimental and the Control groups in terms of components again. In terms of fluency, the mean score of the Control group is 59.16 while it is 65.42 for the Experimental group. And Statistical analysis proved that there is a significant difference between the Experimental and the Control groups in this aspect ($t = -3.20$; $p = 0.001$).

In terms of vocabulary, the Control group has 56.16, and the Experimental group has 63.54 as the mean score. When we compare these mean scores statistically, we, once again, see that there is a significant difference between the two groups ($t = -2.99$; $p = 0.001$).

When comparing the mean scores of both groups in terms of task achievement, which are 59.10 and 67.58 respectively, the statistical analysis reveals a significant difference between the groups ($t = -3.64$; $p = 0.001$).

Finally, we compare the total proficiency scores of the Control and the Experimental groups. The mean scores are 58.10 and 65.49, respectively. The difference is statistically significant ($t = -3.38$; $p = 0.001$); that is; although both groups improved their speaking during this one-month study, the improvement of the Experimental group in speaking is reasonably higher than the Control group's success. This improvement is more likely because of the awareness that the students gained during the treatment.

In one of his studies, O'Maley (1983) taught the strategies of 'functional planning', and 'co-operating with peers' and observed a raise in subjects' success. That subjects in the Experimental group reached a higher level of proficiency shows a consistency with the result of this study. Oxford et. al. (1990) emphasized the importance of explicit teaching of learning strategies in different case studies. During these case studies, they explicitly had talking sessions about learning strategies and their importance in language learning process. As a result they saw that the level of consciousness of students was improved. Similarly, in our study, it has been observed that students in the Experimental group requested some time for thinking and planning their conversation in post-test, and they asked questions both to evaluators and to one another to pinpoint the meaning. The students in the Experimental group also tried to help their partners when one of them feels that his/her partner is in difficulty in expressing his/her thoughts. This shows that they, at least, changed their attitudes toward the target language and tried to use the language learning strategies.

This result indicates that raising students' consciousness on the existence of language learning strategies and training students on these learning strategies are assets for students to achieve a better proficiency in English as a foreign language. Although the subjects were exposed to only four strategies among many, they reached a better success and a better performance compared to their beginning level of speaking.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary

This study aimed to find out the effects of training language learning strategies on speaking proficiency level of the students attending the faculty of Communication Sciences at Anadolu University. It also identified the language learning strategies used by the students at the beginning of the study.

For the purpose of this study, two classes were chosen, one as the Control group and the other as the Experimental group. A total of 50 students participated in the study. 25 of them were in the Control group and the other 25 were in the Experimental group. Subjects in both groups were beginners of English. Their level of English was determined according to the scores they got on the placement test, administered before they started the Intensive English Program of the faculty.

Before beginning the treatment, the students were administered a language learning inventory (SILL) developed by Oxford (1990). This inventory was administered in order to determine their present frequency of the use of language learning strategies. The results of the inventory showed that the students both in the Control and in the Experimental group were medium users of the strategies in general.

In addition to the administration of the inventory, students were also given a pre-test to determine their speaking proficiency level and to see whether the both groups were equal or not. The results of the pre-test indicated that there is no significant difference between them. In other words, the Control and the Experimental group had the same level of speaking proficiency. In terms of the components of the speaking exam (fluency, vocabulary, and task achievement), there was also no significant difference between the groups.

The treatment lasted four weeks, three hours per week. During the treatment, the Experimental group was exposed to four language learning strategies, which were 'functional planning', 'self evaluation', 'co-operating with peers and people who know English well', and 'asking questions for clarification'.

In post-test, however, the Experimental group noticeably succeeded better scores for each component in the speaking exam, and consequently the total proficiency of speaking. Statistical results also supported that there was a significant difference between the Control and the Experimental group. This change in proficiency level of the Experimental group is most probably because of the exposure of learning strategies.

5.2 Conclusion

All of us use some strategies one way or other when we learn something (e.g. learning how to ride a bicycle or learning how to write an essay) consciously or unconsciously. Using strategies consciously, however, provides us some benefits such as being more successful at what is learned. Teaching language learning strategies may contribute

students' learning. They can have more confidence in themselves in and out of class when they have to use their target language. Considering the results of this study, it can be concluded that teaching language learning strategies can be an advantage for students for gaining power over their language learning period. Since teachers cannot always be around and ready to meet students' needs, teaching them how to become self-sufficient in meeting their own needs can fasten and make their learning process less painful. However, strategy training should be in harmony with the general language teaching program and should include various strategies as much as possible. In addition to this, it should not concern only one skill as it has been done in this study; it would be more beneficial for them if they learned different strategies in different skills at the same time. Thus, in order to have more sufficient and proficient learners, we, as teachers, should show them how to walk in the path of language learning. This study actually followed a different process from the other studies summarized in Chapter II in terms of the teaching period and the training, all of the studies regarding strategy training includes a two-week teaching period, and researchers train the language teachers first and these teachers teach strategies to students. Then the researchers evaluate students' performance. However, research findings in terms of strategy training in speaking have shown that teaching language learning strategies facilitates learning.

Finally, according to the results of this study, teaching of language learning strategies may be integrated into the basic language teaching program of Communication Sciences Faculty at Anadolu University or other faculties having a foreign language program.

5.3. Suggestions for Further Studies

By this study, the effect of teaching four different language learning strategies on proficiency level in speaking in the target language is investigated. Another study can be designed including more and different strategies.

A similar study can be designed in other skills (listening, reading, writing).

