

T. C.
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University
Institute of Educational Sciences
Department of Foreign Language Teaching
English Language Teaching Programme

Vocational College Students' Language Learning Strategy Use and its Relationship with Self-Esteem and the Achievement Level in the English Course

Adnan YAVUZ
Master of Academic Thesis

Supervisor
Assist. Prof. Dr. Hasan BAYRAKTAR

Çanakkale
June, 2014

Tashhütname

Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak sunduğum 'Vocational College Students' Language Learning Strategy Use and its Relationship with Self-Esteem and the Achievement Level in the English Course' adlı çalışmamın, tarafımdan, bilimsel ahlak ve değerlere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçada gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, bunları atıf yaparak yararlanmış olduğumu belirtir ve bunu onurumla doğrularım.

Tarih

23/06/2014

Adnan YAVUZ




Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi

Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Onay

Adnan YAVUZ tarafından hazırlanan çalışma, 23/06/2014 tarihinde yapılan tez savunma sınavı sonucunda jüri tarafından başarılı bulunmuş ve Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Tez Referans No: 10041031

	Akademik Unvan	Adı SOYADI	İmza
Danışman	Yrd. Doç. Dr.	Hasan Bayraktar	
Üye	Doç. Dr.	Cevdet YILMAZ	
Üye	Doç. Dr.	Çavuş ŞAHİN	

Tarih: 23 / 06 / 2014

İmza:



Doç. Dr. Ajda KAHVECİ

Enstitü Müdürü

Acknowledgements

Creating a detailed study, as this one, demands absolutely great contributions of colleagues and the supervisor of the study. In particular, I would like to emphasize my gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Hasan Bayraktar for his demanding leadership to the pathways throughout the study.

I am sincerely grateful to the members of my dissertation committee, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cevdet Yılmaz, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çavuş Şahin, Assist. Prof. Dr. Hasan Bayraktar for generously sharing their wisdom and knowledge.

Beginning from creating an idea till the conclusion phase, it was a demanding study. I would like to acknowledge the following people.

I would like to heartfully thank my family, and friends for their assistance to complete this master thesis. I also would like to show my sincere gratitude to my professors; Prof. Dr. Dinçay Köksal for sharing his deepest knowledge for research studies, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ece Zehir Topkaya for widening my view to the methodology in language teaching, Assist. Prof. Dr. Salim Razi for leading me in the world of statistics.

I am deeply grateful to the director of Çan Vocational College, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özcan Özen for allowing me to conduct this study in his college and to also the students for participating and sharing their feelings and thoughts.

My sincere gratitude also goes to my classmates in MA class for their sincere friendship and encouragement.

Dedication

Dedicated to my beloved family; for her tenderness and affection to my wife, Fatma, for the joy they bring to my life and their patience to my son, Ahmet Emrehan and my daughter, Zeynep Semra.

Contents

Title	
Declaration	
Acknowledgements	1
Dedication	ii
Contents.....	iii
Abbreviations	vii
List of Tables.....	viii
List of Appendices	xi
Abstract	xii
Özet	xiv
Chapter I: Introduction	1
Statement of Problem	1
Purpose of the Study and the Research Questions	2
Purpose of the Study.	2
Research questions.....	2
Significance of the Study.....	3
Limitations of the Study	4
Organisation of the Thesis	4
Summary.....	6

Chapter II: Languages Learning Strategies, Self-Esteem, Self-Perception of Achievement, and a General View on Language Education in High Schools in Turkey	7
Language Learning Variables.....	8
Language Learning Strategies in Language Teaching	9
Summary for learner strategies.	13
Self-Esteem in Language Learning	14
Self-Perception of Achievement.....	15
Studies on Language Learning Strategies, Self-Esteem, and Self-Perception of Achievement.....	17
Studies on self-esteem.....	17
Studies on self-perception of achievement.	18
Studies on strategy use and its relation to self-esteem and self-perception of achievement.	20
An Overlook in Language Education in High Schools in Turkey.....	23
Summary of the Chapter.....	25
Chapter III: Methodology.....	27
Approaches and Types of Educational Research.....	27
Rationale for a Statistical Survey Research Design	28
Restatement of Research Questions	29
The Study.....	30
Setting.	30
Participants.....	30

Materials and Instruments.....	35
Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis.....	40
Summary of the Chapter.....	41
Chapter IV: Findings and Discussions	43
Restatement of Research Questions of the Study	43
Findings and Discussions of the Research Questions	44
Findings and discussions of research question 1.	44
Findings and discussions of research question 2.	48
Findings and discussions of research question 3A.	51
Findings and discussions of research question 3B.....	61
Findings and discussions of research question 4A.	62
Findings and discussions of research question 4B.....	66
Findings and discussions of research question 4C.....	70
Findings and discussions of research question 5A.	74
Findings and discussions of research question 5B.....	88
Chapter V: Conclusion and Implications	92
Summary of the Study	92
Aim of the study.....	93
Summary of methodology.....	93
Summary of main findings.....	96
Conclusion.....	101
Implications for Language Education and Suggestions for Further Research	104

References	106
Appendices	113

Abbreviations

CHE	The Council of Higher Education
DÖSE	Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanteri
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ESL	English as a Second Language
Mgmt.	Management
pp.	from page to page
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
SILL	Strategy Inventory for Language Learning
QASELE	Questionnaire of Academic Self-Esteem in Learning English
QPSFLE	Questionnaire of Perception for Success and Failure in Learning English
Tech.	Technology

List of Tables

Number	Title	Page
1	Wenden and Rubin's Classification of Language Learning Strategies	11
2	O'Malley and Chamot's Classification of Language Learning Strategies	12
3	Oxford's Classification of Language Learning Strategies	13
4	English Class Hours in Some Types of High Schools in Turkey.	24
5	Descriptive Information about the Participants of the Study	31
6	School Types and Participants	32
7	The List and Descriptive Data of the Interviewed Participants ...	33
8	Subsamples of the Interviewed Student	35
9	Key to Understand the Averages for Using Learning Strategies .	45
10	Mean Uses of Language Learning Strategy Types	48
11	Test of Normality of Mean Language Learning Strategy Use ...	51
12	Descriptive Information about Schools According to Mean Values of Strategy Use	52
13	Multiple Comparisons between High Schools according to Language Learning Strategy Use	53
14	Anova Analysis of Strategy Use Differences between Seven School Types	55
15	Test of Normality of Mean Language Learning Strategy Use	56
16	Kruskall Vallis Test of Language Learning Strategy Types' Mean Use	57

