INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES AMONG PREPARATORY SCHOOL STUDENTS: LEARNING ORIENTATIONS AND STRATEGIES

Üniversite Hazırlık Okulu Öğrencilerinin Bireysel Öğrenme Farklılıkları: Dil Öğrenme Yönelimleri ve Stratejileri

Burak AYDIN[*]

Feryal ÇUBUKÇU[**]

ABSTRACT: This study investigated the language learning strategies and motivational orientations, along with their correlations with each other among university students who study English preparatory year. A group of 195 students were surveyed on orientations by using Gardner's (1985) *Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB)* on two domains: a) integrative orientation and b) instrumental orientation; and on learner strategies by using Oxford's (1990) *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)* for ESL/EFL learners on three domains: a) cognitive strategy, b) metacognitive strategy, c) social strategy. The data collected were analyzed in descriptive and correlative figures. The results showed that students used all strategies with metacognitive ones being the most preferred. Furthermore, the students seemed to employ both integrative and instrumental orientations, with instrumentality being slightly more preferred. The data also proved a positive and significant correlation between learner strategies and orientations. The study aims to inspire further studies on strategies and orientations with different contexts and levels of students.

Keywords: Learning Strategies, Motivational Orientations, Correlation.

ÖZ: Bu çalışma İngilizce hazırlık eğitimi alan üniversite öğrencilerinin benimsediği dil öğrenme yönelimleri ile öğrenme stratejilerini incelemek ve bu iki faktör arasındaki korelasyonu saptamak amacıyla yapılmıştır. Çalışmadaki veriler iki ölçek yardımıyla toplanmıştır. Öğrenme yönelimlerini saptamak amacıyla Gardner'ın (1985) *Motivasyon ve Tutum Ölçeği* "bütünleyici yönelim" ve "araçsal yönelim" kısımlarıyla kullanılmıştır. Öte yandan Oxford'un (1990) geliştirdiği *Dil öğrenme Stratejiler Envanteri* üç bölümüyle (üstbilişsel,

[*] Öğr. Gör., Yaşar University /School of Foreign Languages, burak.aydin18@gmail.com, ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0001-9812-4842

[**] Prof.Dr., Dokuz Eylul University/ Faculty of Education/English Language Education, cubukcu. feryal@gmail.com, ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0003-3313-6011

bilişsel, sosyal stratejiler) kullanılmıştır. Çalışma örneklemine 195 üniversite öğrencisi dahil edilmiştir. Toplanan veriler betimsel analiz ve korelasyon analizi yöntemleriyle incelenmiştir. Çalışma sonucunda öğrencilerin belirtilen üç öğrenme stratejisinden de yararlandığı fakat en çok üstbilişsel stratejileri kullandığı görülmüştür. Ayrıca öğrencilerin hem bütünleyici hem de araçsal yönelimlerle dil öğrendiği saptanmış fakat araçsal yönelimin daha çok tercih edildiği görülmüştür. Korelasyon verileri ise öğrencilerin kullandığı dil öğrenme stratejileri ve yönelimleri arasında pozitif ve yüksek korelasyon olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Yapılan çalışmanın farklı seviye ve eğitim bağlamlarında yer alan öğrencilerle yapılabilecek diğer çalışmalara örnek teşkil edeceği düşünülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğrenme Stratejileri, Dil Öğrenme Yönelimleri, Korelasyon.

INTRODUCTION

Individual differences (IDs) are believed to have an impact on language learning. Many teacher guides and researchers recognize this impact and many studies address IDs. However, as Skehan (1991: 276) notes, in SLA research there has been more focus on "universal sequences in development" rather than "differences among learners". In fact, during 60s and 70s the research was on "the good language learner" and the primary differences among learners were believed to be merely "aptitude" and "motivation" (Dörnyei, 2005: 6). Since then, there has been more research on a variety of individual difference factors.