Finally, when selecting subjects of the study, age, sex, social and economic background, and personal styles can be considered in forming the groups.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, H. D. (1987). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Chamot, A. U. (1993). 'Student Responses to Learning Strategy Instruction in the Foreign Language Classroom'. *Foreign Language Annals*, 26:3
- ____ (1987). 'The Learning Strategies of ESL Students,' in Anita L. Wenden and Joan Rubin, eds., Leamer Strategies in Language Learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Chamot, A. U. and Kupper, L. (1989). 'Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Instruction'. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22:1
- Fotos, S. S. (1993). 'Consciousness Raising and Noticing through Focus on Form: Grammar Task Performance versus Formal Instruction'. *Applied Linguistics*, 14:4
- Haggstorm, M. (1993) 'Study Strategies for Beginnig Foreign Language Classroom' *The Modern Canadian Language Review*, Vol. 49:2
- Huang, X. Van Naarsen, M. (1987) 'Learning Strategies for Oral Communication'. *Applied Linguistics*, 8:3
- O'Maley M. J. (1987). 'The Effects of Training in the Use of Learning Strategies on Learning English as a Second Language' in Anita L. Wenden and Joan Rubin, eds., Leamer Strategies in Language Learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- O'Maley, M. J. and Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- O'Maley, M. J. and Chamot, A. U., Manzanares, G., Russo, R. P., and Kupper, L. (1985a). 'Learning Strategies Used by Beginning and Intermediate ESL Students'. *Language Learning*, 35:1
- O'Maley, M. J. and Chamot, A. U., Manzanares, G., Russo, R. P., and Kupper, L. (1985b). 'Learning Strategy Applications with Students of English as a Second Language'. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19:3
- Oxford, L. R. (1989). 'Use of Language Learning Strategies: A Synthesis of Studies with Implications for Strategy Training.' *System*, Vol. 17:2
- _____. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. USA: Newbury House Publishers
- _____. (1993a). 'Research on Second Language Learning Strategies'. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13
- _____. (1993b). 'Language Learning Strategies in a Nutshell: Update and ESL Suggestions'. *TESOL Journal*, Vol. 2:2
- Oxford, L. R., and Crookall, D. (1989). 'Research on Language Learning Strategies: Methods, Findings, and Instructional Issues'. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73:4
- Oxford, L. R., Lavine, R., and Crookall, D. (1989) 'Language Learning Strategies, the Communicative Approach, and their Classroom Implications' *Foreign Language Annals*, Vol. 22:1
- Oxford, L. R., and Crookall, D., Cohen, A., Lavine, R., Nyikos, M., and Sutter, W. (1990). 'Strategy Training for Language Learners: Six Situational Case Studies and a Training Model'. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22:3
- Ramsey, A. (1989) *Plenty to Say*. Longman Group UK Limited
- Reiss, M. (1985). 'The Good Language Learner: Another Look'. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 41:3
- Rost, M. and Ross, S. (1991). 'Learner Use of Strategies in Interaction: Typology and Teachability'. *Language Learning*, 41:2

- Rubin J. (1975). 'What can We Learn from the Good Language Learner?'. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 9:3
- _____. (1987). 'Learner Strategies: Theoretical Assumptions, Research History and Typology' in Anita L. Wenden and Joan Rubin, eds., Learner Strategies in Language Learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Schmidt, W. S. (1990). 'The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning'. *Applied Linguistics*, 11:2
- Smith, M. S. (1981). 'Consciousness Raising and the Second Language Learner'. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 2:2
- Wenden, A. (1987a). 'Conceptual Background and Utility' in Anita L. Wenden and Joan Rubin, eds., Learner Strategies in Language Learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- _____. (1987b). 'How to Be a Successful Language Learner: Insights and Prescriptions from L2 Learners' in Anita L. Wenden and Joan Rubin, eds., Learner Strategies in Language Learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Wenden, A., and Rubin, J., eds (1987) *Learner Strategies in Language Learning* . Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Yilmaz, V. (Inprep.) 'Language Learning Strategies of Turkish EFL Students and the Effects of Proficiency Level and Gender on Strategy Use' Unpublished Master Thesis of Art.

APPENDIX A

DİL ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ LİSTESİ

Yönergeler

Bu liste İngilizce öğrenme şekliniz hakkında bilgi toplamak amacı ile düzenlenmiştir ve dil öğrenme ile ilgili 50 cümleden oluşmaktadır. Lütfen her cümleyi okuyunuz ve **cümlenin size ne kadar uygun olduğunu gösteren rakamı** (1, 2, 3, 4, veya 5) size verilecek cevap kağıdı üzerine yazınız. Rakamların ne anlama geldiği aşağıda açıklanmaktadır:

1. Hiç yapmam yapanım	2. Nadiren yaparım	3. Az çok
4. Genellikle yaparım	5. Her zaman yaparım	

Cevaplarınızı **cümlelerin sizi ne kadar iyi tanımladığını göz önüne alarak** veriniz. Nasıl olmanız gerektiğini veya başkalarının yapuklarını düşünerek, veya seçenekleri doğru yada yanlış şeklinde değerlendirerek **cevap vermeyiniz**. Cevaplarınızı mümkün olduğunca çabuk veriniz ve lütfen bu sayfalar üzerinde herhangi bir işaretleme yapmayınız. Sorularınız varsa, lütfen öğretmeninize sorunuz.