17	Mann-Whitney U Test Results of Changes among the School Types the Students Graduated from according to the Types of Language Strategy Use	58
18	Test of Normality of Mean Language Learning Strategy Use according to Genders	61
19	Independent Sample T-Test Results for Language Learning Strategy Use of the Genders	61
20	Statistical Analysis of the Questionnaire of Self-Esteem in Learning English	63
21	Correlation between Language Learning Strategy Use and Academic Self-Esteem	65
22	Correlation between Language Learning Strategy Use and English Exam Score	67
23	Model Summary of Regression between Language Learning Strategy Use and English Exam Scores	68
24	Regression Analysis of Language Learning Strategy Use and English Exam Score	69
25	Frequency of Perceived Success Levels	70
26	Correlation between Language Learning Strategy Use and Self- Perception of Achievement	72
27	Model Summary of Regression between Language Learning Strategy Use and Self-Perception of Achievement	74
28	Regression Analysis of Language Learning Strategy Use and Self-Perception of Achievement	75
29	Descriptive Analysis of Reasons for Success	76

30	Descriptive Analysis of Reasons for Failure	81
31	Test of Normality of Mean Language Learning Strategy Use according to Success Groups in English Exam	88
32	Independent Sample T-Test Results for Language Learning Strategy Use of Success Groups in English Exam	89
33	Independent Sample T-Test Results for Use of Different Language Learning Strategy Types for Success Groups in English Exam	90

List of Appendices

Number	Title	Page
I	Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanteri (DÖSE)	112
II	Academic Self-Esteem Questionnaire	116
III	İngilizce Öğreniminde Akademik Öz-Saygı Anketi	117
IV	İngilizce Öğrenmede Başarı ve Başarısızlık Algısı Anketi	118
V	Interviews Protocol	120
VI	Permission Provided by the Director of Vocational School to Use the Data	122

Abstract

Vocational College Students' Language Learning Strategy Use and its Relationship with Self-Esteem and the Achievement Level in the English Course

The success rate among learners enrolled in English courses may vary depending on their interest, academic self-esteem, educational background, teaching methodology, or techniques and activities used in the course, and learner strategies employed by students, etc. The combination of and/or relation between some of these variables may also affect the success.

As the title suggests, this study aims to reveal the relationship between language learning strategy use among vocational college students and their self-perception of achievement, academic self-esteem in learning English.

The study was based on both quantitative and qualitative characteristics and utilized questionnaires and interviews through statistical survey method. Data collection tools were administered to 294 students during the Spring Semester of 2013 in a vocational college.

To collect the data, initially, Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanteri - DÖSE) by Cesur M.O. & Fer S. (2007) was administered to the students to reveal the extent of the learner strategy use among students. Together with DÖSE, the Questionnaire of Academic Self-Esteem in Learning English (QASELE), and the Questionnaire of Perception for Success and Failure in Learning English (QPSFLE) were also applied. Apart from the questionnaires, in order to provide rich data for the study, interviews with 34 students about the reasons of success and failure in language learning were carried out.

The results indicate that the students in vocational colleges use language learning strategies at a medium level, use metacognitive strategies with the highest frequency and cognitive strategies with the lowest frequency, have academic self-esteem in learning English, perceive themselves successful in learning English also at a medium level. There is a moderate correlation between language learning strategy use and academic self-esteem in learning English, a weak correlation between language learning strategy use and self-perception of achievement, and a weak correlation between language learning strategy use and the actual achievement grades in learning English. Language learning strategy use is a significant predictor of self-perception of achievement. There is a significant difference between successful and unsuccessful students but there is not a significant difference between male and female participants and also graduates of different high schools in overall language learning strategy use. On the other hand, in the use of compensation strategies, the graduates of Anatolian High Schools outperform the graduates of all other schools. The graduates of Vocational High Schools also outperform the students who graduated from Trade High Schools in the use of compensation strategies.

The findings, discussions, and implications of the study might provide a contribution to English language teaching in vocational colleges in Turkey.

Özet

Meslek Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Dil Öğrenme Stratejisi Kullanımı ve Bunun İngilizce Dersinde Özsaygı ve Başarı Seviyesiyle İlişkisi

İngilizce öğrenenler arasındaki başarı oranı; ilgi, akademik özsaygı, eğitim geçmişi, derste kullanılan öğretim metodları, teknik ve aktiviteler, öğrenenler tarafından kullanılan öğrenme stratejileri gibi unsurlara bağlı olarak değişkenlik arzedeabilmektedir. Bu değişkenler arasındaki ilişki ve/veya değişkenlerin farklı kombinasyonları da aynı zamanda başarıyı etkileyebilmektedir.

Çalışmanın başlığından da anlaşılacağı gibi, bu çalışma adı geçen değişkenlerin bazılarını ele alır. Bu bağlamda Meslek Yüksekokulu öğrencileri arasında dil öğrenme stratejileri kullanımının öğrencilerin kişisel başarı algısı, akademik özsaygı ve eğitim geçmişiyle ilişkisini araştırmayı hedefler.

Çalışma esasen nicel ve tamamlayıcı nitel temeller üzerine kurulmuş ve yürütülmesinde karma metod araştırma yöntemiyle birlikte araştırma materyalleri ve anketler kullanmıştır. Veri elde etme araçları Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Çan Meslek Yüksekokulu'ndaki 294 öğrenciye 2013 Akademik yılı Bahar Dönemi'nde uygulanmıştır.