Skehan (1991) identified four IDs as aptitude, motivation, learner strategies and styles. That is, he added additional categories to the traditional big two. Robinson (2002) made a distinction between cognitive factors (i.e. intelligence, aptitude, working memory and speed) and affective/conative factors (i.e. anxiety, motivation and emotion), which made IDs categorized in a two-factor scale. Also, Scrivener (2005) identified IDs as motivation, Multiple Intelligences (see Gardner, 1983) and sensory preferences. Lastly, Ellis (2004: 530) took it in a slightly different approach and categorized the factors responsible for IDs such as abilities, propensities, learner cognitions and learner actions; in addition, he listed a wide range of learner differences under the abovementioned categories (see Table 1).

Table 1: Factors Responsible for Individual Differences in L2 Learning

Category	Factors
1 Abilities	a. Intelligence b Language aptitude c. Memory
2 Propensities	a. Learning style b. Motivation c. Anxiety d. Personality e. Willingness to communicate
3 Learner cognitions about L2 learning	a. Learner beliefs
4 Learner actions	a. Learning strategies

Source: Ellis, 2004: 530.

Drawing on Ellis's (2004) categorizations, in this study, the focus is on two IDs; **motivational orientations** and **learning strategies**. *Orientations*, under motivational factors and as a propensity, will be based on Gardner's (1985a) study and contribute to the research in finding out students' long-term perspectives about language learning. *Strategies*, based on Oxford's (1989) study and classified as learner actions, refer to specific day-to-day and moment-to-moment actions learners take to learn better. In this sense, two IDs taken for this study effectively address both learners' future projections and ongoing techniques of learning a language.

Instead of dealing with their repercussions in language achievement, this study will rather address the identification and correlation of these two important personal variables in language learning. That is to say, the study aims to lay out how IDs may have a relationship between one another; not mainly their direct effect on language achievement.

Motivational Orientations

Orientation, as a term, refers to goals of conducting a task. Similarly, in language education context, Gardner (1985a: 11) sees orientation as "goal" and this goal as merely "learning the language". Interestingly, orientation is mostly used for motivation although there is a difference. According to Gardner (1985a) and Masgoret & Gardner (2003), orientations are related to motivation but they are not necessarily the same. Motivation, as a broader concept, consists of effort, desire, attitude and goal directedness. Actually that "goal directedness" is the part where orientations are located. Then, orientation is a part of motivation. Motivation can be seen as the persistence and effort in learning while orientation can be regarded as long-term goals in mind (Ellis, 2004). In other words, motivation comes and goes while orientations are set targets which do not change often. In this sense, as an example, an individual who has an aim of learning English for personal benefits may still not have the motivation to do so.

Gardner (1985a) in his Socio-Educational Model, puts emphasis on motivational variables in language acquisition and categorizes orientations as *integrative* and *instrumental*. Integrative orientation is "[…] a desire, willingness, or ability to become psychologically closer to another language community" and instrumental orientation takes place if there are "[…] practical benefits for the individual" (Gardner, 2010: 17). Baker (1992: 32) refers to the elements within instrumental orientation as "vocational reasons, status, achievement, personal success, self-enhancement, self-actualization or basic security and survival". In his terms, the elements within integrative orientation are associated with "social and interpersonal" benefits. Gardner's (1985a) *Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB)*, which is used in this study, has eight items for integrative and instrumental orientations.

In terms of second language acquisition, while there is a distinction made among the orientations, it is still not clear which one caters for language learning more. Some empirical studies throughout the history have given mixed results. To start with, Gardner and Lambert's (1959) early work on orientations put emphasis on integrativeness. They conducted research on English learners of French and reported that integratively oriented learners are generally more successful than those who are instrumentally oriented.

However, later research offered more equalizing results (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003; Gardner, 2006; Choubsaz & Choubsaz, 2014). Gardner (2006), with his research on motivational factors on language learning concluded that both integrative and instrumental orientations have a positive correlation with achievement. Similarly, Masgoret & Gardner (2003) in their meta-analysis of 75 samples with 10,489 individuals demonstrated that motivation is the core correlate with achievement and integrative and instrumental orientations are both influential in learning. Both inclinations seem to have a big impact on motivation in this research, which means learners achieve language utilizing both. In a similar vein, Choubsaz & Choubsaz (2014) sampled Iranian learners and found that they were both integratively and instrumentally oriented, which shows that having both orientations is possible while learning a language.