Part A

1. İngilizce'de yeni öğrendiğim şeyler ile bildiklerim arasında ilişkiler kuranım.
2. Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce kelimeleri hatırlayabilmek için onları cümle içinde kullanırım.
3. Hatırlamama yardımcı olması için yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce bir kelimenin okunuşu ile resmi veya görüntüsü arasında bir ilgi kuranım.
4. Yeni öğrendiğim bir kelimeyi o kelimenin kullanılabileceği bir ortamı zihnimde canlandırarak hatırlarım.
5. Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce kelimeleri hatırlamak için, içinde bu kelimelerin geçtiği kafiyeler oluştururum.
6. Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce kelimeleri hatırlamak için, üzerlerine bu kelimeleri yazdığım küçük kartlar kullanırım.
7. Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce kelimeleri hareketlerle ve davranışlarla canlandırırım.
8. İngilizce derslerinde öğrendiklerimi sık sık gözden geçiririm.
9. Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce kelime veya deyimleri onların sayfadaki, tahtadaki, veya tabelalardaki yerlerini düşünerek hatırlarım.

Part B

10. Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce kelimeleri birkaç defa tekrar eder veya yazarım.
11. Anadili İngilizce olanlar gibi konuşmaya çalışırım.
12. İngilizcedeki sesleri pratik yapmak amacı ile düzenli olarak tekrarlarım.

13. Bildiğim İngilizce kelimeleri çeşitli şekillerde kullanırım.
14. İngilizce konuşmalarda konuşmayı ben başlatırım.
15. İngilizce TV programları veya filmler seyredirim.
16. Eğlence amacı ile İngilizce kitap, dergi, vs. okurum.
17. İngilizce notlar, mesajlar, mektuplar, veya raporlar yazanım.
18. İngilizce bir yazıya ilk önce çabucak bir göz atar, daha sonra başa dönüp dikkatli bir şekilde okurum.
19. Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce kelimelere benzeyen Türkçe kelimeler bulmaya çalışırım.
20. İngilizcede kalıplar bulmaya çalışırım.
21. Bilmediğim İngilizce bir kelimenin anlamını; kelimeyi bildiğim eklere, köklere ayırarak bulurum.
22. Kelime kelime aynen çeviri yapmamaya çalışırım.
23. Duyduğum veya okuduğum İngilizce bilgilerin özetlerini çıkarırım.

Part C

24. İlk defa karşıma çıkan İngilizce kelimeleri anlamak için tahminde bulunurum.
25. İngilizce konuşurken bir kelimeyi hatırlayamadığımda, söylemek istediğim şeyi el kol hareketleri ile anlatırım.
26. İngilizce konuşurken veya yazarken kullanmam gereken en uygun kelimeleri bilmiyorsam, bildiğim kelimelerden onlarla aynı anlama gelebilecek yeni kelimeler türetirim.
27. Karşılaştığım her yeni kelimeyi anlamak için sözlüğe bakmadan, İngilizce kitap, dergi, vs. okurum.
28. İngilizce konuşurken karşımdaki kişinin söyleyeceği bir sonraki kelime veya cümleyi tahmin etmeye çalışırım.
29. İngilizce bir kelimeyi hatırlayamazsam, aynı anlama gelen başka bir kelime veya deyim kullanırım.

Part D

30. İngilizcemini kullanmak için mümkün olduğunca çok yol bulmaya çalışırım.
31. İngilizcede yaptığım hataları farkederim ve bu hataları daha başarılı olmama yardımcı olacak şekilde kullanırım.
32. Birisi İngilizce konuşurken dikkatle dinlerim.
33. Nasıl daha iyi İngilizce öğrenebileceğimi bulmaya çalışırım.
34. İngilizce çalışmaya yeterince zamanım olacak şekilde işlerimi planlarım.
35. İngilizce konuşabileceğim insanlar aranım.
36. Mümkün olduğunca çok İngilizce kitap, dergi, vs. okumak için fırsatlar bulmaya çalışırım.
37. İngilizce becerilerimi geliştirmek için açık ve kesin hedeflerim vardır.
38. İngilizce öğrenmede gösterdiğim gelişmeyi gözden geçiririm.

Part E

39. İngilizce kullanmaktan korktuğumu hissettiğimde rahatlamaya çalışırım.
40. Hata yapmaktan korktuğumda bile İngilizce konuşmak için kendimi cesaretlendiririm.
41. İngilizcede her hangi bir başarı gösterdiğimde kendimi ödüllendiririm.
42. İngilizce çalışırken veya İngilizce kullanırken gergin veya sinirli olursam, bunu farkedirim.
43. Bir 'Dil Öğrenme Günlüğü' tutar ve dil öğrenirken hissettiklerimi bu günlüğe kaydederim.
44. İngilizce öğrenirken hissettiklerimi başkaları ile paylaşırım.

Part F

45. İngilizce konuşurken birşeyi anlamazsam, karşımdaki kişiden yavaşlamasını veya tekrar etmesini isterim.
46. Anadili İngilizce olanlardan, ben konuşurken hatalarımı düzeltmelerini isterim.
47. Pratik yapmak amacı ile diğer öğrencilerle İngilizce konuşurum.
48. Bir zorlukla karşılaştığımda, anadili İngilizce olanlardan yardım isterim.
49. İngilizce sorular sorarım.
50. Anadili İngilizce olanların kültürlerini öğrenmeye çalışırım.

