

İngilizce Öğrenenlerin Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri ile Başarıları Arasındaki İlişki

Ali CEYLAN^{a, b}

Özet

Bu çalışma, öğrencilerin dil öğrenme strateji tercihlerini belirlemeyi ve öğrencilerin dil öğrenme stratejileri ile dil becerilerindeki akademik başarıları arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma, Türkiye'de bir devlet üniversitesine bağlı bir yabancı dil yüksekokulunun hazırlık programına kayıtlı 405 (K=162, E=243) öğrenci ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırmanın amacına uygun olarak, veri toplamak için Ardehava ve Tretter (2013) tarafından uyarlanan İngilizce Öğrenenler için Dil Öğrenme Strateji Envanteri Öğrenci Formu'nun (DÖSE-İÖ Öğrenci Formu) Türkçe versiyonu kullanılmıştır. Sonuç olarak, öğrenciler dolaylı stratejiler arasında üstbilişsel ve sosyal stratejileri diğer strateji kategorilerine göre daha fazla kullanmaktadırlar. Ayrıca öğrencilerin stratejileri orta düzeyde kullandıkları tespit edilmiştir. Ayrıca, dil öğrenme stratejilerinin bazı alt kategorilerinin becerilerdeki başarı ve dil başarı testinin bazı ölçütleri üzerinde etkisi vardır.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Dil Öğrenimi
Beceri
Strateji
Başarı

Makale Hakkında

Geliş Tarihi: 16.06.2022
Kabul Tarihi: 23.12.2022
Doi: 10.18026/cbayarsos.1131841

The Relation Between Language Learning Strategies and Achievement of English Language Learners

Abstract

This study aims to determine the students' strategy preferences and to explore the relationship between the language learning strategies of the students and their academic achievement in language skills. The research was conducted with the participation of 405 (F=162, M=243) preparatory program students of a school of foreign languages at a state university in Turkey. In accordance with the purpose of the study, the Turkish version of the Strategy Inventory of Language Learning for English Language Learners Student Form (SILL-ELL Student Form) adapted by Ardehava and Tretter (2013) was used to gather data. As a result, students use metacognitive and social strategies, among indirect strategies, more than other strategy categories. Further, it was found that students use strategies moderately and there is female superiority in using language learning strategies. In addition, some sub-categories of language learning strategies have an impact on achievement in skills and some measures of the language achievement test.

Keywords

Language Learning
Skills
Strategy
Achievement

About Article

Received: 16.06.2022
Accepted: 23.12.2022
Doi: 10.18026/cbayarsos.1131841

^a ali.ceylan@cbu.edu.tr

^b Dr., Manisa Celal Bayar University, School of Foreign Languages, ORCID: 0000-0002-6509-7304.

Introduction

Language-learning strategies (LLSs) are accepted as an essential concept in language learning and their contribution to the quality of students' learning has been stated by Oxford (1993). Therefore, it is believed that being conscious of LLSs has a vital role in students' academic achievements. Many researchers have investigated this issue. While some of them associated LLSs with higher proficiency levels of the students (Ardasheva, 2011; Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Hu, Gu, Zhang & Bai, 2009; Lan & Oxford, 2003), some others make correlations with academic achievement (Erdoğan & Özdemir, 2018; Habók & Magyar, 2018; Qomariah, 2018; Taheri, Sadighi, Bagheri & Bavali, 2020; Wu, 2008). Therefore, investigating the impact of LLSs on their language skills (reading, listening, writing and speaking) or the measures of the achievement tests will contribute to the teaching and learning of LLSs that are accepted as teachable and learnable structures as stated in the study of Ardasheva and Tretter (2013). At this point, this study is significant in that it examines the relationship between the LLS use of students and their achievement in skills or measures of the language achievement test, which has not been examined in detail. Therefore, this study, carried out with the students at a preparatory school of a state university, will contribute to the teachers about the level of LLS use by their students in addition to its contribution to the literature on LLS use. Accordingly, this study aims to determine the students' strategy preferences and to find out the relationship between the LLSs of the students and their academic achievement in language skills. In line with the aim, the study sought answers to the following questions:

- a. What are the most and the least used strategy types among English preparatory program students?
- b. What is the relationship between the LLS use of students and their academic achievement?
- c. Is there a difference in LLS use of the students according to their proficiency levels?