Veri elde etmek için ilk olarak Rebecca Oxford'un (1990) Dil Öğrenme için Strateji Envanteri'nin Türkçe versiyonu olan, M.O. Cesur ve S. Fer (2007) tarafından yüksek iç tutarlılık güvenilirliği ile oluşturulan Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanteri (DÖSE) öğrenciler arasındaki öğrenme stratejisi kullanma oranını belirlemek için uygulanmıştır. DÖSE ile birlikte, İngilizce Öğrenmede Akademik Özsaygı ve İngilizce Öğrenmede Başarı ve Başarısızlık Algısı Anketleri de uygulandı. Anketlerden ayrı olarak, çalışmanın bulgularını güçlendirmek için, dil öğrenmede başarı ve başarısızlık nedenleri üzerine 34 öğrenciyle

görüşmeler yapıldı. Anketler aracılığıyla temin edilen veriler istatistiksel veri analiz programı SPSS 21.0 kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir.

Çalışmada kullanılan anket ve görüşmelerin nicel ve nitel analiz sonuçları Meslek Yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin genel olarak dil öğrenme stratejilerini orta derecede, özelde, üst biliş stratejilerini en sık olarak diğer taraftan bilişsel stratejileri en az oranda kullandıklarını, İngilizce öğrenmede özsaygı algılarının ve başarı algılarının orta düzeyde olduğunu göstermiştir. Çalışma aynı zamanda, Meslek Yüksekokulu öğrencileri arasında dil öğrenme stratejisi kullanımıyla İngilizce öğrenmede özsaygı algısı arasında orta derecede; dil öğrenme stratejisi kullanımıyla başarı algısı arasında düşük derecede; dil öğrenme stratejisi kullanımıyla başarı notları arasında düşük derecede ilişki olduğunu, dil öğrenme stratejisi kullanımının başarı algısının önemli bir yordayıcısı olduğunu, başarılı ve başarısız öğrenciler arasında dil öğrenme stratejisi kullanımında önemli fakat bay ve bayan katılımcılar ve farklı okul türlerinden mezun öğrenciler arasında önemsiz bir fark olduğunu da ortaya koymuştur. Diğer taraftan, Anadolu Lisesi mezunları telafi stratejisi kullanımında diğer tüm okul mezunlarından öndedirler. Meslek lisesi mezunları ise Ticaret lisesi mezunlarını telafi stratejisi kullanımında geride bırakmıştır.

Çalışmanın bulgu, tartışma ve önerilerinin Türkiye'deki meslek yüksekokullarındaki İngilizce dil öğretimine katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir.

Chapter I: Introduction

In order to achieve success in any aspect of the life, what an individual needs most is probably self-confidence/esteem. Language learning is no exception: any learner needs academic self-esteem to demonstrate a relative success over others. The same as in learning a language, one may need academic self-esteem to demonstrate a relative success. The feeling of self-esteem may motivate the learner and helps to activate the faculties needed for learning. The question at this point is what affects academic self-esteem, and whether using learner strategies causes a positive change in academic self-esteem and students' perception of achievement. The researcher aims to find out the mentioned relations above.

In this chapter, information is provided on the background, research questions, as well as the significance, limitations, and organisation of the study.

Statement of Problem

The freshman students at Çan Vocational College have many individual differences and display a set of different qualifications and skills in language learning. Also the high schools they graduated from are various, ranging from vocational high schools to Anatolian high schools. During the informal talks the researcher (as their English teacher) had with students, some students complained that they had no ability to learn a foreign language because of their unwillingness or weak language learning background. They seemed to have neither self-esteem nor a belief in their capabilities in language learning. Additionally, those who did not have any self-esteem seemed mostly to have graduated from technical high schools which were founded and designed to train their students on technical issues and their curriculum include very few hours of foreign language learning. On the other hand, those who did not complain about those problems performed or seemed to perform significantly better in language learning. When those who complained were asked about how they tried to learn the language, what methods they applied to perform better or if there were any methods or special

strategies they applied to learn the language, some replied there were not any and some others replied they even did not try to apply any strategies or methods. The case emerged a question in the researcher's mind: Is there a relation between applying any strategy and self-esteem in language learning, actual achievement grades and the self-perceived achievement of the students? Defining or at least revealing any relation between those issues may help to create and design new applications, and approaches to determine learner strategies for certain types of learners.

Purpose of the Study and the Research Questions

Purpose of the Study.

This research study has the following goals:

1. to identify the language learning strategies employed by the vocational college students
2. to determine the most and the least often used language learning strategies
3. to identify the vocational college students' level of academic self esteem
4. to identify the relationships between
 - the use of language learning strategies and students' level of self-esteem
 - the use of language learning strategies and the actual achievement grades received in the English course
 - the level of strategy use and the types of schools students graduated
 - language learning strategy use and the self-perceived achievement level

Research questions.

The study is conducted to answer the following questions. Some of the research questions are categorized according to their relations. The first three questions are about presence or levels of the main variables in the study.

RQ1. Do the vocational college students use language learning strategies? If so, to what extent?

RQ2. What are the types and frequency of language learning strategies employed by vocational college students?

RQ3-A. Does the level of strategy use vary according to the school type students graduated?

RQ3-B. Does the level of strategy use vary according to gender?

RQ4-A. What is the relationship between language learning strategy use and the level of academic self-esteem?

RQ4-B. What is the relationship between language learning strategy use and the actual achievement grades received in the English course?

4Q4-C. What is the relationship between language learning strategy use and self-perceived achievement level?

4Q5-A. What is role of the use of language learning strategies in explaining the self-perception of achievement?

RQ5-B. How does the use of language learning strategies change in successful and unsuccessful students?

Significance of the Study

As aforementioned above, student usually come from different educational backgrounds and seemingly failure stories affect the use of language learning strategies. Some totally refuse to use any strategy, some have almost no self-esteem in language learning, some exert some effort but give up very soon, some others try a few strategies and when they succeed they feel motivated by themselves and try harder during the course. If a relationship among the variables analysed in the study can be revealed, in other words, if it is revealed that the strategies which the students usually utilise lead them to report higher self-esteem in learning English, those findings can be taken into account by the teachers to work with the

students in vocational colleges who have failure stories in learning a foreign language. The findings also might provide contributions to English language education in vocational colleges.

Limitations of the Study

This study includes the following limitations:

1. As the participants of the present study are students from technical programs, the results may not be generalized to all the major categories, such as social programs, arts programs, literature programs, fine art programs.
2. As the students are all beginner and elementary level students, the results of the present study may not be generalized to pre-intermediates, intermediates, upper-intermediate, and advanced levels.
3. As the study was conducted with the participants in a vocational college of a university in western Turkey, the results may not be generalized to students in different vocational colleges of Turkey and various countries.