On the other hand, other later research offered distinction between the orientations in language achievement (Badib & Guru, 2011; McEown, Noels & Saumure, 2014; Şener & Erol, 2017). Badib & Guru (2011), in their study in Malaysia, found that different students have different orientations; namely, passive ones are instrumentally oriented while active ones are rather integrative. McEown, Noels & Saumure (2014) studied in Japanese context and indicated that integrative orientation correlates with achievement; however, it might just be associated with Foreign Language (FL) context. As a contradiction, Şener &

Erol's (2017) study in Turkish context indicated that EFL students' language learning was influenced by their instrumental orientations.

In short, both integrative and instrumental orientations are the indicators of success in language learning and they affect motivational intensity. They are proven to be an important factor for language acquisition and it is possible for learners to employ both orientations at the same time. In description, integrative learners are expected to be more enthusiastic about joining target language community and instrumental ones are supposed to learn languages to obtain further personal gains. With this in mind, this study will be only descriptive, without major conclusions for achievement.

Language Learning Strategies

The term "strategy" comes from Ancient Greek meaning management and tactics used to win a war. Today, besides this war-like definition, strategy is also used in a variety of contexts. As an influential term in education, learning strategies mean "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective and more transferable to new situations" (Oxford, 1990: 8). Similarly, Bialystock (1978: 76) defines language learning strategies as "optimal methods for exploiting available information to increase the proficiency of second language learning". She also adds that use of learning strategies is at the discretion of learners. Within this understanding, language learning strategies (LLS) are the techniques learners tend to embrace whenever they are necessary in their learning continuum.

In SLA history, there have been different taxonomies and perspectives offered for LLS. Bialystock (1978) classified learner strategies as formal functioning, functional functioning, monitoring and interferencing. Rubin (1981) categorized LLS as direct (contributing learning process, i.e. cognitive strategies) and indirect strategies (not having a direct impact on learning, i.e. strategies like gestures). Another taxonomy can be found within O'Malley & Chamot's (1990) work. They classified strategies as metacognitive (planning, evaluating), cognitive (inferencing, summarizing) and social/affective (cooperation, self-talk). Dörnyei's (2005) categorizations are broadly similar: metacognitive, cognitive, social and affective strategies.

Among all these taxonomies, Oxford's (1990: 14-15) frame influences our study. In her broader perspective, she classified six domains included in two groups. To specify, in "direct" group – related to dealing with the new language – there are *memory strategies* (remembering new information), *cognitive strategies* (understanding and producing language) and *compensation strategies* (using language despite knowledge gaps). On the other hand, in "indirect" group –

related to general management of learning – she located *metacognitive strategies* (coordinating learning), *affective strategies* (managing emotions) and *social strategies* (learning with others).

Oxford (1990) sees her categories as being related to one another and being conscious processes. She also lists their benefits and functions for learning as being helpful for achieving language, making learners self-regulated and being teachable in this sense.

These benefits and functions are actually supported by the recent research. As for Oxford's point on "achievement", Huang's (2015) study with college freshmen in Taiwan proved that intermediate learners utilized strategies while elementary learners did not, which shows that learning strategies may be related to proficiency. Also, Jurkovic (2010), in her study with Slovenian learners, proved that LLS (especially metacognitive ones) are correlated with achievement. Al-Ahdal & Al-Ma'amari (2015) also found that Saudi learners' use of learning strategies (especially metacognitive and cognitive) led to more language achievement. As for "self-regulation" and "teachability" claims, Oxford is supported again. Agor (2014) conducted research in Ghana with pre - post tests with experimental group (ones receiving strategy instruction) and a control group (the ones who did not receive any strategy instruction) and found that the ones receiving instruction on learning strategies achieved more in learning English. In addition, Torres (2013) analyzed good language learners in Korea to identify their strategies and consequently emphasized the importance of self-regulation training in terms of strategy use for better success.