The Language Learning Strategies (LLSs)

Language learning and teaching have shifted from a teacher-centred focus to a student-centred focus; therefore the emphasis has been pushed forward to the learners and learning as stated by Gürsoy and Eken (2018). As a result, the personal traits of the learners and characteristics of the learning situations have been examined by many researchers (Ajideh, Yaghoubi-Notash & Khalili, 2017; Bialystok, 1981; Chamot & Rubin, 1994; Cohen, 1998; Ellis, 2008). In addition, for the sake of student-centred learning, learning strategies derived from the cognitive psychological aspect have gained importance (Williams & Burden, 1997). While language-learning strategies emerged in learning and teaching language in the late 1970s, many authors have had definitions of the concept and classified LLSs (Erdoğan & Özdemir, 2018). According to one of the earliest definitions by Rubin (1975) LLSs were described as "the techniques or devices that a learner may use to acquire knowledge". Wenden and Rubin (1987) also described LLSs as "any sets of operations, steps, plans, routines used by the learner to facilitate the obtaining, storage, retrieval, and use of information". Before them, Claus and Casper (1983) were the ones who approached the concept from the perspective of language learning by defining it as "an attempt to develop linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the target language". Oxford (1990), the creator of the inventory used in this study, defined LLSs as "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-

directed, more effective, and more transferrable to new situations" (p. 8). One of the definitions of the LLSs was made by Oxford (2011) and Oxford (2013) by defining it as "the learner's use of consciously chosen tools for active, self-regulated improvement of language learning". To sum up, among the definitions above, this study adopted Oxford's Taxonomy of Language Learning Strategies (Oxford, 1990) which is the core of the inventory adapted by Ardeslava and Tretter (2013).

Oxford's Taxonomy of Language Learning Strategies

Oxford's LLSs taxonomy has two different categories one of which is direct strategies and the other category is indirect strategies. Direct strategies include processing linguistic information mentally and on the other hand, and indirect strategies mean managing learning a language without using the target language directly (Oxford, 1990). There are six major groups of second language (L2) learning strategies under these two main categories suggested by Oxford (1990). Oxford (1990) includes compensation, cognitive, and memory among direct strategies while she includes, social, affective, and metacognitive strategies among indirect strategies. Cognitive Strategies provide a chance for the learners to manipulate the language material directly like reasoning, summarizing note-taking, practising in naturalistic settings, and reorganising information to create stronger patterns (knowledge structures). Metacognitive Strategies such as identifying self-learning style preferences and needs, monitoring his/her mistakes, collecting and creating an appropriate learning atmosphere and timetable, organizing materials, and self-evaluation of success, are used to design the learning process. Memory Strategies help learners, without a deeper understanding, link L2 items with one another. Many memory strategies such as rhyming, acronyms, the mental picture of a word and flashcards help learners learn and retrieve information. Compensatory strategies such as inferring the meaning from the context when reading a text or listening to a recording while talking around the missing word to help learners in speaking and writing, help the learner use made-up words instead of missing knowledge. Affective strategies are the ones that are identifying self-anxiety levels, rewarding yourself for success in the language, and talking about feelings. Social strategies which include asking questions, asking for help, asking for clarification, talking with English-speaking people and exploring culture contribute to the learner in developing collaboration with others, and understanding the culture of the target language while learning the language itself (Oxford, 2003).

Methodology

Participants

Participants in this exploratory study were the students studying at the school of foreign languages at a state university in the academic year 2018-2019. Although 469 students who were selected randomly based on the convenience sampling method participated in the study, 64 students were excluded because of missing values in the data collected. As is seen in Table 1, 405 students 40% of whom were females (n=162) and 60% of whom were males (n=243) participated in the study. The students were assigned to their classrooms according to a placement exam that determines three different levels as A, B and C levels. Level A stands for elementary-level students, B stands for pre-intermediate level students and C stands for intermediate level students.