Organisation of the Thesis

In order to provide a way to search through the thesis, the organisation of the thesis is explained in this section.

Five chapters have been included in the thesis. The first chapter can be accepted as the introduction to study including research questions, limitations of the study and also the organizations of thesis.

The first chapter introduces the study providing statement of problem, and the research questions. Then, the significance of the study in language education is discussed. Limitations of the study are provided to lead a pathway for further research studies on the issues studied in the thesis. In the final section of the chapter, organisation of the study leads readers to find brief information about the issues in the chapters.

The second chapter deals with the definitions and literature review of the terms studied and commence summarizing the difference between ‘learning’ and ‘acquisition’ and then the role of learners in education throughout the history of education. In the next section of the chapter, carrying the discussion on to the features of good language learners and the strategies that good language learners employs; i.e. language learning strategies, providing a discussion from the historical background to the up-to-date definitions. The chapter also provides the categorizations of language learning strategies by leading scholars of the field. Following sections discuss the other leading concerns of the study; self-esteem in language learning and self-perception of achievement and a brief summary on language learning hours in secondary education school types of Turkish National Education System. The significance of self-esteem in a person’s life, the effect of academic self-esteem in education, broadly and specifically in learning language, are the final issues discussed in the chapter. The third and the last issue discussed in the chapter is self-perception of achievement.

Firstly, discussing the methods of research employed in the field of applied linguistics in general, the third chapter displays the methods utilized to carry out the study. The main concerns of the chapter are the instruments of the study and setting and participants.

Chapter four presents a detailed analysis of the results and also discusses the main findings, referring to the relevant literature on the issues, thus, tries to seek answers to reveal answers to the research questions reported at the beginning of the study.

The purpose of the chapter five is to conclude the findings and discussions of the research questions provided in the previous chapter. It draws conclusions based on the findings and links these conclusions with other relevant prior research by referring to previous studies and reviews of literature. Implications and suggestions for the further studies are also the provided in the last section of the chapter.

Summary

To sum up, this chapter has discussed how the idea for such a study arose in 'statement of the problem' section. The researcher asserts that some of the vocational college students utilize language learning strategies, have self-esteem and perceive successful in language learning while some others do not utilize any strategies, seem not to have self-esteem and have a self-perception of failure. It is stated by the researcher that this study mainly aims to reveal possible relations between those variables. The chapter has also presented the research questions which are aimed to be answered by the study, possible contributions of the study to language education, the limitations of the study, and consequently, organization of the study.

Chapter II: Languages Learning Strategies, Self-Esteem, Self-Perception of

Achievement, and a General View on Language Education in High Schools in Turkey

Throughout the history of language teaching, the linguists and researchers have been in the chase of the best method to apply in language classes. For the last few decades, they have come to a point that there is not a best method to fulfil all the needs of parameters in language learning environment. Kumaravadivelu (2006) explains the limitations of methods by referring to the myths about them and Brown (2002) suggested four possible reasons of demise of methods. He claims that methods are too prescriptive, indistinguishable from each other at later stages, the creation of powerful centres and vehicles of linguistic imperialism, and it is not possible to choose the best method by scientific parameters. As Kumaravadivelu cited, Nunan (1991) summarized the reason nicely: It has been realised that there was never and probably never will be a method for all. After a brief look through the mental steps from methods to post method era, another developmental perspective of language learning will be mentioned from now on. The schools of language also have much changed from teacher centred and behaviouristic perspectives to constructivist first and social constructivist perspectives. Whatever the method you apply, on the other hand, when learners do not have an understanding of how to learn, the effect of the method or methods lose their affects. At this point, learners' profiles, characteristics, and, for some others, strategies that learners use to acquire language gain importance.

After some decades from the introduction of learner strategies, in the mid-1980s, learner beliefs appeared as another field focusing on learners. Learner beliefs are defined as beliefs about nature of language and language learning in Barcelos (2003). Barcelos also emphasizes the social and cultural nature of beliefs which is not the main issue to discuss in this study. Theoretically-oriented definitions of learner beliefs vary beginning from very early studies and according to Thomas and Harri-Augustein (1983, p.338) those early studies

‘opened a whole new Aladdin’s cave of personal beliefs, myths, understandings, and superstitions as they were revealed by the persons’ thoughts and feelings about their learning’.

In this study, the main focus is on overall academic self-esteem and self-perception of achievement in learning a foreign language. Therefore, not all the belief factors’ relation to learner strategies is mentioned here. As stated above, the relation between self-esteem, self-perception of achievement and learner strategies is the main focus of this study.

Language Learning Variables

To commence with, it would be meaningful to start the discussion with a general view to learning. Learning is defined as ‘the process by which information is obtained, stored, retrieved, and used.’ by Rubin J. (1987). A common assumption in learning a language and acquiring a language is that learning occurs conscious and generally in a planned way but on the other hand acquisition seems to be unconscious and spontaneous. The first one mostly occurs in education environment, i.e. classroom, but the second in social environment. By the way, the term social environment includes does not exclude the educational environment. Throughout the history of mankind, classroom environment has been accepted as the only area of learning. Teacher has been the main source of information and as a result, the learner has been accepted as the receiver of knowledge.

By that time, the factors affecting language learning were taken into consideration. Brown H. D. mentions these factors under four headings; age, psychological, socio-cultural and linguistic factors. The discussed issues in this thesis are mainly related to and categorized under psychological factors by Brown. The effects of age, socio-cultural and linguistic factors are not the main concerns of the study.

Language Learning Strategies in Language Teaching

As one of the main issues which took part in this thesis, language learning strategies are discussed in this part mentioning its background, development and categorizations made by various linguists.

