

The Language Learning Strategies of Turkish EFL Students and Their Impact on Success

Özlem YALÇIN ÇOLAKOĞLU

PhD-Instructor, Bahcesehir University, yalcino88@gmail.com,

ORCID-ID: 0000-0002-9492-5383

Geliş Tarihi/Received

20.06.2023

Kabul Tarihi/Accepted

20.08.2023

e-Yayım/e-Printed

28.12.2023

ABSTRACT

The present study was designed to measure the impact of language learning strategies (LLS) on students' language learning processing. LLS are conscious learning processes selected by learners and have been shown to increase language proficiency when used effectively. Extensive studies have been conducted to understand the preferred strategies by learners of different languages. The study focuses on English Language Teaching (ELT) students studying at a Turkish university. The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) questionnaire was used to assess language learning strategies. The questionnaire included six strategy categories: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies. The research questions explored the frequency of LLS usage among ELT students, the relationship between strategies and the academic year of study, and the relationship between strategies and success in English language courses. The participants were 82 students, and the data was collected through online questionnaires, followed by think aloud protocol sessions with 30 randomly selected students. The collected data were analyzed using frequency analysis through a Chi square test and correlational analysis. The results indicated that cognitive strategies were the most frequently used strategy by the ELT students, followed by metacognitive and social strategies. The findings will be discussed in detail.

Keywords: Language learning strategies, the strategy inventory for language learning, think aloud protocol

İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenen Türk Öğrencilerinin Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri ve Başarıya Etkileri

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, dil öğrenme stratejilerinin (DÖS) öğrencilerin dil öğrenme süreçleri üzerindeki etkisini ölçmek için tasarlanmıştır. DÖS, öğrenciler tarafından seçilen bilinçli öğrenme süreçleridir ve etkili bir şekilde kullanıldığında dil yeterliliğini arttırdığı gösterilmiştir. Farklı dilleri öğrenenler tarafından tercih edilen stratejileri anlamak için kapsamlı araştırmalar yapılmıştır. Farklı dilleri öğrenen öğrencilerin kullanmayı tercih ettikleri stratejileri anlamak için kapsamlı araştırmalar yapılmıştır. Bu çalışma, bir Türk Üniversitesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği bölümünde öğrenim görmekte olan öğrencilerine odaklanmaktadır. Öğrencilerin kullandığı Dil öğrenme stratejilerini değerlendirmek için Dil Öğrenme Strateji Envanteri (DÖSE) anketi kullanılmıştır. Anket altı strateji kategorisi içermektedir: bunlar; bellek, bilişsel, telafi, üstbilis, duyuşsal ve sosyal stratejilerdir. Araştırma soruları, İngilizce öğretmenliği bölümü öğrencilerinin DÖS kullanım sıklığı, tercih edilen stratejiler ile eğitimin akademik yılı arasındaki ilişki ve İngilizce dil derslerinde tercih edilen stratejiler ve başarı arasındaki ilişki araştırılmıştır. Ankete 82 öğrenci katılmıştır ve sonuçları çevrimiçi olarak toplanmıştır. Rastgele seçilen 30 öğrenci ile sesli düşünme protokolü oturumları yapılmıştır. Toplanan veriler, Ki-kare testi ve korelasyonel analiz yoluyla frekans analizi kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlar, bilişsel stratejilerin İngilizce öğretmenliği bölümü öğrencileri tarafından en sık kullanılan strateji olduğunu, ardından üstbilis ve sosyal stratejilerin geldiğini göstermiştir. Bulgular ayrıntılı olarak tartışılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dil öğrenme stratejileri, dil öğrenimi için strateji envanteri, sesli düşünme protokolü

1. INTRODUCTION

Language learning strategies (LLS) are regarded as important factors affecting students' longitudinal process of language learning. They are defined as "learning processes which are consciously selected by the learner" (Cohen, p.4, 1999) and affirmed to have an impact on increasing language proficiency when used effectively (Rubin et al., 2007). They are techniques, methods, or approaches that students employ to both acquire and enhance their language skills.

Over the past few decades, extensive research endeavours have been undertaken to explore LLS (Alhaysony, 2017; Bialystok, 1981; Chamot et al., 1987; Charoento, 2017; Huang & van Naerssen, 1987; Kim, 1991; McGroarty, 1987; Oxford, 1986; Platsidou & Kantaridou, 2014; Wu, 2008) yielding profound insights into the favoured strategies among learners of diverse languages such as French learners (Bialystock, 1981), Russian learners (Chamot et al., 1987) and Chinese learners (Huang & van Naerssen, 1987). It has been shown that students from different countries use different language learning strategies and prioritize them differently (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995).