Data Collection Tool and Procedure

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning–ELL Student Form was adapted by Ardasheva and Tretter (2013) from the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) invented by Oxford (1990). The inventory consists of 28, 5-Likert scale items. The overall Cronbach alpha coefficient for the inventory which is composed of 6 subscales (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social) was calculated as .90. In order to make the students understand the statements, the researcher translated the inventory into Turkish. After the translation, the inventory revised by three other instructors who were graduated from three different departments of the profession (English Language Teaching, English Language Literature and English Translation and Interpretation). Then, a pilot study in which 252 (97 Female, 155 Male) students took part was conducted by the researcher. According to the analysis, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the overall translated inventory was calculated as .85.

Table 1. Cronbach Alpha Coefficient of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning–ELL Student Form

Direct Strategies	Indirect Strategies	
Memory strategies	Metacognitive strategies	Overall
Cognitive strategies	Affective strategies	($\alpha=.85$)
Compensation strategies	Social strategies	
($\alpha=.75$)	($\alpha=.78$)	

Table 1 shows that with 405 participants the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated as ,75 for direct strategies, .78 for indirect strategies and .85 for the overall score of the translation of the inventory.

In addition to the inventory, the researcher used the students' midterm exam scores including scores gained from reading, writing, speaking, listening, vocabulary and language use (grammar) sections in order to test the relationship between the LLSs of the students and their academic achievement in these specifications.

Data Analysis

In the analysis of the data, SPSS 22 software program is used. Within the analysis, descriptive analysis was used to show the distribution of the participants. Pearson correlation was used to see the relationship between the score of the students in the midterm exam including each section of it and sub-dimensions of the inventory and overall scores from the inventory. In addition, ANOVA was used in order to see the relationship between the inventory scores of the students and their levels of proficiency.

Ethical Considerations

In order to use the inventory and translate it, the researcher got written permission from the researcher who adapted the inventory. In addition, the researcher also got permission from the administration of the prep school to use the scores of students by ensuring to keep the information used was confidential.

Findings

The most and the least used strategy types

In order to find out what the most and the least used strategy types are, the mean scores of the students from each type of strategy were calculated and Table 2 shows the percentiles of the strategy used by the students in each strategy type.

Table 2. Percentile Analysis for Strategy Use

		N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Mean/Max (%)
Direct Strategies	Memory	405	19,36	7	35	55,31%
	Cognitive	405	12,77	5	25	51,08%
	Compensation	405	14,78	5	25	59,12%
Indirect Strategies	Metacognitive	405	15,21	4	20	76,05%
	Affective	405	6,18	3	15	41,20%
	Social	405	13,94	4	20	69,70%
	Overall Score	405	82,24	28	140	58,74%

The total score ranged from 28 to 140 because the instrument was a 5-point Likert scale. According to the analyses, a higher percentile indicates higher use of LLSs. The overall mean strategy score was calculated as 82.24 (58.74%). This ratio indicates that the participants use LLSs moderately.

The highest percentiles belong to metacognitive ($\bar{x}=15.21$; 76.05%) and social ($\bar{x}=13.94$; 69.70%) strategy types while the lowest percentiles belong to cognitive ($\bar{x}=12.77$; 51.08%) and affective ($\bar{x}=6,18$; 41,20%) strategy types. That is to say, metacognitive and social strategies are the most frequently used strategy groups while affective and cognitive strategies are the least used ones.

The Relation between Students' Academic Achievement and Their LLS Scores

The analysis that was used to seek the answer to the second research question that aimed to find out the relation between students' academic achievement and their LLS scores was Pearson Correlation. The analysis reveals the relation between students' scores that they gain from the SILL-Student Form which includes sub-categories (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social strategies) and total scores gained in the midterm exam including scores in sections of the exam (listening, use of English, vocabulary, reading, writing and speaking). The Pearson Correlation analysis is presented in Table 3.