Since the birth of social constructivist approaches to language learning, this point of view has started to change, i.e. learner and thoughts on good learner gained much importance in learning environment. Learner has been started to be accepted as the main responsible of his /her learning and to that extend, the strategies or concepts which help learner to carry out this responsibility have begun to develop. First, the term of good language learner aroused around 1970 and to be a good language learner some characteristics were believed to be carried by learners. The article ‘What the Good Language Learner Can Teach Us’ written by Rubin in 1975 could be accepted the first platform of strategy research. The list of techniques that Rubin proposes a good language learner to employ can be accepted as the first outgrowth of strategy research. Following Rubin, some other researchers, Stern (1975) and Naiman et al. (1978), studied along similar concepts.

After shifting in perspectives and contributions in early language learner strategies (LLS), Rubin (in Wenden and Rubin, 1987, p.19) suggests some strategies to help learners to develop their autonomy. Rubin defines these learning strategies as "*any set of operations, steps, plans, routines used by the learner to facilitate the obtaining, storage, retrieval, and use of information*". Another definition by Stern indicates that "*the concept of learning strategy is dependent on the assumption that learners consciously engage in activities to achieve certain goals and learning strategies can be regarded as broadly conceived intentional directions and learning techniques*" Since the birth of the term ‘learner strategy’, critiques and definitions also have grown with the term. The definitions provided above seem to clarify enough the term after critiques. As both definitions suggests, those strategies are various.

Some are operative; some are related to phases of learning, and/also including plans and routines affecting acquisition, memory, recall and usage of language. There have been debates on naming, categorizing, defining and clarifying learner and learning strategies specifically in terms of their conscious and unconscious nature and observable and non-observable characteristics. To sum up all debates and in order to conclude with clear understanding, Rod Ellis (2008) provides a relatively better list of characteristics of strategies:

- Strategies refer to both general approaches and specific actions or techniques used to learn an L2.
- Strategies are problem orientated. The learner deploys a strategy to overcome some particular learning or communication problem.
- Learners are generally aware of the strategies they use and can identify what they consist of if they are asked to pay attention to what they are doing/thinking.
- Strategies involve linguistic behaviour (such as requesting the name of an object) and non-linguistic (such as pointing at an object so as to be told its name).
- Linguistic strategies can be performed in the L1 and in the L2.
- Some strategies are behavioural while others are mental. Thus some strategies are observable, while others are not.
- In the main, strategies contribute indirectly to learning by providing learners with data about the L2 which they can process. However, some strategies may also contribute directly.
- Strategy use varies considerably as a result of both the kind of task the learner is engaged in and individual learner preferences.

Since there are several definitions, debates and critics on learner strategies, there are several ways of categorizations. Among these, the contributions of Wenden and Rubin (1987), O'Malley and Chamot (1990), and Oxford (1990) for categorization are mentioned in

following paragraphs. First and broadly handled categorization, O'Malley and Chamot also provided a similar one belongs to Rubin. She categorises and explains the strategies in four groups. Table 1 indicates the classifications of language learning strategies by Wenden and Rubin.

Table 1

Wenden and Rubin's Classification of Language Learning Strategies

Type of Strategy	Application Area of the Strategy
Cognitive strategies	Directly related to learning
Metacognitive strategies	Above learning or beyond learning, preparing and planning for learning, managing time, evaluating and assessing oneself.
Communication strategies	Gestures, mimes and body language are used to maintain a conversation despite the gaps in their knowledge of the second language.
Socio-affective strategies	Socio, taking your emotional temperature, risk taking, ambiguity tolerance and affective, feeling safe, coping with your negative feelings.

Similarly, O'Malley and Chamot (1990) categorized learner strategies under three titles but his classification seems to be more comprehensible and slightly simpler. Table 2 displays the classification of language learning strategies by O'Malley and Chamot.

Table 2

O'Malley and Chamot's Classification of Language Learning Strategies

Type of Strategy	Application Area of the Strategy
Cognitive strategies	work directly with the target language and are more limited to specific learning tasks.
Metacognitive strategies	require planning for learning, thinking about the learning process as it is taking place, monitoring of one's production or comprehension, and evaluating learning after an activity is completed.
Social strategies	things that learners do to manage their feelings or to manage their interaction with others.

This explanation of strategies suggests possible answers to foster for cognitive and metacognitive capacities of learners but not in terms of techniques. At this point, it should be defined that in Applied Linguistics the term of learner strategies and learning strategies are sometimes accepted as different from each other. Oxford (1990) takes these techniques, re-categorises them adding more applicable point of views and examples. She classifies first into two main lines; direct and indirect strategies. Two main categories are divided into three sub-categories and consequently, those six sub-categories are explained with different techniques. Additionally, she presents mind opening samples of techniques supporting each sub-categorised strategy. Table 3 indicates the categorisation of language learning strategies by Oxford.

Table 3

Oxford's Classification of Language Learning Strategies

Categories	Sub-categories	Techniques
Direct strategies	Cognitive Strategies	Practicing, receiving and sending messages, analysing and reasoning, and creating structure for input and output
	Compensation Strategies	Guessing intelligently, and overcoming limitations in speaking and writing,
	Memory Strategies	Creating mental linkages, applying images and sounds, reviewing well, and employing action
	Metacognitive Strategies	Centring your learn, arranging and planning your learning, and evaluating your learning,
Indirect strategies	Affective Strategies	Lowering your anxiety, encouraging yourself, and taking your emotional temperature
	Social Strategies	Asking questions, cooperating with others, and empathizing with others

Summary for learner strategies.

In this part, a brief historical and conceptual background of learner strategies is provided summarizing the learner's and teacher's role throughout the educational history and shifts in understanding the changing roles. From that point, the part comes up with a need to good learner and then the shaping times of learner strategies. The definitions and critics of leading linguists for the issue, and naturally various classifications, some of which have still been utilized by the researchers in the field, are provided. One of the critics of Dörnyei (2005) cited in Ellis R. (2012) should be reported at this point that although some learner strategies

have been discussed in the field, there might be numerous unconscious strategies which have not been reported. In spite of almost four decades of discussions and research studies in the area, the various and relatively controversial definitions of learner strategies displays the lack of unity among the linguists on how to define the issue. Ellis R. (2012) claims; this is because the lack of determination of which learning behaviour constitute strategies and which do not. Another critics by Ellis on learner strategy area is that since 1990's, the same questionnaire dominates the research studies and the other methods of investigating strategies as added to the same confusion aforementioned above. He forwards a discussion on a new term 'self-regulation' which provides, according to him, a broader perspective on the process not the product as the learner strategies do. As cited in Ellis, Tseng et al. argued that this new item provides a more satisfactory way of empowering the learners than traditional strategy training. Ellis finalizes his comment this way and starts a new discussion.