Apart from being supported by research, Oxford (1990) also took action to collect LLS data and inform learners of strategy use. She designed *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)* incorporating six strategy domains (metacognitive, cognitive, social, affective, compensation, memorization) and suggested educators doing in-class research using the respective questionnaire. In our study, SILL will be utilized with only three domains: metacognitive, cognitive and social strategies. The rationale for this preference is the fact that research prioritizes these three strategies for being significantly associated with L2 acquisition (Oxford, 2003).

METHOD

Aim and Research Questions

The aim of the study is to investigate the language learning strategies and motivational orientations among students who are in their preparatory year at university. The study was conducted at a private university, in İzmir/Turkey. The research questions for the study are as follows:

1. What are the strategies of preparatory school students in learning English?

2. What are the motivational orientations of preparatory school students in learning English?

3. Is there a correlation between the strategies and orientations?

Participants

In this study, 195 preparatory year students were sampled. The students were aged between 18-24 and consisted of 98 male and 97 female individuals. They were studying in the Foreign Languages Department of the university, which runs on a three-track modular system. The students were mid-level English learners who had got relatively high scores in the proficiency test conducted in September and started the academic year in Pre-intermediate class. At the time of the study, they had already completed the first track of Pre-intermediate level English and were studying Intermediate level in the second track of the modular system.

Procedure and Instrumentation

Data collection was conducted in quantitative method by using two questionnaires. The first one – for the orientations – is Gardner's *Attitude/ Motivation Test Battery (AMTB)* (1985a). The questionnaire originally consists of 104 items with 6 Likert type options. In this study only 8 items were utilized (4 items each for integrative/instrumental orientations). The reason AMTB was used in this study is that it is a rooted survey with a lot of contexts it was studied and used in. Besides, it has high reliability with .85 median for the whole questionnaire, .82 for integrative and .62 for instrumental orientations (Gardner, 1985b). In this study, 5 point Likert version of the questionnaire which Khan (2007) used for university level students was adopted. In our study, the Cronbach Alpha for orientations questionnaire was found to be .74.

The second questionnaire used for language learning strategies was Oxford's (1990) *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)* *for ESL/EFL learners*. The questionnaire consists of 6 domains (cognitive, metacognitive, compensation, affective, social, memorization) with a total of 50 items. Only 29 items related to 3 domains (cognitive: 14 items, metacognitive: 9 items, social: 6 items) were used in this study. This inventory was chosen for the study since it has high reliability and has been conducted in various contexts. The reliability of the questionnaire was proven to be .87 or higher in various studies (see Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995). For the domains, Mohammadi & Alizadeh (2014) found .81

for cognitive, .92 for metacognitive and .84 for social strategies. In our study, the reliability for the three domains was found to be .82.

The questionnaires were applied in English since the students were expected to understand the items. To secure the comprehensibility more, the teachers who applied the questionnaire were asked to clarify and monitor the process. The questionnaires were applied during a class time in sixteen classrooms within the same day.

RESULTS

The data collected was analyzed through Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 23. Descriptive analysis was utilized to clarify research questions 1-2 since only the mean scores were analysed and Pearson correlation was utilized to address to research question 3. The tables for the respective information will be outlined below.

Initially, the data regarding students' strategy use will be shared. This information will relate to Research Question 1: *What are the strategies of Preparatory School students in learning English?*

Table 2: Cognitive Strategies Used by Students

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Saying/writing English words	195	3.69	.866
Trying to talk like native speakers	195	3.54	.991
Practicing sounds of English	195	3.76	.836
Using English words in different ways	195	3.74	.842
Starting conversations in English	195	3.49	.944
Watching TV shows/movies in English	195	4.26	.884
Reading for pleasure in English	195	3.36	1.028
Writing (messages, reports) in English	195	3.58	1.044
Skimming/scanning English passages	195	3.57	.924
Looking for words in L1 similar to new words in L2	195	3.57	.935
Finding patterns in English	195	3.32	.904
Finding meanings of words by dividing into parts	195	3.74	.894
Trying not to translate word-by-word	195	3.14	1.193
Making summaries of heard/read in English	195	3.29	1.011
Valid N (listwise)	195		

When Table 2 is analyzed students seem to have reasonably high mean averages as to cognitive strategy use. The mean scores average 3.57, which is between "neutral" and "agree" and it is obvious that students have a tendency

to employ cognitive strategies in their studies. As for the most preferred cognitive strategy, it is evident that students learn English mostly by watching TV shows and movies in English (Mean = 4.26). On the other hand, the least used cognitive strategy is trying not to translate word-by-word (Mean = 3.14).