The Relation Between Language Learning Strategies and Achievement of English Language Learners

Table 3. A Pearson Correlation to Show the Relation between Students' Midterm Exam Results and Their LLS Scores

	Total Score	Listening	Use of English	Vocabulary	Reading	Writing	Speaking
Total LLS Score	.026	.020	.009	.050	-.040	-.004	.047
Memory	.094	.062	.058	.122*	.046	.066	.043
Cognitive	.002	-.010	-.038	.050	-.008	.007	.013
Compensation	.100*	.024	.100*	.080	.021	-.003	.120*
Metacognitive	.124*	.063	.119*	.098*	-.014	.082	.118*
Affective	-.148**	-.056	-.123*	-.095	-.119*	-.136**	-.091
Social	-.122*	-.030	-.115*	-.105*	-.147**	-.089	-.031

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

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

As is seen in Table 3, none of the scores from the midterm exam has any significant correlation with overall LLS use and cognitive strategy use. On the other hand, other sub-categories have a correlation with either total scores in the midterm exam or their scores in the sections of the exam.

It is also seen that memory strategies have an impact on the vocabulary score of the students since there is a positive significant correlation between them (.122*). In addition, it is clear in Table 7 that compensation strategies have an impact on total scores (.100*), use of English scores (.100*) and speaking scores (.120*) of the students in the exam since there is a significant positive correlation between them. Similarly, metacognitive strategies also have a significant positive correlation with total scores (.124*), use of English scores (.119*) and speaking scores (.118*) of the students.

Unlike other strategy categories, affective strategies have a significant negative correlation with total scores (-.148**), use of English scores (-.123*), writing scores (-.136**) and reading scores (-.119*) of the students. Regarding social strategies, there is a significant but negative correlation with total scores (-.122*), use of English scores (-.115*), vocabulary scores (-.105*) and reading scores (-.147**) of the students.

LLS Use of the Students According to Their Proficiency Levels

In order to find out whether there is a difference in LLS use of the students according to their proficiency levels, ANOVA was run. The results of the ANOVA analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. The Relationship between Students' Levels and Their Strategy Use

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P	Sig. Level
Overall LLS Score	Between Groups	2061.243	2	1030.622			
	Within Groups	88191.473	402	219.382	4.698	.010	<i>p</i> <.05
	Total	90252.716	404				
Memory	Between Groups	42.510	2	21.255			
	Within Groups	9230.290	402	22.961	0.926	.397	<i>p</i> >.05
	Total	9272.800	404				
Cognitive	Between Groups	52.164	2	26.082			
	Within Groups	5883.481	402	14.636	1.782	.170	<i>p</i> >.05
	Total	5935.644	404				
Compensation	Between Groups	155.270	2	77.635			
	Within Groups	4072.730	402	10.131	7.663	.001	<i>p</i> <.05
	Total	4228.000	404				
Metacognitive	Between Groups	62.221	2	31.110			
	Within Groups	4417.518	402	10.989	2.831	.060	<i>p</i> >.05
	Total	4479.738	404				
Affective	Between Groups	54.136	2	27.068			
	Within Groups	2568.417	402	6.389	4.237	.015	<i>p</i> <.05
	Total	2622.553	404				
Social	Between Groups	169.381	2	84.690			
	Within Groups	4742.313	402	11.797	7.179	.001	<i>p</i> <.05
	Total	4911.694	404				

According to ANOVA results given in Table 4, a significant difference was found for Overall Score [$p(.010) <.05$], Compensation Strategy Score [$p (.001) <.05$], Affective Strategy Score [$p (.015) <.05$], and Social Strategy Score [$p (.001) <.05$] in terms of students' level. In addition, no significant difference was found in the Memory, Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategy Scores of the students according to their level of proficiency.

In order to find out the source of the difference, the Tukey test which is among Post Hoc Tests was applied to the data collected. The results of the Tukey test are presented in Table 6.