Self-Esteem in Language Learning

This study also focuses on the relation between self-perception of achievement, self-esteem and the use of learner strategies.

As the second item on which the study based, self-esteem plays a critical role among the dynamics affecting the learning in the classroom. In general, confidence has broad effects in a person's life. As it is cited in Craig (2007), famous philosopher Cicero states that *'Confidence is that feeling by which the mind embarks in great and honourable courses with a sure hope and trust in itself.'* Concerning this definition of Cicero, one may assume that in all aspects of life, people need confidence not only as a characteristic value but also a key to hope about life. Brown H. D. (2002) displays the same point of view; 'Self-esteem is probably the most pervasive aspect of any human behaviour. It could easily be claimed that no successful cognitive or affective activity can be carried out without some degree of self-esteem, self-confidence, knowledge of yourself, and self-efficacy-belief in your own

capabilities to successfully perform that activity.’ Seabi J. (2011) also points out the importance of self-esteem in person’s life; ‘it is commonly believed that individuals with high self-esteem are effective and generally successful in all areas of life.’ As also cited in Seabi (2011), Wiggings (1994) reports that students, who feel positive about themselves, are more persistent at difficult tasks, happier, and tend to perform better academically. Craig mentions relations between confidence, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and optimism. According to her, latter three terms are preferred ones in use by psychologists instead of confidence. Dictionary definitions of confidence refer to two ideas: first, about being certain of your own ideas and second, about having trust in people, plans or the future. The approach about own abilities relates to self-efficacy and trust about plans and future refers to optimism. Thus, one can formalize confidence as a combination of self-efficacy and optimism.

As even a paragraph of referred to terminology about ‘self’ displays that the issue can be accepted multidimensional, multi-layered, overlapped and defined in various ways by scholars. The term, this study focuses on, is self-esteem in learning a foreign language. Self-concept as a broader term is defined in Erten and Burden (2014) ‘personal perceptions of one’s own academic abilities or skills that are developed through experience with and interpreting the learning environment.’ Erten and Burden also discuss that global or all-embracing self-concept may not tell us much about subject-specific self-concept and achievement. Therefore, it is critical to define the term subject-specific self-concept. As cited in Bong and Skaalvik (2003), Rosenberg (1979) claimed that ‘self-esteem is based on self-assessments of qualities that are perceived as important or psychologically central by individuals’.

Self-Perception of Achievement

Self-perception of achievement has been accepted and searched under the title of reasons for success and failure. People who perceive themselves successful or unsuccessful

refer to different reasons. These reasons are subjective internal or external causes (Peacock, 2009) of failure and success perceived by learners for a specific task (Peacock, 2009, and Weiner, 2010). The issue is accepted as a sub-category or sub-title of motivational concept and historically based on the foundations constructed by William James (Weiner, 2010).

Beginning from the early studies, reasons of success and failure have been categorized in a developing way. First findings from the research studies were ability, effort, task difficulty and luck (Weiner, 1992), effort, help from others for success and dissatisfactory teaching methods, distraction, task difficulty for failure (Williams and Burden, 1999). As the theory develops, some other categorizations appeared in the field. Weiner suggested three main groups of reasons for success and failure: a) internal and external causes, b) stable and unstable causes, c) controlled and uncontrolled causes.

Internal reasons are ones that indicated by the learners as sourcing from the learners themselves, e.g. effort, strategy use, ability, mood, etc. Whilst, learners state that external factors such as teacher, task, peers, time, luck, etc. affect their learning outcomes.

Another dimension of these factors is stability/instability. This refers to the question of whether the factors affecting learning outcomes will change in time or not. Stable causes are the ones that do not change in time, e.g. ability, teacher, etc. While unstable causes are the ones that can change in time, e.g., effort, task, mood, strategy use, etc.

The factor of controllability/uncontrollability indicates whether the reasons for success and failure can be controlled or uncontrolled by learner. Controllable causes are the ones that can be controlled by the learner, e.g. effort, strategy use, interest, etc. Uncontrollable causes are the ones that cannot be controlled, e.g. luck, environment, teaching materials etc.

The present study aimed to reveal the place of strategy use among the other reasons for success. Therefore, application of all the theory is not the concern of the study.

Studies on Language Learning Strategies, Self-Esteem, and Self-Perception of Achievement

Studies on self-esteem.

Huang (2011) differentiates global self-concept and subject-specific self-concept in terms of relation to academic achievement. Although Huang mentions strong correlation between self-concept and academic achievement, it is stated in the study that ‘researchers should use academic or subject-specific measures when examining the relation between self-concept and academic achievement. Studies using global self-concept to examine this relation may underestimate its strength.’

One of the significant studies in the field is the study of Seabi J. (2011) which was conducted among first year engineering students in South Africa. It aimed to reveal the relation between self-esteem, intellectual functioning, learning strategies and academic achievement. Seabi revealed that there was a significant relation between self-esteem and academic achievement. The relations between other variables in the study are reported in the following sections.

The relation between culture and self-esteem was also a point of interest since the beginning of the introduction of the term ‘self-esteem’. As cited in Ku N.K (1999) early studies in the field by Eaton and Dembo (1997) and Stigler et al. (1985) reported Asian students’ underestimation of their academic abilities comparing their non-Asian counterparts. But the results of the study of Ku (1999) do not agree with the results of Eaton and Dembo (1997) and Stigler et al. (1985). Ku indicated that Asian students anticipated their own abilities as higher than non-Asians. The difference between the results may cause a need for further research studies in different settings. The results of a study, conducted in an environment including both Asian and non-Asian students, may differ from a study including only Asian or non-Asian participants. Also the age group of the students may have a higher

influence on the results. Participation of both cultures may create an environment for students to compare their abilities. On the other hand, conducting two different studies including one culture in each may give a chance to student to evaluate only their own abilities without comparing other cultures. Thus, the real perception of students' self-esteem may be revealed.