Some of these studies (e.g. Chamot, O'Malley, Kupper, & Impink-Hernandez, 1987) divided strategies based on the four language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing whereas; others (Poltzer & McGroarty, 1985) categorized strategies into three groups of behaviours: classroom behaviours, individual study behaviours, and interactions outside of class. The reason for choosing the SILL is that the items in the six strategy categories provide a clear description of what learners do while learning a foreign language based on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from 5-always to 1- never or almost never. Another reason for preferring Oxford's six strategy categorizations over other ones is because of their practicality in terms of task applications, to investigate whether students really use the strategies they claim to use in the SILL. The six groups of strategies that will be used in this study were organized by Oxford (1989) in the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) as follows:

1. *Memory strategies* (e.g. grouping, rhyming) 9 items
2. *Cognitive strategies* (e.g. analyzing, summarizing) 14 items

3. *Compensation strategies* (e.g. guessing meaning from the context) 6 items
4. *Metacognitive strategies* (e.g. planning for tasks, monitoring errors) 9 items
5. *Affective (emotional, motivation-related) strategies* (e.g. self-encouragement) 6 items
6. *Social strategies* (e.g. asking questions, becoming culturally aware) 6 items

Although there are a large number of studies examining the LLSs of students all around the world, only a few of them investigated the relationship between the use of LLSs and other variables such as students' grades (Kurt & Atay, 2006) and language proficiency (Ghavamnia, Kassaian, & Dabaghi, 2011). Studying the LLSs used by students in different grades will provide evidence for the belief that more experienced language learners (who have studied a language for a longer period) use more strategies than less experienced language learners (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989). Counter evidence for this hypothesis has been found through some studies (Lee, 2003; Kurt & Atay, 2006) showing that language learners in higher grades do not always use more strategies than lower grade learners. Since most of the past studies rely on data gathered through questionnaires about students' beliefs about their use of strategies, it is questionable whether students' beliefs and perceptions match their use of strategies in real-life activities. As a result, another important dimension that needs to be explored about LLSs is, whether students apply the strategies which they claim to use in the questionnaires given to them, through the application of strategy assessing tasks.

A general finding of the examination of LLS has shown that the appropriate use of strategies leads to greater achievement in language skills and proficiency (Oxford & Crookall, 1989). Gaining information about different factors (e.g. first language (L1), gender and grade) affecting students' LLS choice, will enhance students' learning by providing implications for course planning and teaching. Strategy assessment can raise students' awareness of how to learn a language faster and easier. Furthermore, self-directed autonomous learning by empowering students through strategy-based instruction can be enhanced if a relationship between students' educational success and their use of strategies can be revealed. As a result, it seems highly important that language teachers become aware of their student's language learning strategy use and its impact on success in language learning.

1.1. Purpose

The conducted study aimed to provide insights into the language learning strategies employed by students who were enrolled in the English Language Teaching programs at a foundation University in Istanbul, Turkey. To achieve this goal, one of the frequently utilized strategy assessment tools globally, the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL, Oxford, 1986-1990), was employed. Specifically, Version 7.0, designed for individuals learning English as a second language, was chosen as the strategy evaluation instrument. One major advantage of this questionnaire was that it provided immediate feedback to the learner, allowing them to discover a significant amount about their use of strategies. On the other hand, a limitation of this instrument was that it didn't describe the language learning strategies a student used during a specific language task, when compared to think aloud protocols. Moreover, SILL was accepted as the most frequently used language learning strategy questionnaire that has been tested for reliability and validity in multiple ways. Moreover, in addition to answering the following research questions, the second part of the study aimed to investigate the reliability of the students' answers to the questionnaire. The hypothesis suggested that students did not employ the strategies they claimed to utilize in the SILL.

Research questions:

1. Which language learning strategies are more frequently used by ELT students at a University in Turkey?
2. Is there any significant relationship between language learning strategies and the students' academic year of study?
3. Is there any significant relationship between language learning strategies used by the students and their success in English language courses?

2. METHOD

2.1. Participants

The participants in this study were 82 randomly selected students from four academic years of an English language teaching department of a foundation university in Istanbul, Turkey. The students' ages range from 19 to 24 including both males and females. Out of these

participants, 30 students were randomly selected for the second part of the study, the follow up, which is discussed in the procedures section. The researcher concurrently held a position as an assistant in the English Language Teaching program and meanwhile was pursuing her PhD as part of this study in one of her courses.