Translated by Vedat Yılmaz

APPENDIX B

DİL ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ LİSTESİ

Cevap ve Puanlama Cetveli

İsim: _____

Grup: _____

<u>Bölüm A</u>	<u>Bölüm B</u>	<u>Bölüm C</u>	<u>Bölüm D</u>	<u>Bölüm E</u>	<u>Bölüm F</u>	<u>Tüm Liste</u>
1. _____	10. _____	24. _____	30. _____	39. _____	45. _____	TOP Bölüm A _____
2. _____	11. _____	25. _____	31. _____	40. _____	46. _____	TOP Bölüm B _____
3. _____	12. _____	26. _____	32. _____	41. _____	47. _____	TOP Bölüm C _____
4. _____	13. _____	27. _____	33. _____	42. _____	48. _____	TOP Bölüm D _____
5. _____	14. _____	28. _____	34. _____	43. _____	49. _____	TOP Bölüm E _____
6. _____	15. _____	29. _____	35. _____	44. _____	50. _____	TOP Bölüm F _____
7. _____	16. _____		36. _____			
8. _____	17. _____		37. _____			
9. _____	18. _____		38. _____			
	19. _____					
	20. _____					
	21. _____					
	22. _____					
	23. _____					
TOP _____	TOP _____	TOP _____	TOP _____	TOP _____	TOP _____	TOP _____
÷9= _____	÷14= _____	÷6= _____	÷9= _____	÷6= _____	÷6= _____	÷ 50 = _____
						(Genel Ortalama)

APPENDIX C

Scale for the Averages

High	Always or almost always used	4.4 to 5.0
	Generally used	3.4 to 4.4
Medium	Sometimes used	2.4 to 3.4
	Generally not used	1.4 to 2.4
Low	Never or almost never used	1.0 to 1.4

APPENDIX D

The Pre-test and Post-test Given to the Subjects

1. A. _____ is your boyfriend. He saw you while you are sitting in a cafe with another boy. He is very jealous of you. Explain the reasons. Why were you together?
B. _____ is your girlfriend. You saw her with another boy while they were sitting in a cafe. You are very jealous of her. Ask what they were doing. Learn why they were together?
2. A. Yesterday night you saw two people. They were trying to steal things from a market. When they saw you they escaped. Now you are in the police station and the policeman asks you questions about the people. (What were they wearing?) Explain their physical appearances. How did you see them?
B. You are a police man/woman. This man/woman came to you to give information about an event. Try to understand the event. Ask questions. Ask, for example, the descriptions of the people (what were they wearing, their appearance). How and when did s/he see the event? Where were s/he going? Etc.
3. A. You want to go out with your friends tonight. But you know that your father/mother doesn't want this. Try to get a permission and give your reasons. Why do you want to go out? Why today and not another day?
B. Your daughter/son wants to go out with her/his friends tonight. You don't want this very much but if you learn the reason you can. Ask questions. Why does s/he want to go out tonight? Why today? Is it really important for her/him?

4. A. One of your friends gives a party tomorrow, but there will be some people that you don't like. Because of that you don't want to go. You can't tell this to your friend. Give some other reasons.
- B. You invited one of your best friends to your party but s/he doesn't want to come. Learn why doesn't s/he want to come to your party.
5. A. The deadline of your homework is today, but you couldn't finish it. Talk to your teacher and give your reasons. (Your teacher already gave extra time to students)
- B. You expect all the homework today, but one of your students didn't bring his/her homework. You can't accept this because you already gave extra time to the students. Because they said the time is very short.
6. A. You're going to meet a boy tomorrow. You don't know him. Now you're talking on the phone. Ask about his clothes and his appearance. Decide on the place you will meet.
- B. You're going to meet a girl tomorrow. You don't know her. Now you're talking on the phone. Ask about her clothes and her appearance. Decide on the place you will meet.
7. A. You're going to England for a language course. You know a little bit English but you want to learn more. You will stay with a family there. They will meet you at the airport. Describe yourself so that they can find you. You're talking on the phone.
- B. You're an English speaking family. A student from Turkey will stay with you for a month. You will meet him/her at the airport. Ask him/her describe himself/herself. Describe yourself too. You're talking on the phone.

Prepared by Özlem Ersöz

APPENDIX E

Speaking Evaluation Scale Used in The Study

Hazırlık Oral Examinations

Fluency

90 -100	Comfortable and natural speed and rhythm in everyday contexts. There may be some hesitation when speaking on more abstract topics.
80 - 89	Speaks with minimal hesitation in everyday contexts. Hesitation when discussing abstract topics, but does not demand unreasonable patience of the listener.
70 -79	Does not hesitate unreasonably in everyday contexts, though may experience some difficulty with more abstract topics.
60 -69	Hesitates noticeably in everyday contexts. Abstract topics create a problem and demand patience on the part of the listener.
50 -59	Unacceptable hesitation in everyday contexts.
40 -49	Speech very disconnected
0 -39	Not capable of connected speech.

Vocabulary Resource - Appropriateness

90 -100	Wide and appropriate range of vocabulary for everyday tasks, and generally adequate range for discussing more abstract topics.
80 - 89	Shows few gaps in vocabulary for everyday tasks, though more abstract topics reveal weakness.
70 -79	Vocabulary adequate for everyday tasks, though may experience difficulty when discussing abstract topics.
60 -69	Vocabulary occasionally insufficient to accomplish everyday tasks. Abstract tasks are not usually handled.
50 -59	Vocabulary often insufficient to accomplish everyday tasks.
40 -49	Severe lack of vocabulary makes it almost impossible to communicate.
0 -39	Vocabulary too slight for even minimal conversation.

Task Achievement - Performance

90 -100	Wholly effective at communicating both actively and receptively, both in everyday contexts and more abstract topics.
80 - 89	Communicates effectively in everyday contexts, but lacks natural responsiveness when dealing with more abstract topics.
70 -79	Communication level mainly adequate in everyday contexts, but awkward and non-effective on more unexpected ground.
60 -69	Sometimes does not communicate naturally even in everyday contexts. Does not do well with abstract topics.
50 -59	Des not communicate naturally even in everyday contexts..
40 -49	Rarely able to communicate even at basic level.
0 -39	Understanding and communication minimal.