Table 5. Tukey Test Results that Show Strategy Use According to the Proficiency Level

The Relation Between Language Learning Strategies and Achievement of English Language Learners

	N	\bar{x}	LEVEL	A	B	C
Overall LLS Score	353	82.74	A		.027*	.286
	44	76.51	B			.036*
	8	90.75	C			
Memory	353	19.47	A		.363	.991
	44	18.43	B			.897
	8	19.25	C			
Cognitive	353	12.80	A		.548	.284
	44	12.16	B			.156
	8	14.88	C			
Compensation	353	14.71	A		.945	.000*
	44	14.55	B			.001*
	8	19.13	C			
Metacognitive	353	15.30	A		.119	.439
	44	14.25	B			.123
	8	16.75	C			
Affective	353	6.29	A		.012*	.929
	44	5.14	B			.277
	8	6.63	C			
Social	353	14.17	A		.001*	.999
	44	12.09	B			.273
	8	14.13	C			

When the results of the Tukey test are examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference between A-level students and B-level students [$p (.027) < .05$]. According to score means, A-level students ($\bar{x}=82.74$) have higher scores than B-level students ($\bar{x}=76.51$). In addition, there is another significant difference [$p (.036) < .05$] between C-level students ($\bar{x}=90.75$) and B-level students ($\bar{x}=76.51$) in overall strategy use.

Another significant relationship was determined between students' level and their use of compensation strategies. The significance [$p (.000) < .05$] results from the difference between the scores of A-level students ($\bar{x}=14.71$) and C-level students ($\bar{x}=19.13$). And there is also a

significant difference between the scores of B-level students ($\bar{x}=14.55$) and C-level students ($\bar{x}=19.13$).

Affective strategy use also has a significant relationship with the level of students. The significance [$p (.012) <.05$] derives from the difference between the scores of A-level students ($\bar{x}=14.71$) and C-level students ($\bar{x}=19.13$).

As a result of the Tukey test, it was also found that there is a significant difference between A-level students and B-level students [$p (.001) <.05$]. According to the score means of the students, A-level students ($\bar{x}=14.12$) have higher scores than B-level students ($\bar{x}=12.09$).

The results of the analyses above show that proficiency level in English is affected by the LLS use of the students. Especially, when the mean scores of the students that they got from the SILL-ELL Student Form are examined, it is clear that C-level students have the highest LLS scores at the overall level and in sub-category levels. That is to say, LLS use has a positive impact on the proficiency of the students.

Discussion

According to the findings, the students of the English preparatory program use LLSs moderately, which aligns with the findings of a study by Gürsoy and Eken (2018). It can be inferred from the finding that students' LLSs can be improved to a higher level in this context. In order to achieve this, strategies can be taught to the students because this kind of activity can encourage independent learning and fosters metacognitive knowledge (Dam 1995). As a result, strategy use can be achieved (Wenden, 2002).

It was also found that the students mostly use metacognitive and social strategies while they use cognitive and affective strategies the least. In addition, it can be concluded that students use indirect strategies more frequently. According to these findings, in this context, the students more frequently use metacognitive strategies such as seeing mistakes in English and trying to do better, looking for ways to become a better student of English, in addition to social strategies such as practising English with other students and asking the speaker to slow down or say it again. Consistent with this finding, Gerami and Baighlou (2011), Nacera (2010) and Salahshour, Sharifi and Salahshour (2013) found that metacognitive strategies were used more often than all the types of strategies.

As a result, the personal traits of the learners and characteristics of the learning situations have been examined by many researchers (Ajideh, Yaghoubi-Notash & Khalili, 2017; Bialystok, 1981; Chamot & Rubin, 1994; Cohen, 1998; Ellis, 2008)

On the other hand, not only cognitive strategies such as breaking long words into small pieces and reading for fun but also affective strategies such as self-rewarding and talking to people about how they feel when learning English are the least frequently used strategy categories. This finding is in line with the study of Gerami and Baighlou (2011) who conducted their study with Iranian students who were learning English. They found out that their students use metacognitive strategies more. It is also consistent with the findings of Magogwe and Oliver (2007) and Makoni (2016) which revealed that the most commonly used language learning strategies amongst high school learners were metacognitive strategies.

The scores of the students in the midterm exam did not have any significant correlation with overall LLS use and cognitive strategy use. These results contradict with the literature (Kato, 1996; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995) because generally LLS use and cognitive strategy use are associated with L2 proficiency in several studies (Habók & Magyar, 2018; Qomariah, 2018; Taheri, Sadighi, Bagheri & Bavali, 2020). The contradiction may derive from the personality differences of the students who took part in the study as mentioned by Ellis (2008). For instance, Sharp (2008) investigated the relationships among personality types, language learning strategies and proficiency of students learning English in Hong Kong. The results showed that introversion was negatively related to social strategy use and positively related to metacognitive strategy use. In addition, Kang (2012) found that openness, conscientiousness and extraversion showed positive relationships with most of the strategies. Moreover, openness and conscientiousness were found to be the most significant predictors of using language learning strategies.