2.2. Instrumentation

An online version of the questionnaire known as Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) version 7.0 (Oxford, 1986-1990) was used for data collection. The questionnaire starts with background information about the participants and then moves on to six parts, each one dealing with one of the six strategy types. Answers to the questions were scored on a 5 point Likert scale including the following statements:

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost true of me

2.3. Procedures

After the first data collection part was completed through the online questionnaire, further data collection for the follow up of the study was conducted through think aloud technique which is used in various fields, including education and psychology, where individuals verbalize their thoughts as they perform a task or solve a problem. It involves vocalizing one's internal thought processes, providing insights into how a person approaches a task, makes decisions, and addresses challenges. In language learning research, think aloud protocols are often used to gain a deeper understanding of the strategies learners use while completing language-related tasks. By vocalizing their thoughts as they engage with the task, participants reveal the thought patterns, decision-making processes, and problem-solving strategies they employ. This technique helps researchers uncover the cognitive aspects of a task and gain insights into learners' metacognitive processes, ultimately shedding light on their language learning strategies and problem-solving abilities.

Sessions were conducted with 30 students selected at random. Each of these students was tasked with completing assignments (refer to Appendix 1) designed to evaluate five out of the six language learning strategies categorized by Oxford. One of the strategies which is known as “affective strategy” was not included in this part because of its assessment difficulty through think aloud tasks. The think aloud sessions were conducted individually and the students were audio-taped with their approval. The researcher met the students individually in her office and the sessions took around 15 -20 minutes. To prevent any misunderstandings and foster a more comfortable environment, students were prompted to verbalize their thoughts in Turkish, their native language.

Data about students’ content course grades were obtained through their transcripts with the students' and faculty’s consent.

2.4. Data Analysis

The data from the online questionnaire was transferred into the SPSS program for statistical analysis. The first research question required a frequency analysis through a Chi square test whereas; the second and third research questions required correlational analysis. The 50 items of the questionnaire were grouped under the six strategies. Furthermore, the student’s grades in four English language courses known as “Oral Communication I & II” and “Composition I & II” were entered into SPSS and classified as *speaking* and *writing* variables.

3. RESULTS

A chi square analysis was conducted to answer the first research question related to the strategy preferences of ELT students who answered the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) questionnaire developed by Rebecca Oxford (1986-1990). The frequency count in Table 1 shows that *cognitive strategies* (mean = 51,52) are more frequently used by ELT students than the other five strategies.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of strategy variables

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Memory	82	31,1829	6,48289	15,00	45,00
Cognitive	82	51,5244	9,28323	21,00	69,00
Compensation	82	22,6098	4,37376	11,00	30,00
Metacognitive	82	35,6829	6,52418	16,00	45,00
Affective	82	17,8171	5,21661	8,00	30,00
Social	82	22,3293	4,89155	9,00	30,00

However, table 2 indicates that the frequency of the cognitive strategy is not statistically significant ($p=.707 > 0,05$) and the observed chi square value ($\chi^2=25,336$) is lower than the critical value ($\chi^2=43,773$) at $df=30$. It can be seen that the statistical significance was found in compensation ($p=.013$; $\chi^2= 33,854$) and affective ($p=.026$; $\chi^2=32,634$) strategies which reveal higher observed chi square values than expected.

Table 2. Chi square analysis

	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social
Chi Square	30,805	25,366	33,854	26,268	32,634	29,707
Df	24	30	18	22	19	19
Asymp. Sig.	,159	,707	,013	,240	,026	,056

In order to answer the second research question, whether there is a significant relationship between language learning strategies and the students' academic year, a Spearman's rank correlation was conducted. Table 3 indicates that all strategies, except the affective strategy, show weak positive correlations with the academic year. However, none of the strategies reveals strong correlations which leads to the result that there is no statistically significant ($p > 0.05$) relationship between the language learning strategies and the students' academic year.