APPENDIX F

Self-Evaluation Form

for Determining Language Learning Goals and Objectives

1. Setting long term goals; first set some long-term goals for yourself, answer the following questions:

a. Why are you learning this language? (you can choose more than one)

_____ For advancement

_____ For good grades

_____ For a good job

_____ For travel

_____ Because the language is required for graduation

_____ To get to people from the new culture

_____ Because it's fun

_____ Other (list) _____

b. Considering the purposes you have identified, decide how speaking is important for you. Indicate below the importance of each skill area (1= least important, 5= most important). Then indicate how proficient you want to become in each of these skills (low, medium, high).

<u>Skill</u>	<u>Importance</u>	<u>Desired Proficiency</u>
Speaking	_____	_____
Listening	_____	_____
Reading	_____	_____
Writing	_____	_____

c. Now, you have decided your priorities. What are your long-term goals for learning the new language for the next months or years? Sample goals: to be able

to hold a short social conversation; to reach a certain proficiency level. Goals should be realistic.

2. Evaluate yourself in speaking; answer the questions below: Where are you in terms of speaking now? Be fair on yourself.

- a. When you speak to people who know the new language, do they seem to understand you most of the time, without asking you to repeat? _____
- b. In class do your classmates generally understand what you say in the new language? _____
- c. Has your speaking increased since last month in terms of quality and quantity? _____
- d. Do you find ways to express yourself orally even if you don't know all the words? _____

On the basis of these questions, give yourself a rating on speaking (circle one):

1. Doing just fine, about where I should be
2. Not too bad, nothing to worry about
3. Serious problems

APPENDIX G

The Scores of Control Group in Pre-test Given by Evaluator 1&2

Es	Ss	Fluency	Vocab.	Task Ach.	Average	Gen. Prof
E1	1	50	45	56	50.3	42.6
E2		35	32	38	35	
E1	2	50	53	58	53.6	53.3
E2		50	52	57	53	
E1	3	58	73	57	62.6	63.8
E2		64	65	66	65	
E1	4	20	20	25	21.6	27.5
E2		30	30	40	33.3	
E1	5	5	5	5	5	3
E2		1	1	1	1	
E1	6	25	18	25	22.6	32.9
E2		40	40	50	43.3	
E1	7	43	40	53	45.3	47.3
E2		48	45	55	49.3	
E1	8	59	57	65	60.3	57.9
E2		52	55	60	55.6	
E1	9	35	30	40	35	32.1
E2		30	30	28	29.3	
E1	10	15	15	15	15	14.1
E2		20	10	10	13.3	
E1	11	37	34	45	38.6	39.3
E2		42	38	40	40	
E1	12	55	57	65	59	42.8
E2		25	25	30	26.6	
E1	13	5	5	5	5	10
E2		15	15	15	15	
E1	14	55	53	65	57	62.1
E2		67	65	70	67.3	
E1	15	67	65	75	69	69
E2		68	62	77	69	

E1	16	30	40	40	36.6	33
E2		30	20	38	29.3	
E1	17	68	65	75	69.3	66.1
E2		62	60	67	63	
E1	18	35	30	40	35	32.5
E2		30	25	35	30	
E1	19	30	25	25	26.6	29.1
E2		35	30	30	31.6	
E1	20	35	40	50	41.6	44.6
E2		48	45	50	47.6	
E1	21	65	50	40	51.6	41.3
E2		35	28	30	31	
E1	22	1	1	1	1	1
E2		1	1	1	1	
E1	23	15	18	20	17.6	11.3
E2		5	5	5	5	
E1	24	50	50	50	50	36.6
E2		25	20	25	23.3	
E1	25	1	1	1	1	1
E2		1	1	1	1	

APPENDIX H

The Scores of Experimental Group in Pre-test Given by Evaluator 1 & 2

Es	Ss	Fluency	Vocab.	Task Ach.	Average	Gen. Prof
E1	1	40	30	37	35.6	34.5
E2		35	30	35	33.3	
E1	2	55	50	55	53.3	54.1
E2		55	52	52	53	
E1	3	56	50	58	54.6	55.3
E2		58	55	55	56	
E1	4	57	54	58	56.3	60.1
E2		65	62	65	64	
E1	5	56	55	58	56.3	58.1
E2		58	60	62	60	
E1	6	40	25	40	35	28.3
E2		25	20	20	21.6	
E1	7	40	35	35	36.6	36.6
E2		40	35	35	36.6	
E1	8	60	58	64	60.6	60.5
E2		60	59	62	60.3	
E1	9	46	45	47	46	42.1
E2		42	35	38	38.3	
E1	10	64	65	68	65.6	67.5
E2		68	70	70	69.3	
E1	11	15	15	15	15	18.3
E2		25	20	20	21.6	
E1	12	40	40	48	42.6	46.5
E2		55	48	48	50.3	
E1	13	46	43	47	45.3	41.3
E2		42	35	35	37.3	
E1	14	30	30	30	30	20
E2		10	10	10	10	
E1	15	10	10	10	30	13.3
E2		20	15	15	16.6	

E1	16	55	50	55	53.3	53.8
E2		55	50	58	54.3	
E1	17	50	40	50	46.6	46.3
E2		50	40	48	46	
E1	18	40	35	40	38.3	30.8
E2		35	15	20	23.3	
E1	19	54	48	55	52.3	52.8
E2		55	50	55	53.3	
E1	20	47	43	46	45.3	45.3
E2		46	42	48	45.3	
E1	21	40	35	43	39.3	28.8
E2		20	20	15	21.6	
E1	22	53	40	40	44.3	32.1
E2		30	20	10	20	
E1	23	50	40	40	43.3	30.8
E2		25	20	10	18.3	
E1	24	40	40	45	41.6	42.4
E2		45	45	40	43.3	
E1	25	45	45	50	46.6	48.3
E2		50	50	50	50	