On the other hand, other sub-categories correlate at least either students' total scores in the midterm exam or their scores in one of the sections of the exam. For instance, memory strategies have an impact on the vocabulary score of the students. As is found by Purpura (1997), in an assessment context, memory strategies significantly correlated negatively with grammar and vocabulary sections of the test, and memory strategies had an impact on L2 proficiency in learning huge numbers of characters in Kanji by heart (Kato, 1996).

Similarly, there were positive correlations between compensation strategies and students' total scores, scores in the use of English and speaking sections of the midterm exam. These findings are clearly consistent with the findings of Oxford and Ehrman (1995) which mentioned a significant relationship between compensatory strategies and L2 proficiency. In addition, this finding also aligns with the findings of Cohen (1998) who proposed that strategies for compensation are employed for speaking and writing. Moreover, metacognitive strategies correlated with students' total scores, and scores in the use of English and speaking sections of the midterm exam as was also stated by Oxford, Judd, and Giesen (1998).

In this study, unlike other strategy categories, affective strategies presented a significant negative correlation with students' total scores, and scores in the writing and reading sections of the midterm exam. These results were in line with the findings of Mullins (1992) who found out that affective strategies have a negative impact on certain components of proficiency. The reason for this can be that students do not need affective strategies (Oxford, 2003). Similarly, regarding social strategies, there was a significant but negative correlation with total scores, scores in the use of English, vocabulary and reading sections of the midterm exam. This finding contradicts the study in which Oxford et al. (1995) stated that social strategy use is one of the predictors of L2 proficiency.

When the scores of the students in the LLS inventory were examined, it was clear that the LLS use of the students differ significantly according to their proficiency level in English. It is clear that C-level students have the highest LLS scores at the overall and sub-category levels. That is to say, LLS use has a positive impact on the proficiency of the students. At this point, the findings of this study are consistent with the literature studies that reveal LLSs are associated with higher proficiency levels of students (Ardasheva, 2011; Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Erdoğan & Özdemir, 2018; Habók & Magyar, 2018; Hu et al., 2009; Lan & Oxford, 2003; Qomariah, 2018; Taheri, Sadighi, Bagheri & Bavali, 2020; Wu, 2008).

Conclusion

Since there is no unique way of learning English as a foreign language for all students, the field of language learning and teaching has shifted from teachers and teaching to language learner and learner variables (Gürsoy, 2018). Therefore, learner characteristics, one of which is LLS use, have gained more importance than ever before. Therefore, LLSs have become popular among SLA researchers because of their impact on SLA (Oxford, 1990). For this reason, this study examined the relationship between the LLS use of students and their achievement in skills or measures of the language achievement test, which had not been examined in detail before.

This exploratory study used quantitative data from SILL-ELL Student Form and the students' scores they got from the midterm exam. The findings of the study showed that students use metacognitive and social strategies that are among indirect strategies more than other strategy categories. Further, it was found that students use overall strategies moderately. In addition, some sub-categories of LLSs have an impact on achievement in skills or some measures of the language achievement test.

There may be some implications for teachers and researchers in light of the discussion. To increase L2 proficiency, teachers can provide instruction to help students learn how to use learning strategies. Furthermore, integrating LLSs into the curriculum while teaching English to students in an English preparatory program may be an effective way of increasing their proficiency levels.

On the other hand, this study has some limitations. The first one is that this study is limited to 405 students studying in an English preparatory program. In addition, this study was also limited to only one school. The other limitation of this study can be that this study is quantitative. Therefore, these limitations may shed light on further research, a similar study may be carried out in several English preparatory programs with a larger number of students. It may be also suggested for further studies that an experimental study in which strategy instruction will be the treatment in order to examine its effects on academic achievement can be conducted.