Table 3: Metacognitive Strategies Used by Students

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Finding ways to use English	195	3.84	.749
Noticing own mistakes and learn better bu using them	195	3.86	.825
Paying attention when someone is speaking English	195	3.99	.803
Trying to find out how to be a better English learner	195	3.96	.782
Planning schedule to find more time to study English	195	3.09	1.044
Looking for people to talk to in English	195	3.51	.938
Looking for opportunities to read in English	195	3.45	.914
Having clear goals for improving English skills	195	3.76	.890
Thinking about own progress in learning English	195	3.86	.732
Valid N (listwise)	195		

Table 3 shows that students seem to have high mean averages as to metacognitive strategy use as well. This time the average is 3.70, which is closer to "agree" and it seems that the students embrace metacognitive strategies slightly more than cognitive ones. The most preferred metacognitive strategies seem to be paying attention to English speakers (Mean = 3.99) and finding out ways to be a better English learner (Mean = 3.96). The least preferred metacognitive strategy is planning schedule to find more time to study English (Mean = 3.09). It is averaged on "neutral" part so students do not seem to be decisive about scheduling their time.

Table 4: Social Strategies Used by Students

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Asking speakers to slow down/repeat when not understood	195	4.08	.875
Asking English speakers to correct my speech	195	3.43	1.000
Practicing English with other students	195	3.28	1.028
Asking for help from English speakers	195	3.47	1.027
Asking questions in English	195	3.84	.815
Learning about the culture of English speakers	195	3.32	1.118
Valid N (listwise)	195		

Table 4 indicates that students also employ social strategies in English learning with relatively high mean scores. The average for the social strategies is 3.57,

which falls on the zone between "neutral" and "agree", like cognitive strategies. In detail, students mostly ask speakers to slow down or repeat when they do not understand their speech (Mean = 4.08). However, the least used social strategies seem to be practicing English with other students (Mean = 3.28) and learning about the culture of English speakers (Mean = 3.32).

Second of all, the data regarding students' motivational orientations will be outlined. This information relates to Research Question 2: *What are the motivational orientations of Preparatory School students in learning English?*

Table 5: Students' Integrative Orientation

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Being comfortable with English	195	4.31	.739
Meeting and interacting with native English people	195	4.38	.760
Comprehending and appreciating English art/literature	195	3.66	.969
Reading books in English	195	3.94	.950
Valid N (listwise)	195		

Table 6: Students' Instrumental Orientation

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Future career	195	4.68	.755
Appearing a more knowledgeable person	195	4.29	.793
Participating in classroom discussions	195	3.93	.806
Being respected more	195	3.68	1.261
Valid N (listwise)	195		

By examining Table 5 and 6, it becomes clear that students have both integrative and instrumental motives in learning English. The mean scores are mostly averaged on the "agree" part. In detail, the mean average is 4.07 for integrative orientation and 4.14 for instrumental orientation. Therefore, students can be regarded slightly more instrumental. Specific to integrative data, it is clear that students learn English to be comfortable with the language (Mean = 4.31) and to meet and interact with English people (Mean = 4.38). As for instrumental orientation, they learn English mostly for future career (Mean = 4.68) and to appear a more knowledgeable person (Mean = 4.29).