Table 3. Correlations between academic year and the six strategies

	Academic Year
Academic Year	1
N	82
Memory	,187 ,093
Cognitive	,059 ,601
Compensation	,215 ,052
Metacognitive	,064 ,568
Affective	-,006 ,955
Social	,184 ,098

The final research question investigated the relationship between language learning strategies used by the students and their success in English language courses which are identified as four courses divided into speaking and writing variables. The correlation analysis for this research question (see Table 4) reveals that there is a weak positive ($r = .285$; $p = .011$) correlation between students' success in writing and the metacognitive strategy at a highly significant level. When we look at the correlation between speaking and the strategies, we see that three strategies show weak positive correlations with the speaking variable. These strategies are; cognitive ($r = .325$; $p = .003$), metacognitive ($r = .321$; $p = .004$) and social ($r = .268$; $p = .017$) strategies.

Table 4. Correlations between strategies and skill variables

	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social	Speaking	Writing
Memory	1							
Cognitive	,761 ,000	1						
Compensation	,634 ,000	,639 ,000	1					
Metacognitive	,681 ,000	,847 ,000	,594 ,000	1				
Affective	,525 ,000	,517 ,000	,483 ,000	,443 ,000	1			
Social	,585 ,000	,743 ,000	,503 ,000	,634 ,000	,522 ,000	1		
Speaking	,181 ,110	,325 ,003	,209 ,064	,321 ,004	,047 ,682	,268 ,017	1	
Writing	,019 ,870	,203 ,075	,057 ,623	,285 ,011	,048 ,679	,089 ,437	,554 ,000	1

3.1. Follow up results

The second part of the study involved think aloud sessions with 30 randomly selected students who carried out five tasks related to the five strategies: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive and social. Students were asked to think aloud in Turkish which is their mother tongue to prevent any misunderstandings and to create a more comfortable environment.

The results of this part show that students do not always use the strategies which they have claimed to use based on the SILL outcomes. According to the audio-taped sessions, 14 students used a memory strategy for the first task. The rest of the students (16) preferred to guess the right answer by choosing the one that did not sound familiar to them. One participant said “Hmm bütün 3 kelimeler 3 harfli sadece biri 4 harfli o yüzden bence 4 harfli olan yanlış halbuki kelimeler çok benziyor ama ben yine de 4 harfli kelimeyi seçtim. (Hmm all the 3 words are 3 letters but only one has 4 letters that’s why I choose the 4 letter word although the words look very similar)”. The second task required the usage of a cognitive strategy and it was observed that 18 students made use of it by analyzing and summarizing the text involved in the task. The highest use (25) of the strategy was during the third task in which students tried to find the meaning of a word by guessing it from the context. Another

participant said “Şu an hiçbir fikrim yok sadece atıyorum. Cümlede kadınların şapkalarına tüy yazıyor sanırım o kelimenin adı “kuş” olsa gerek (I have no idea right now, I’m just guessing. In the sentence it talks about feathers on women’s hats, I think the name of the word must be a “bird”)”. This behaviour is defined as a compensation strategy. The fourth task required metacognitive strategies to be solved and it was observed that 17 students solved the jigsaw reading task by organizing the pieces according to their places in the text. The rest of the students did not plan for the task instead they read the pieces in mixed order and tried to find the topic of the text. The final task tested the student’s social strategies by providing them with a scenario and asking what they would do in that case. 20 students solved the task by preferring a social strategy “Sokakta bir kaç kişiye sorarım veya bir taksiciye sorarım” (I would ask a few people on the street or I would ask a taxi driver) whereas 10 students seemed to feel more comfortable using technology devices instead of asking questions to foreigners.

4. DISCUSSION

The present study aimed to find out the language learning strategy used among Turkish ELT students studying at a foundation university in Istanbul. The students’ academic year of study and their English language course grades were taken into consideration to find a relationship between these variables and the strategy used. Findings of the study have shown that cognitive strategy was found to be the most preferred strategy due to its highest mean though it did not come out to be statistically significant. The result is in line with Chamot, A. et al. (1987) as the most preferred strategies were cognitive and metacognitive. In fact, the follow up of the study does support this finding because only 18 out of 30 students made use of it during the cognitive task. A possible explanation for the high mean could be related to the 14 items that are under the category of cognitive strategy, which is the largest group among the six strategies.

Although Oxford and Nyikos (1989) claimed that years of studying a language have a significant effect on strategy use, the second research question could not provide evidence for this argument since the academic year did not reveal a high correlation with any of the strategies. As a result, it is not possible to say that more experienced learners use more strategies than less experienced learners (Kurt, G. & Atay, D., 2006). Moreover, the correlation

analysis between strategies and reading and writing skills also did not provide strong evidence for high correlations instead it only showed that some of the strategies may have a little impact on students' speaking abilities (Chamot, A. U., O'Malley, J. M., Kupper L. and Impink-Hernandez., M., 1987). In light of the facts, it is questionable whether strategy-based instruction does affect learners' language learning success.