Kurtovic's (2012) study on self-esteem also demonstrated critical, illuminative results for our study. Those results will be mentioned under the following part. The other studies (Mahfouz A. R. I. M. & Ma'ajini O. B. H., 2013; Zarei et al, 2012; Benjamin F., 2009; Gázquez J.J., et al., 2006; Asadifard A. & Biria R., 2013) which were conducted to reveal the relation between self-esteem and language learning strategies are reported in the following sections.

Studies on self-perception of achievement.

Peacock (2009) conducted a study in Hong Kong with 505 university students to reveal the connections between reasons for success and failure, proficiency level, gender, and academic discipline. The study identified 26 factors expressing their reasons for their success and failure. It is concluded in the study that self-perception of achievement affects proficiency, effort and persistence. Peacock's hypothesis was that there were significant differences between genders in terms of self-perception of achievement. Consequently, the female participants in the study perceived their success expressing more internal, unstable, and uncontrollable factors than the males. In other words, female learners referred to their own efforts for their success more than males did.

A quantitative study conducted by McQuillan in the USA in 2000, cited in Williams, Burden, Poulet and Maun (2004), revealed some other reasons of success and failure. The participants in the study explained their success with having a good teacher, high level of motivation, effort and ability, environmental factors in the classes, and time. The most

frequent reasons for failure were low level of effort, employing insufficient learner strategies, lack of time, and poor level of atmosphere in classes.

Kurtovic A. (2012) studied the correlations between the dimensions of reasons for poor and good grades and self-esteem, hopelessness and depression. The study included 295 young adult learners aged between 15 and 18. The results of that study can be accepted as critical since the current study tried to reveal similar issues. Kurtovic named external, unstable and uncontrollable dimensions of reasons as 'globality of causes' and indicated that both stable causes for success and referring to global causes for poor and good grades demonstrated negative correlation with self-esteem. It can be asserted from these results that the learners who have high self-esteem in learning a foreign language refer to insignificant number of stable causes such as ability, teacher, environment, etc. On the other hand, referring to good grades and controllable reasons for success and failure indicated positive correlation with self-esteem. The results indicate that when learners can control reasons for both success and failure they feel high self-esteem in learning a foreign language.

Apart from the studies above, there are number of other studies reporting various kinds of reasons for success and failure. For instance, the study conducted in Bahrain by Williams, Burden and Al-Baharna in 2001 revealed that students indicated level of exposure to English, practising the language, teacher and family support as the most common causes of success. Whereas, dissatisfactory level of comprehension, and inappropriate methods of teaching were reported by students as the most common causes of failure.

The reason for high variety of reasons for both success and failure is explained by some scholars. Williams, Burden, Poulet and Maun (2004) explained it with the nature, and the settings of studies. Quantitative nature, cultural and setting aspects of the studies affect the number and the variety of reasons. The study, conducted with 985 students of a comprehension school in London by Siann et al. (1996), revealed a similar cultural aspect of

self-perception of achievement. The study included both Asian and non-Asian participants. One of the critical reasons for success by the Asian participants in the study was the support of family. Erten and Burden (2014) indicated a conclusion citing some research studies from China (Peacock, 2009), Japan and Thailand (Gobel and Mori, 2007 and Mori et al., 2010), and in Malaysia (Thang, Gobel, Nor, & Suppiah, 2011) that non-western learners have a self-critical approach and expressed internal causes for failure in the studies mentioned above.

Studies on strategy use and its relation to self-esteem and self-perception of achievement.

In order to reveal the beliefs of learners, most research studies utilized a questionnaire developed in 1980s, Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory (BALLI). As this study refers to and mentions not all the aspects of learner beliefs but only some issues as mentioned above, the researcher of the study used some other instruments which are broadly mentioned in Chapter III to reveal the data.

One of the studies discussing the relation between self-esteem and learner strategies is the one that Asadifard A., Biria R. (2013) carried out in a university with one hundred and twenty seven students majoring in English. Following the correlational analysis, Asadifard and Biria revealed language learning strategies have moderate correlation with self-esteem. According to the results of the study, compared to other types of strategies, cognitive and compensation strategies have the highest correlation with self-esteem. On the other hand, affective strategies have the least correlation with self-esteem. Asadifard and Biria also studied the use of language learning strategies and self-esteem in terms of gender. The study did not reveal a difference between genders in terms of these variables.

Mahfouz A. R. I. M. & Ma'ajini O. B. H. (2013) studied the relationship between self-learning strategies, motivation and self-esteem in a university with 280 students. The study revealed a significant difference between genders in terms of self-learning strategies and a

high correlation between cognitive strategy use and self-esteem. Zarei et al. (2012) conducted an experimental study on the effect of cognitive and metacognitive strategies on the self-esteem and academic performance with 87 students of a guidance school. Their study did not reveal a significant difference between self-esteem measures of both experimental and control groups. On the other hand, the total scores of the groups were significantly different at the end of study. The study of Gázquez J.J. et al. (2006) aimed to reveal the relation between self-esteem and the use and selection of learning strategies. No significant relation between these variables was found at the end of the study. The aim of the research of Benjamin F. (2009) was to define the relationship between self-esteem and learning strategies amongst 197 university students according to the year of study, difference between genders in terms of self-esteem, Findings indicated that there is a difference in genders in terms of self-esteem learning strategy use. Females had more positive self-esteem levels than the males. Moreover, the year of study also have an effect on the self-esteem levels of the students. The relation between language learning strategies and self-esteem was also studied by Seabi J. (2011) in a research which was conducted in a university in South Africa with one hundred and eleven first year engineering students. Seabi revealed modest but significant correlation between self-esteem and learning strategies.

Yin C. (2008) conducted a study to examine the relation between learner strategies, attitudes, motivations and learner beliefs. She carried out the study in six universities of China with 1201 undergraduate participants. The study focused on not only self-esteem but learner beliefs in general. The result that our study values indicated that, as stated in Yin (2008), “*Ability beliefs positively affected English proficiency, self-directed practicing strategy use, and compensatory vocabulary-learning strategy use.*” It can be stated that when participants value their language learning abilities they perform more use of learner strategies. This shows a direct relation between self-esteem and learner strategy use.