APPENDIX I

The Scores of Control Group in Post-test Given by Evaluator 1 & 2

Es	Ss	Fluency	Vocab.	Task Ach.	Average	Gen. Prof
E1	1	60	45	60	55	59.6
E2		67	61	65	64.3	
E1	2	60	55	65	60	63
E2		64	66	68	66	
E1	3	60	58	60	59.3	66.1
E2		73	72	74	73	
E1	4	50	35	45	43.3	51
E2		60	58	58	58.6	
E1	5	40	30	40	36.6	45.5
E2		55	50	58	54.3	
E1	6	50	40	40	43.3	48.5
E2		57	52	52	53.6	
E1	7	55	50	50	51.6	56.6
E2		62	60	63	61.6	
E1	8	60	60	65	61.6	67.1
E2		70	73	75	72.6	
E1	9	35	28	35	32.6	38.8
E2		45	45	45	45	
E1	10	60	70	75	68.3	67.6
E2		67	66	68	67	
E1	11	35	30	35	33.3	40.8
E2		50	45	50	48.3	
E1	12	65	60	60	61.6	64.8
E2		68	67	69	68	
E1	13	55	50	55	53.3	57.1
E2		62	60	60	60.6	
E1	14	55	60	65	60	66.3
E2		70	73	75	72.6	
E1	15	70	60	65	65	70.6
E2		75	77	77	76.3	

E1	16	55	40	50	48.3	44.1
E2		40	40	40	40	
E1	17	70	60	65	65	70.1
E2		75	75	76	75.3	
E1	18	55	60	55	56.6	63
E2		68	70	70	69.3	
E1	19	55	55	50	53.3	58.8
E2		64	63	66	64.3	
E1	20	60	58	58	58,6	64.3
E2		67	73	70	70	
E1	21	65	60	65	63.3	67.1
E2		70	70	73	71	
E1	22	60	73	75	69.3	66.1
E2		63	62	64	63	
E1	23	55	58	58	57	60
E2		64	63	62	63	
E1	24	55	40	40	45	48.3
E2		57	45	53	51.6	
E1	25	50	40	40	40	48
E2		55	50	53	52.6	

APPENDIX J

The Scores of Experimental Group in Post-test Given by Evaluator 1 & 2

Es	Ss	Fluency	Vocab.	Task Ach.	Average	Gen. Prof
E1	1	78	70	75	74.3	72.5
E2		70	70	72	70.6	
E1	2	68	65	65	66	67.8
E2		68	68	73	69.6	
E1	3	70	70	75	71.6	71.8
E2		72	68	76	72	
E1	4	70	70	75	71.6	72.6
E2		75	70	76	73.6	
E1	5	65	68	70	67.6	64.5
E2		64	60	60	61.3	
E1	6	60	50	65	58.3	59.5
E2		60	56	66	60.6	
E1	7	65	60	65	63.3	63
E2		63	60	65	62.6	
E1	8	75	70	75	73.3	72
E2		70	69	73	70.6	
E1	9	70	65	70	68.3	65.1
E2		62	60	64	62	
E1	10	65	65	70	66.6	67
E2		67	65	70	67.3	
E1	11	70	70	70	70	69.3
E2		68	68	70	68.6	
E1	12	65	60	60	61.6	57.1
E2		56	48	54	52.6	
E1	13	75	75	80	76.6	76.5
E2		75	76	78	76.3	
E1	14	70	65	70	68.3	67.5
E2		67	65	68	66.6	
E1	15	50	55	60	55	58.3
E2		60	60	65	61.6	

E1	16	68	67	70	68.3	64.1
E2		60	58	62	60	
E1	17	70	73	75	72.6	66.8
E2		60	59	64	61	
E1	18	68	65	75	69.3	63
E2		54	54	62	56.6	
E1	19	68	65	70	66	63.1
E2		60	58	63	60.3	
E1	20	70	65	70	68.3	64.8
E2		63	58	63	61.3	
E1	21	68	70	75	71	65.5
E2		62	58	60	60	
E1	22	60	60	60	60	62.5
E2		65	64	66	65	
E1	23	60	55	60	58.3	55.5
E2		55	55	53	52.6	
E1	24	60	65	65	63.3	63.5
E2		65	62	64	63.6	
E1	25	60	65	65	63.3	62.8
E2		65	60	62	62.3	