The follow up of the study revealed interesting results in the students' strategy use during think aloud tasks. It was observed that compensation strategy was the most frequently applied strategy by the students (n=25), opposite to what was found in the analysis of the SILL which revealed cognitive strategy to be the most frequently used strategy although, statistically not significant. Chi square analysis results also showed that the compensation strategy was preferred a lot and found to be statistically significant ($p = 0.13$) which is supported by the think aloud task results.

All in all, the study has shown that strategy use is not that much effective as discussed in the literature review. Students are not always aware of the strategies they are using therefore; the SILL alone is not a good data collection source that provides reliable evidence. Self-report data collected through interviews, diaries and think aloud protocols are more comprehensive and efficient in exploring how and when learners apply strategies. Finally, it should be investigated whether strategy instruction and training should constitute an essential component of ELT programs or not and if strategy training leads to success in language learning.

5. CONCLUSION AND LIMITATIONS

One of the limitations of the study is the uneven number of students studying in different academic years. A larger sample size and an equal number among the groups under investigation may provide more significant statistical outcomes.

Futhermore, one potential approach could involve conducting a study with preparatory students who are not familiar with language learning strategies and comparing their outcomes. Unfortunately, due to university policy limitations, the researcher was unable to engage with students who lacked familiarity with these strategies. While the initial intention

was to include both groups for a comparative analysis, the study will focus on the group that has a prior understanding of the strategies.

Another issue that needs to be addressed is that only two language skills, writing and speaking, were considered when compared to the strategies. However, the use of a proficiency exam covering all English language learning skills would be a more efficient source to correlate with the strategies. Though, at the time the study was conducted, it was not possible to give out an exam to all four groups of students.

Lastly, because of time constraints students were not given the chance to practice the think aloud method. Instead, an example was provided once which may have caused difficulties to work the tasks out.

To conclude, it is not accurate whether the use of strategies does have an impact on a learner's success or not. Although this study has proven that there is no significant relationship among strategies, academic year and language learning course grades, it is difficult to answer the outcome without investigating other important factors. The students' prior education and their teachers' success in teaching the strategies to them might have been two important variables affecting the results.

Further studies investigating other variables in relation to strategies as mentioned above are necessary to enhance the scope of sources that play important roles in strategy teaching and training. In addition to that, questionnaires alone should not be prior sources anymore instead; they should be supported with extra data collection to be more reliable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank distinguished Prof. Hossein Farhady for his guidance in this study.

REFERENCES

- Alhaysony, M. (2017). Language learning strategies use by Saudi EFL students: The effect of duration of English language study and gender. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 7(1).
- Bialystok, E. (1981). The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency. *Modern Language Journal* 65, 24-35
- Chamot, A. U., O'Malley, J. M., Kupper L. and Impink-Hernandez., M. (1987). *A study of learning strategies in foreign language instruction: first-year report*. InterAmerica Research Associates, Rosslyn, VA.
- Charoento, M. (2017). Individual learner differences and language learning. *Contemporary Educational Research Journal*, 7(2), 57-72.
- Cohen, A. D. (1999). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. p.4. London: Longman.
- Ghavamnia, M., Kassaian, and Z., Dabaghi, A. (2011) The relationship between language learning strategies, language learning beliefs, motivation, and proficiency: A study of EFL learners in Iran. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 2, No.5, pp.1156-1161.
- Huang, X.-H and Van Naerssen, M. (1987). Learning strategies for oral communication. *Applied Linguistics* 8, 287-307.
- Kim, J.-D. (1991). A comparison of learning strategies of college students enrolled in beginning and advanced English as a second language. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA.
- Kurt, G. & Atay, D. (2006). Language learning strategies used by Turkish 6th and 8th graders. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 2, 123-137.
- Lee, K. O. (2003). The relationship of school year, sex and proficiency on the use of learning strategies in learning English of Korean junior high school students. *Asian EFL Journal*, 1-36.
- McGroarty, M. (1987). Patterns of persistent second language learners: elementary Spanish. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Miami, FL.