References

- Ajideh, P., Yaghoubi-Notash, M. & Khalili, A. (2017). An Investigation of the Learning Strategies as Bias Factors in Second Language Cloze Tests. *Advances in Language and Literacy Studies*. Vol. 8, No. 2, 91-100.
- Ardasheva, Y. (2011). English language learners in focus: Predictors of English proficiency and academic achievement. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A*, 72, (06)
- Ardasheva, Y., & Tretter, T. R. (2013). Strategy Inventory for Language Learning–ELL Student Form: Testing for Factorial Validity. *The Modern Language Journal*, 474-489.
- Bialystok, E. (1981). The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency. *Modern Language Journal*, 65: 24-35.
- Chamot, A. U., & Rubin, J. (1994). Comments on Janie Rees-Miller's "A critical appraisal of learner training: Theoretical bases and teaching implications". *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 771–776.
- Cohen, A. (1998). *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language*. Essex, U.K.: Longman.
- Claus F. & Kasper, G. (1983). *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Dam, L. (1995). *Learner Autonomy from Theory to Classroom Practice*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Dreyer, C., & Oxford, R. L. (1996). Learning strategies and other predictors of ESL proficiency among Afrikaans speakers in South Africa. In R. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world* (Tech. Rep. No 13, pp. 62–74). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Erdoğan, T., & Özdemir, E. (2018). An Investigation Of Learning Approaches And Language Learning Strategies: Are They Related? *European Journal of Education Studies*, Issue 11.
- Gürsoy, E., & Eken, E. (2018). Identifying Children's Language Learning Strategies: Turkish Example. *Porta Linguarum*, 43-56.
- Hu, G., Gu, Y. P., Zhang, J. L., & Bai, R. (2009). *English language learning strategies in Singapore primary school*. (Final Research Report for Project No. CPR 3/03GYQ).
- Kato, F., (1996). Results of an Australian study of strategy use in learning Japanese Kanji characters. Unpublished manuscript, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.
- Lan, R., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). Language learning strategy profiles of elementary school students in Taiwan. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 41, 339–379.
- Makoni, R. (2016). The Relationship between Mother Tongue and English Second Language Learning Strategies. Unpublished Master Thesis. University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.
- Mullins, P. (1992). *Successful English Language Learning Strategies of Students Enrolled in the Faculty of Arts*, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. San Diego, CA, USA: United States International University.

-
- Nacera, A. (2010). Languages learning strategies and vocabulary size. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 4021-4025.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know?* USA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Oxford, R. L. (1993). Instructional implications of gender differences in second/foreign language (L2) learning styles and strategies. *Applied language learning*, 4(1-2), 65-94.
- Oxford, R. L. (2003). Language Learning Styles and Strategies: An Overview. In R. L. Oxford, *Learning Styles & Strategies* (pp. 1-25). Oxford: GALA.
- Oxford, R. L. (2011). Research timeline: Strategies for learning a second or foreign language. *Language Teaching*, 44, 167–180.
- Oxford, R. L. (2013). *Individual differences*. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Oxford, R., & Ehrman, M. (1995). Adults' language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *System*, 23, 359-386.
- Oxford, R.L., Judd, C., & Giesen, J., (1998). Relationships among learning strategies, learning styles, EFL proficiency, and academic performance among secondary school students in Turkey. Unpublished manuscript, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, USA.
- Purpura, J., (1997). An analysis of the relationships between test takers' cognitive and metacognitive strategy use and second language test performance. *Language Learning*, 42 (2), 289-325.
- Qomariah, I. (2018). Islamic Senior High School Students' Language Learning Strategies and their English Achievement. *Edukasi: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, 5(1), 42-52. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.19109/ejpp.v5i1.2048>
- Rao, Z. (2016). Language learning strategies and English proficiency: interpretations from information-processing theory, *The Language Learning Journal*, 44:1, 90-106, DOI: 10.1080/09571736.2012.733886
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9, 41–51.
- Taheri, H., Sadighi, F., Bagheri, M., S. & Bavali, M. (2020) Investigating the relationship between Iranian EFL learners' use of language learning strategies and foreign language skills achievement, *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 7:1, 1710944, DOI: 10.1080/23311983.2019.1710944.
- Salahshour, F., Sharifi, M., & Salahshour, N. (2013). The relationship between language learning strategy use, language proficiency level and learner gender. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70,634-643.
- Wenden, A. (2002). Learner development in language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 23: 32-55.
- Wenden, A. & Rubin, J. 1987. *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Williams, M., & Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
-

The Relation Between Language Learning Strategies and Achievement of English Language Learners

Wu, Y. L. (2008). Language learning strategies used by students at different proficiency levels. *Asian EFL Journal*, 10, 75–95.