APPENDIX K

CONTROL GROUP'S STRATEGY FREQUENCIES

Ss	A*	fr**	B*	fr**	C*	fr**	D*	fr**	E*	fr**	F*	fr**
1	32	3.55	33	2.35	16	2.66	36	4.00	23	3.83	25	4.16
2	29	3.22	35	2.50	15	2.50	37	4.11	18	3.00	19	3.16
3	23	2.55	32	2.28	12	2.00	35	3.88	16	2.66	15	2.50
4	17	1.88	26	1.85	9	1.50	31	3.44	18	3.00	19	3.16
5	28	3.11	38	2.71	22	3.66	37	4.11	20	3.33	16	2.66
6	29	3.22	28	2.00	11	1.83	34	3.77	16	2.66	22	3.66
7	35	3.88	48	3.42	18	3.00	31	3.44	21	3.50	23	3.83
8	23	2.55	28	2.00	10	1.66	27	3.00	14	2.33	13	2.16
9	13	1.44	23	1.64	8	1.33	21	2.33	12	2.00	16	2.66
10	33	3.66	43	3.07	19	3.16	44	4.88	16	2.66	24	4.00
11	15	1.66	24	1.71	11	1.83	26	2.88	12	2.00	16	2.66
12	32	3.55	55	3.92	18	3.00	44	4.88	23	3.83	24	4.00
13	19	2.11	31	2.21	14	2.33	33	3.66	14	2.33	20	3.33
14	27	3.00	41	2.92	23	3.83	27	3.00	16	2.66	18	3.00
15	21	2.33	33	2.35	18	3.00	35	3.88	23	3.83	21	3.50
16	32	3.55	37	2.64	17	2.83	34	3.77	21	3.50	25	4.16
17	18	2.00	25	1.78	11	1.83	25	2.77	11	1.83	13	2.16
18	18	2.00	39	2.78	23	3.83	27	3.00	26	4.33	18	3.00
19	14	1.55	23	1.64	16	2.66	18	2.00	14	2.33	15	2.50
20	22	2.44	34	2.42	18	3.00	33	3.66	16	2.66	14	2.33
21	30	3.33	40	2.85	21	3.50	34	3.77	17	2.83	15	2.50
22	22	2.44	41	2.92	24	4.00	40	4.44	24	4.00	26	4.33
23	30	3.33	53	3.78	27	4.50	43	4.77	21	3.50	26	4.33
24	33	3.70	26	1.90	12	2.00	30	3.33	17	2.80	19	3.17
25	41	4.50	57	4.07	20	3.33	42	4.66	13	2.16	26	4.33
Ave		2.82		2.54		2.70		3.65		2.94		3.25

A*: Memory Strategies (9) D*: Metacognitive Strategies (9)
 B*: Cognitive Strategies (14) E*: Affective Strategies (6)
 C*: Compensation Strategies (6) F*: Social Strategies (6)

** Frequencies were found out dividing the score of each student by the number of statements.

APPENDIX L

EXPERIMENTAL GDOUP'S STRATEGY FREQUENCIES

Ss	A*	fr**	B*	fr**	C*	fr**	D*	fr**	E*	fr**	F*	fr**
1	15	1.66	28	2.00	10	1.66	34	3.77	13	2.16	27	4.50
2	17	1.88	30	2.14	13	2.16	22	2.44	11	1.83	19	3.16
3	25	2.77	46	3.28	21	3.50	42	4.66	21	3.50	17	2.83
4	22	2.44	26	1.85	12	2.00	30	3.33	10	1.66	11	1.83
5	28	3.11	35	2.50	18	3.00	25	2.77	16	2.66	20	3.33
6	25	2.77	46	3.28	26	4.33	31	3.44	18	3.00	21	3.50
7	25	2.77	26	1.85	18	3.00	27	3.00	16	2.66	23	3.83
8	21	2.22	28	2.00	20	3.33	32	3.55	19	3.16	23	3.83
9	18	2.00	29	2.07	13	2.16	26	2.88	07	1.16	12	2.00
10	20	2.22	28	2.00	15	2,50	35	3.88	13	2.16	20	3.33
11	26	2.88	32	2.28	19	3.16	28	3.11	18	3.00	12	2.00
12	26	2.88	25	1.78	10	1.66	15	1.66	09	1.50	09	1.50
13	18	2.00	26	1.85	10	1.66	26	2.88	15	2.50	08	1.33
14	23	2.45	31	2.21	14	2.33	29	3.22	11	1.83	24	4.00
15	11	1.22	25	1.78	13	2.16	24	2.66	15	2.50	13	2.16
16	13	1.44	37	2.64	13	2.16	25	2.77	16	2.66	25	4.16
17	26	2.88	46	3.29	22	3.66	31	3.44	18	3.00	19	3.16
18	25	2.77	33	2.35	14	2.33	32	3.55	19	3.16	23	3.83
19	23	2.45	33	2.35	22	3.66	38	4.22	20	3.66	19	3.16
20	27	3.00	39	2.78	18	3.00	33	3.66	17	2.83	15	2.50
21	21	2.33	41	2.92	19	3.16	31	3.44	21	3.50	22	2.66
22	25	2.77	48	3.42	21	3.50	39	4.33	18	3.00	14	2.33
23	31	3.88	29	2.07	14	2.33	20	2.22	08	1.33	13	2.16
24	14	1.45	33	2.35	12	2.00	15	1.66	09	1.50	13	2.16
25	17	1.88	35	2.50	18	3.00	31	3.44	21	3.50	16	2.66
Ave	32	2.43		2.38		2.96		3.19		2.53		2.76

A*: Memory Strategies (9) D*: Metacognitive Strategies (9)
 B*: Cognitive Strategies (14) E*: Affective Strategies (6)
 C*: Compensation Strategies (6) F*: Social Strategies (6)

** Frequencies were found out dividing the score of each student by the number of statements.

APPENDIX M

Lesson Plans for the Experimental and the Control Groups

Sample Lesson Plan 1 for the Experimental Group

Function : Describing people's appearance

Aim : To be able to talk about people's appearances; to practice the functional planning strategy and the strategy of co-operating with peers

Preparation : As many pictures of people as possible from magazines or journals

Procedure :

1. Students were required to come to the table and choose one picture they want to talk about. Then they were given 10-15 minutes to try to answer the following questions;

-What am I going to talk about?

-What structure should I use?

-Should I use formal or informal language?

-Which vocabulary can be used to achieve this activity?

-In which order should I give the description of the person?

While trying to answer the questions, the students, unconsciously, planned their speech. They had some time to think about the activity.