- Oxford, R. L. (1986). Development and psychometric testing of the strategy inventory for language learning. ARI Technical Report 728. Alexandria, VA: US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Science.
- Oxford, R. L. (1989). Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know. Heinle & Heinle.
- Oxford, R.L., & Crookall, D. (1989). Research on language learning strategies: Methods, findings, and instructional issues. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 404-419.
- Oxford, R. L. & Nykios, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern Language Journal*, 73,292-300.
- Oxford, R.L. & Burry-Stock, J.A. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL). *System*, 23(1), 1-23.
- Platsidou, M., & Kantaridou, Z. (2014). The role of attitudes and learning strategy use in predicting perceived competence in school-aged foreign language learners. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 5(3), 253-260.
- Politzer, R., & McGroarty, M., (1985). An exploratory study of learning behaviours and their relationship to gains in linguistic and communicative competence. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 103-124.
- Rubin, J., Chamot, A.U., Harris, V., & Anderson, N. J. (2007). Intervening in the use of strategies. In A. D.Cohen & E. Macaro (Eds.), *Language learner strategies* (pp.141-160). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Wu, Y. L. (2008). Language learning strategies used by students at different proficiency levels. *Asian EFL Journal*, 10(4), 75-95.

Appendix 1:

Tasks measuring the language learning strategies:

Strategy 1: Memory

Instruction:

One of these words does not belong with the other three. Find the odd word out. How do you solve this problem? Think aloud.

pat

spot

dot

cot

Strategy 2: Cognitive

Instruction:

Read the text below and circle the right answer for the following question (While answering think aloud):

Reading text:

While playing computer games is sometimes seen as a solitary pursuit, a study at Brigham Young University shows that it actually enhances social connections. Studying the effect of multiplayer online games on marriages, researchers found that in the 76% of the cases where the couple played together, games actually aided the relationship. In other words, couples that gamed together stayed together. Games may have other effects on us too. The famous psychologist, Philip Zimbardo, recently spoke out on the subject. In his 1971 Stanford Prison Experiment, in which volunteers were randomly assigned the roles of prisoner or guard, he showed that human behaviour is heavily influenced by environmental and social pressures. More recently, Zimbardo even suggested that exposing children to morally ambiguous situations in games could be useful in helping them develop their own moral compass. One possibility is to explore virtual worlds through computer games that could enable people to experience and understand concepts that they would otherwise find difficult to imagine. Games about society, populated by real people and open to all, could help test how different cultural backgrounds could be brought together in peace.

It is stated in the passage that computer games ----.

- a) enhance the feeling of loneliness if they involve more than one player all the time
- b) provide opportunities for people to meet unaccustomed ideas and worlds
- c) lead to role conflicts among those who come from different cultural backgrounds
- d) contributes little to strengthening the relationships of married couples
- e) may include harmful features that trigger aggressive behavior among children

Strategy 3: Compensation

Instruction:

Explain the meaning of the underlined words. Meanwhile, think aloud:

1. You can trust the salesmen at that store because they always conduct business in an aboveboard manner.
2. The lovely egret is in danger of extinction because clothing manufacturers use their long, beautiful tail feathers to make ladies' hats.

Strategy 4: Metacognitive

Instruction: (Jigsaw reading)

Below you will find parts of a reading text in a mixed order. Read the parts and find out the topic of the text. (Text will be cut into pieces and given to students)

- 3a** It is often said that play is just for fun, but "just" for fun should not mean that play is unimportant. That would be an error. The fun of play is based on children's creativity, which is a key part of life: creative play and fun are as necessary as food and air.
- 3b** We live in an adult world. It is set up to suit people who are big and strong and rich. However, children are small and weak and poor. For them, this world can be a boring place. They want to do many things, but often they cannot! That is why the creativity of play is important to this group. Through play, boys and girls can make their own world. They can have houses, cars, animals and forts that are the right size for them. They can go to far-off lands. They can do all they want!
- 3c** As a result, the best toys are simple; they should not have a lot of detail. In fact, children prefer toys that they can use as they please. Often the best play-things are also the least expensive ones! Those that cost a lot may be so exact that they do not offer what children need. A battery-powered car may make a very realistic sound, but only one. A talking doll may seem impressive but if it only says a few words like "Mamma", it will soon become boring. It would be cheaper and better for such items to be silent. Their young owners will give them sounds, and each sound will be new!
- 3d** We can trust children to use their toys in a creative way. They use imagination to invent good ideas that grown-ups can no longer see. Play is magic. It can make a sad world full of joy. This is why children have to play. The only job of adults is not to interfere!

Strategy 5: Social

Instruction:

Imagine you have just started to learn English and you went to London. You want to visit the Big Ben but you don't know how to get there. What would you do?