Appendix

DİL ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ ENVANTERİ

Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanteri İngilizce'yi Yabancı Dil olarak öğrenenler için hazırlanmıştır. Bu envanterde İngilizce öğrenmeye ilişkin ifadeler okuyacaksınız. Her ifadenin sizin için ne kadar doğru ya da geçerli olduğunu, derecelendirmeye bakarak, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5' ten birini seçiniz. Verilen ifadenin, nasıl yapmanız gerektiği ya da başkalarının neler yaptığı değil, sadece sizin yaptıklarınıza göre sizi ne kadar yansıttığını işaretleyiniz.. Anketi cevaplamak yaklaşık 8-10 dk. alır.		HİÇBİR ZAMAN	NADİREN	BAZEN	SIK SIK	HER ZAMAN
1.	Yeni İngilizce kelime öğrenmek için bilgi kartları kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Yeni İngilizce kelime öğrenmeye yardımcı olması için kafiyeli yapıları kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Yeni İngilizce kelimeleri rol yaparak ortaya koyarım.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Yeni İngilizce kelimeleri öğrenmeye yardımcı olması için cümle içinde kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Yeni kelimeleri onları ne zaman kullanacağımı düşünerek öğrenirim.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Yeni bir İngilizce kelime duyduğumda gözümde o kelimeyi öğrenmeye yardımcı olacak bir resim canlandırırım	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Yeni kelimeleri onları ilk nerede (bir sayfada, tahtada ya da sokak işaretlerinde) gördüğümü düşünerek öğrenirim.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Eğlence amaçlı olarak İngilizce kitaplar okurum.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Bir sayfayı ya da bir okuma parçasını hızlıca okurum ve sonra geri dönüp dikkatli bir şekilde tekrar okurum.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	İngilizce dilinde kendi dilime benzer kelimeler ararım.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Ne anlama geldiğini anlamak için uzun kelimeleri küçük parçalara ayırırım.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	İngilizce olarak okuduğum ya da duyduğum şeylerin özetini çıkarırım.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	İngilizce bir kelimeyi hatırlayamazsam, ne söylemek istediğimi el hareketiyle anlatırım.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	İngilizce bir kelimeyi hatırlayamazsam, olmayan yeni bir kelime uydururum.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	İngilizce dilinde okuma yaparken, her yeni kelime için sözlük kullanmam.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	İnsanlar İngilizce konuşurken, bir sonraki aşamada ne söyleyeceklerini tahmin etmeye çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Bir İngilizce kelimeyi hatırlayamazsam, aynı anlama gelen başka bir kelime kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5

The Relation Between Language Learning Strategies and Achievement of English Language Learners

18.	İngilizce'deki hatalarımı fark ederim ve daha iyi olmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	İnsanlar İngilizce konuşurken, onları dikkatli bir şekilde dinlerim.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Nasıl daha iyi bir İngilizce öğrencisi olabileceğimin yollarını araştırırım.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	İngilizce'de ne kadar iyi olduğum üzerine düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	İngilizce'de başarılı olduğumda kendimi ödüllendiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	İngilizce öğrenirken nasıl hissettiğimi günlüğüme yazarım.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	İngilizce öğrenirken nasıl hissettiğimi insanlara anlatırım.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	İnsanlar İngilizce konuşurken anlamazsam, onlardan daha yavaş konuşmalarını ya da tekrar etmelerini isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	İngilizce konuşanlardan, ben konuşurken beni düzeltmelerini isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Diğer öğrencilerle İngilizce pratik yaparım.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	İngilizce konuşanlardan yardım isterim.	1	2	3	4	5