Lastly, the data regarding the correlations between students' orientations and learning strategies will be outlined. This information will relate to Research Question 3: *Is there a correlation between the strategies and orientations?*

Table 7: Correlation Between Learning Strategies and Orientations

		Strategies	Orientations
Strategies	Pearson Correlation	1	.594**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	195	195
Orientations	Pearson Correlation	.594**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	195	195

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

As a start, drawing on Table 7, it is clear that there is a relationship between learner strategies and motivational orientations. Pearson correlation shows 0.594, which indicates that the strategies students' employ and their language learning orientations are positively and significantly correlated. At this point, it will be helpful to scrutinize which strategies correlate more with which orientations.

Table 8: Correlation Between Integrative Orientations and Cognitive Strategies

		Integrative	Cognitive
Integrative	Pearson Correlation	1	.459**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	195	195
Cognitive	Pearson Correlation	.459**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	195	195

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

Table 9: Correlation Between Integrative Orientations and Metacognitive Strategies

		Integrative	Metacognitive
Integrative	Pearson Correlation	1	.535**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	195	195
Metacognitive	Pearson Correlation	.535**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	195	195

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

Table 10: Correlation Between Integrative Orientations and Social Strategies

		Integrative	Social
Integrative	Pearson Correlation	1	.237**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001
	N	195	195
Social	Pearson Correlation	.237**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	
	N	195	195

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

When Tables 8-9-10 are analyzed, integrative orientations and three strategies seem to be correlated significantly. To be more specific, integrative orientations are correlated with cognitive strategies with 0.459; with metacognitive strategies with 0.535 and with social strategies with 0.237 Pearson score. Although all these numbers indicate positive and vitally significant correlations, it is apparent that integrative orientation and metacognitive strategies are the most related among these three. On the other hand, integrative orientation and the social strategies are the least correlated.

Table 11: Correlation Between Instrumental Orientations and Cognitive Strategies

		Instrumental	Cognitive
Instrumental	Pearson Correlation	1	.358**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	195	195
Cognitive	Pearson Correlation	.358**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	195	195

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

Table 12: Correlation Between Instrumental Orientations and Metacognitive Strategies

		Instrumental	Metacognitive
Instrumental	Pearson Correlation	1	.399**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	195	195
Metacognitive	Pearson Correlation	.399**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	195	195

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

Table 13: Correlation Between Instrumental Orientations and Social Strategies

		Instrumental	Social
Instrumental	Pearson Correlation	1	.391[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	195	195
Social	Pearson Correlation	.391[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	195	195

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

By viewing Tables 11-12-13, it may be safe to assert that instrumental orientation and three strategies again, seem in positive and significant correlation. Instrumental orientations and cognitive strategies are correlated with 0.358; metacognitive strategies with 0.399 and social strategies with 0.391 Pearson score. This time the numbers are broadly similar, which may indicate that instrumental orientation plays along with three strategies within the same distance.

DISCUSSION

Apparently, the study offered very keen implications for our research questions. In other words, the objectives of the study were reached in a clear-cut way, with significant data and indications. In this part, the research questions will be revisited and discussed under the light of the data shared above.

Regarding Research Question 1, as the data suggests, students seem to employ all three language learning strategies - cognitive (Mean = 3.57), metacognitive (Mean = 3.70) and social (Mean = 3.57) - in a considerable amount to aid their learning. That is to say, they practice, receive and send messages and analyze "cognitively", arrange, plan, evaluate their learning "metacognitively" and ask, cooperate and empathize as a "social" learner. As Oxford (2003) pointed out in her meta-analysis, these three strategies may be the key of these students' success. Being the promising students who are expected to finish prep year with Upper-intermediate level English, these learners may be benefiting from the incorporation of various strategies. What is more, as the data suggests, they tend to utilize metacognitive strategies slightly more than the others. As in Jurkovic (2010) and Al-Ahdal & Ma'amari's (2015) studies, especially metacognitive strategies may play a role in their success.

As another point to discuss, the specific strategies students tend to use in three strategy branches add value to our conclusions. In cognitive category, students

highly favor watching TV shows and series in English to learn English better (Mean = 4.26). It is indeed a popular strategy these days. With the proliferation of multimedia channels, students seem to enjoy a lot of input while learning language in the process. However, students are not decisive about the strategy of trying not to translate word-by-word (Mean=3.14). Students remained neutral to the employment of this strategy when compared to other cognitive strategies. Students' tendency to translate English words into L1 in order to make meaning can be studied to find the probable reasons and outcomes of it.