2. Students were encouraged to co-operate with each other while answering the questions. While trying to answer the questions, they co-operated with each other, and shared their ideas or knowledge.

3. When students were ready, the answers were elicited from the students. The vocabulary, which were necessary to accomplish the task, were written on the board. With the guidance of the teacher, students discussed where they can start or what features should be included while describing the person/people in the pictures. They decided to give the person's physical appearance first (eye, eyebrows, hair, etc.) then his/her clothing.

4. Then, one by one, students came to the board and gave the description of the person. In the mean time, the other students were encouraged to ask questions or add things that the student at the board forgot.

After the activity was completed, the teacher and the students discussed about the use of planning before beginning to speak. The teacher made it clear that if they thought and planned their speech for some time, they would have less difficulty in expressing themselves. Doing this, the teacher used a combination of implicit and explicit teaching: First, the students did not know they practiced functional planning strategy. Then, the students learned that this was a strategy they could use before beginning to speak.

Sample Lesson Plan 2 for the Experimental group

Aim : To practice the self-evaluation strategy

Preparation : Before the lesson, a self evaluation questionnaire was adapted from two different questionnaires; one developed by Oxford (1990) and one by O'Maley et. al. (1985) (see Appendix F). This questionnaire was copied for each student in the class.

Procedure :

1. Before handing the copies out to the students, the importance of self-evaluation in peoples' lives was discussed as a class.
2. Then, a copy of questionnaire was given to each student, and they were required to respond as they wish, making sure that this was not going to affect their performance in class. Students were given some time to think about the statements; then, the answers to these statements were discussed explicitly. That is, some examples from the students' answers were read and the teacher and the students discussed whether these were realistic. So, students had an opportunity to see that they were in a dream world where they can speak as fluently as their teachers or like a native speaker; and where they have a perfect accent, etc.

When the students realized that their aims for learning English were unrealistic, they themselves understood the importance of a realistic plan and evaluation for their learning period.

3. The whole class, then, decided on the three short-term purposes with the guidance of the teacher, which were also the topics that the teacher focused on);

1. To be able to greet someone
2. To be able to give one's appearance
3. To be able to question something and give reasons if they were required.

The students were advised to set up their own aims before starting learning each function in speaking

Sample Lesson Plan 3 for the Experimental Group

Function : Asking and answering questions, asking for and giving reasons

Aim : Practicing the function of asking for and giving reasons and the strategy of asking questions for clarification.

Preparation : An audio or video tape that contains two native speakers of English speak to each other in a natural environment and another one in which two native speakers of Turkish have a talk. Photocopies of the following task sheet for the class as the number of students in the class.

Procedure :

1- Before the activity, the teacher played the tape in which two people are having a chat in students' target language, and wanted them to listen to the tape carefully and put a cross when they heard one of the expressions in the task sheet. This task sheet was given to the students to show them native speakers of all language use some fillers and they sometimes feel the need of asking questions for clarification.

Students listened to the extracts of people talking. They made a cross (X) next to each of the expressions in the list whenever they heard either of the speakers using it.

Really?	_____	Is it?	_____
Is that right?	_____	I see	_____
That's nice	_____	Mmmm	_____
Uh huh	_____	What?	_____
What do you mean?	_____	And then...	_____

Know what I mean? _____ Anyway... _____
That's clear now. _____ Pardon? _____
Did you say that... _____
Aaaa! _____
Nasıl yani? _____
Biraz acar mısın bunu lütfen? _____
Dediğinden hiç birşey anlamadım _____

2. Students did the same with the tape in which a talk was carried by two people in students' native language.

3. Then, the teacher told the students that the aim of this activity was to show that we all sometimes stop to think while speaking, or ask questions to clarify what the speaker said. And this is true for people who speak students' target language. So what they could do is not to panic when speaking in the target language and use fillers to gain time in order to organize their thoughts or ask questions to make the meaning clear.

4. For the next step, as a follow up activity, the teacher grouped the students in pairs. One pair chose a topic to talk about and began to talk continuously, but the other pair stopped him/her as much as possible and ask questions to get more details. They tried to use the expressions in the task sheet when necessary. Before the activity, the students were given some time to plan what to talk about. The aim of this activity was to practice the fillers given in the task sheet, to improve their ability to ask questions, and to explain the things in detail.

With this activity, the students saw the reality that even people whose native language is English use fillers and ask questions for clarification. And the students themselves do it too while they are talking in their native language. Student were encouraged to ask questions for clarification and they were ensured that nobody will think that they do not know enough English if they do so.

Sample Lesson Plan 1 for the Control Group

Function : Describing people's appearance

Aim : To be able to talk about people's appearances;

Preparation : As many pictures of people as possible from magazines or journals

Procedure :

1. Students were required to come to the table and choose one picture they want to talk about. .
2. Before beginning the activity, the vocabulary for describing people were elicited from the students. The vocabulary, which were necessary to accomplish the task, were written on the board. When students were ready, with the guidance of the teacher, students discussed where they can start or what features should be included while describing the person/people in the pictures. They decided to give the person's physical appearance first (eye, eyebrows, hair, etc.) then his/her clothing.
3. Then, one by one, students came to the board and gave the description of the person.

Sample Lesson Plan 2 for the Control Group

Function : Asking and answering questions, asking for and giving reasons

Aim : Practicing the function of asking for and giving reasons

Preparation : None

Procedure :

1. The kinds of questions that students could ask were elicited from them and they were written on the board to guide the students. Then, students were grouped in pairs. One of the pairs was required to decide on a topic to talk about, and the other one was supposed to interrupt him/her with questions to be able to get more information.
2. When one student in the pair finished talking, the other student took the turn.