In metacognitive side, for the most part, students seem to employ strategies like paying attention to English speakers (Mean = 3.99) and trying to find ways to be a better learner (Mean = 3.96). It reveals that students are highly receptive to English when it is spoken and are in quest of designing their learning for success. These strategies should also be deeply analyzed to see to what extent they add to acquisition of languages. On the other hand, students do not highly favor planning schedule to find more time to study English (Mean = 3.09). There may be a need for students to be instructed and guided to be able to plan their time to study. This may be another point to consider while teaching language students.

Lastly, in social branch, students favor asking speakers to repeat or slow down when they do not understand (Mean = 4.08). Actually, it is a consistently emphasized strategy in language classes in Turkey and these students are mainly taught in English language. It can be inferred that students make meanings in classroom (and in conversations) by interfering with the grade of language they are addressed and by asking their peers and teachers to be comprehensible in their speeches. On the other hand, although the difference is not a huge one, students tend to learn about the culture of English speakers (Mean=3.32) less when compared to the other social strategies. It seems clear that students mostly focus on language content rather than its cultural aspects. The reason can be that these students may have not found the opportunity to familiarize with the target language community enough or have not consciously wondered about the culture in which the target language is in play.

With all these strategies employed, as Oxford (1990) notes, these students may benefit self-regulation in the long run. As also Torres (2013) suggested, language learners may be better with the help of self-regulation training. These learners are obviously open for more improvement in terms of strategy employment and in need to know about their existing strategy use.

As for Research Question 2, the students seem to be both integratively (Mean = 4.07) and instrumentally (Mean = 4.14) oriented in learning English. In other words, they not only want to be closer to English language community but

also learn the language for practical benefits such as career and academic success. As Gardner (2006) put it, both orientations have a say in language achievement. The levels of these learners may be related to their employment of both orientations. However, they favor instrumental orientation slightly more. That is to say, these students are learning English more for professional, social and other individual benefits and less for being a part of the target community. Thus, this result is in line with Şener & Erol's (2017) study, which concluded that Turkish learners are generally instrumentally oriented. The instrumentality in Turkish samples can be studied further to find out the contextual factors affecting the tendency.

Specifically, on integrative grounds, students prefer to learn English to meet and interact with English people (Mean = 4.38). On instrumental grounds, they learn English for future career (Mean = 4.68) and to appear more knowledgeable (Mean = 4.29). Despite the fact that the students learn English predominantly for their professional life, it is a positive point to discover that they also see various gains in achieving language proficiency. These students are clearly aware of the different benefits that learning languages might bring. Actually, in the long run, this diversity might also be beneficial for these prep year students who are supposed to use their English within various contexts (professional, academic, social) in the later stages of their university life and careers.

For Research Question 3, the answer is that there is a positive and significant correlation between learner strategies and orientations (Pearson = 0.594). The detailed data also prove there are significant correlations between particular orientations and strategies as well. Integrative orientation proved the highest correlation with metacognitive strategies (Pearson = 0.535) and the least with social strategies (Pearson = 0.237). It is interesting to see the lower correlation between integrative orientation and social strategy use since integrative set of mind would be assumed to work with social strategies more. Never the less, the correlation is still significant and positive. The bottom line conclusion is that metacognition and integrity work together and the students who want to be part of the target language community consistently rely on thinking about their learning and shaping it accordingly.

Instrumental orientation, on the other hand, seems to be positively and significantly correlated with all three strategies with similar scores (Pearson = 0.358; 0.399; 0.391). This may mean the ones learning English for practical goals tend to benefit from various strategies to a similar extent. It may be assumed that learning English for instrumental outcomes requires using bits and pieces of all learning strategies.

CONCLUSION

Briefly, when language learners employ orientations to learn languages, they also tend to use language learning strategies. This basic finding is really valuable for the fact that language acquisition may be related to learners' goal directedness, strategic learning and also their interplay. The language educators may benefit from this finding and can constantly gauge their learners' goals and strategies in learning so as to shape their instruction, guidance and monitoring.

Along with these points drawn, the study may imply some good suggestions for future research, as follows:

- A study with more students and/or in different educational contexts can be conducted to see if strategies and orientations are still positively correlated,

- A study with lower level students may be necessary to see their strategy use, orientations and their correlations since this study only showed results with mid/high-level language learners,

- This kind of students who seem to utilize strategies to a large extent may be exposed to self-regulation training to learn about their strategy use and to achieve language more. Then, a follow-up study can be conducted to see the relationship between self-regulation levels and achievement.

REFERENCES

Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H., & Al-Ma'amari, A. A. H. (2015). Learning strategies of the Arab EFL learners: Finding correlation with outcomes. *Advances in Language Literary Studies*, 6 (5), 230-241.

Agor, J. T. (2014). Language-learner strategy instruction and English achievement: Voices from Ghana. *English Language Teaching*, 7 (6), 175-192.

Badib, A. A. N., & Guru, S. (2011). Exploring international student orientation and attitude towards learning English in Malaysia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 2 (2), 219-231.

Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Bialystock, E. (1978). A theoretical model of second language learning. *Language Learning*, 28 (1), 69-83.

Choubsaz, Y., & Choubsaz, Y. (2014). Motivational orientation and EFL learning: A study of Iranian undergraduate students. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 392-397.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ellis, R. (2004). Individual differences in second language learning. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.). *The handbook of applied linguistics.* (p.525 – 551). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences.* New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13 (4), 266-272.

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

Gardner, R. C. (1985b). *The attitude/motivation test battery: Technical report.* Retrieved from publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs/AMTBmanual.pdf; on December 20, 2018.

Gardner, R. C. (2006). Motivation and second language acquisition (Manuscript). Retrieved from publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs/SPAINTALK.pdf; on December 23, 2018.

Gardner, R. C. (2010). *Motivation and second language acquisition: The socio-educational model.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Huang, I. (2015). Language learner strategies and English proficiency of college freshman in Taiwan: A mixed-methods study. *Asia-Pacific Edu Res*, 24 (4), 737-741.

Jurkovic, V. (2010). Language learner strategies and linguistic competence as factors affecting achievement test scores in English for specific purposes. *TESOl Journal*, 1 (4), 449-469.

Khan, N. (2007). *Motivational orientation and English language proficiency of students of the department of English of Brac University.* BA Thesis, BRAC University, Bangladesh.

Masgoret, A. R., & Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, motivation and second language learning: a meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and associates. *Language Learning*, 53, 123-163.

McEown, M. S., Noels, K. A., & Saumure, K. D. (2014). Students' self-determined and integrative orientations and teachers' motivational support in a Japanese as a foreign language context. *System*, 45, 227-241.

Mohammadi, H., & Alizadeh, K. (2014). An investigation of reliability and validity of strategy inventory for language learning among Iranian university students. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1 (2), 53-64.

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

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House/Harper & Row.

Oxford, R. (2003). Language learning styles and strategies: An overview. *GALA*, 1-25. Retrieved from web.ntpu.edu.tw/~language/workshop/read2.pdf; on December 21, 2018.

Oxford, R., & Burry-Stock, J. (1995). Assessing the language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL). *System*, 1, 1-23.

Robinson, P. (Ed.) (2002). *Individual differences and instructed language learning.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rubin, J. (1981). Study of cognitive progresses in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11 (2), 117-131.

Scrivener, J. (2005). *Learning teaching: A guidebook for English language teachers* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Macmillan.

Skehan, P. (1991). Individual differences in second language learning. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13 (2), 275-298.

Şener, S., & Erol, I. K. (2017). Motivational orientations and self-efficacy beliefs of Turkish students towards EFL learning. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 67, 251-267.

Torres, G. (2013). Empowering the language learner: Language learning strategy training and self-regulation in an EFL classroom. *Journal of International Education Research*, 9 (3), 267-276.