As cited in Yin (2008), Park (1995) studied strategy use, belief system, and their relationship with second language proficiency. The participants were 332 Korean university students learning English as a foreign language. The study found that university students in Korea use metacognitive and memory strategies more than communication-affective strategies. It is reported that students try to find a person, namely friend, to practise English as speaking. Although the study revealed a moderate correlation between beliefs and learner strategies, self-esteem demonstrates more correlation with learner strategies.

The studies of Sun M. (2009) and Su M.M. (2005) are similar to the present study in terms of setting. Both studies were conducted in technical educational institutes. Former one aimed to reveal the relation between language learning strategy use and an English proficiency test scores. The results indicate that high level achieved students who passed the exam used compensation strategies and low level achieved students who failed the exam used metacognitive strategies more than the other types and there is a statistically significant difference between both groups of participants in terms of overall language learning strategy use. Latter one reported the medium level use of all types of language learning strategies vocational college students in Taiwan. The study also revealed a bivariate correlation between self-perceived English proficiency and the use of language learning strategies. Some other research studies (Suwanarak K., 2012; Ghavamnia M. et al., 2011) also resulted that there is a relation between language learning beliefs and the use of learner strategies.

As a result of the literature review of the studies mentioned above, it can be stated that there is a two-way directional relation between learner strategies, self-esteem and self-perception of achievement. The question is '*Does high self-esteem cause more use of learner strategies or does the use of learner strategies cause high self-esteem?*' The answer to this question needs an experimental study to be conducted to research the causal relation among

two issues. Unfortunately, this study does not focus on this issue and it might be accepted as a limitation of this study.

An Overlook in Language Education in High Schools in Turkey

The participants in our study are the students who educate in a vocational college in Çanakkale. Not only the cities where they come from but also the school they graduated from has a wide range of variety. In this section, the secondary school types and the education EFL in these school types are described referring to the online sources Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education.

Before university, education in Turkey is categorized into three: pre-school education, primary education and secondary education. At present (2014), pre-school education and secondary education are optional but primary education is compulsory. The main school types concerned in the study are secondary school types. As it is stated in the online document ‘Turkish National Education System’, secondary school education is categorized into two: General Secondary Education and Vocational and Technical Secondary Education. The Former one includes General High Schools, Anatolian High Schools, Science High Schools, Social Sciences High Schools, Multi-Programmed High Schools and some other subject specific Anatolian High Schools. On the other hand, the latter one includes Technical High Schools, Vocational High School, Trade High Schools, Tourism High Schools, and İmam Hatip High Schools.

EFL education starts in 2nd grade in Turkey. During the primary education, which is compulsory until the end of 8th grade, students have 2 hours in 2nd, 3rd and 4th grades and 4 hours of English courses every week for the following years till the end of primary education. By the way, educational year includes almost 180 days of education which means 36 weeks. Therefore, all the students in Turkish National Education System have almost 790 hours of

EFL course on average before they start secondary education. The participants in our study started their EFL courses at their schools in 4th grades because of the curriculum of their time.

Keeping this number of courses in mind, it is reasonable to see the number of EFL courses in high school types. To the curriculums which are derived from the website of Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education, high schools have following numbers of EFL courses. Table 4 displays the number of compulsory English classes for each year in different high schools of Turkish Education System.

Table 4

English Class Hours in Some Types of High Schools in Turkey.

Type of High Schools	Number of EFL Hours in Schools						Total Number of EFL Classes in High School Education + EFL Hours from Primary Education
	Prep (if included in school curriculum)	Grades	9th Grade	10th Grade	11th Grade	12th Grade	
General High Schools			3	2	2	2	324+648 (972 hours)
Anatolian High Schools	Optional Year-20 Hours	Prep	6	4	4	4	648+648 (1296 hours)
Science High Schools			7	3	3	3	576+648 (1224 hours)
Social Sciences High Schools	20		6	3	3	3	1260+648(1908 hours)
Vocational, Fine Arts, and Commercial High Schools			3	2	2	2	324 +648 (972 hours)

At this point it is reasonable to provide general information about the hours of EFL courses in prep schools of university education to have a general understanding about what these amounts mean. The education of EFL in prep schools is generally conducted with 26 hours which might change from 20 to 30 hours obviously depending on the university itself and reaches almost 780 hours. Therefore, the table above suggests that all the students in the education system of Turkey have EFL courses more than a prep school student has at university. The variety of EFL hours between school types is discussed in terms of learner strategy use and self-esteem in data in Chapter IV.

Summary of the Chapter

In this chapter, literature review of the research issues is provided. At first, learner strategies are discussed with a perspective starting from very early approaches to learning and education. Comments on the role of learner throughout the history of education played a critical role to set the way of presenting learner strategies in the first section. And then, the development of learner strategies is mentioned with the help of leading scholars' ideas and categorizations. As the other issues the study deals with, self-esteem and reasons for success and failure are presented providing definitions and history of their development.

Following the definitions and historical background of key terms in the study, the studies dealing with the correlations between learner strategy use, self-esteem, and self-perception of achievement are presented. The results of the studies indicated that there is a significant correlation between learner strategy use, self-esteem and self-perception of achievement. The results are mentioned broadly again in the analysis of results and conclusion chapters of the study.

In the final section before the summary, brief information about the secondary school types in Turkish National Education System and general information about the hours of EFL courses both in primary education and secondary education is provided. The provided

information is evaluated in relation to learner strategy use and self-esteem among vocational college students who participated in the study in Chapter IV.

Chapter III: Methodology

In this chapter, firstly, a brief explanation of research types used in the field of applied linguistics is provided. Some scholars' categorizations in the field are presented, and then the rationale for a survey study is introduced. Following this section, the methodology used in this study is discussed, providing detailed information about the setting, participants, data collection instruments and the procedures for data collection and analysis.

Approaches and Types of Educational Research

The categorizations of educational research types are various: qualitative and quantitative (Nunan, 1992), psychometric and naturalistic (Nunan & Bailey, 2009), primary and secondary (J.D. Brown, 1998), etc. That is, the phenomenon of educational research has been defined and categorized under various headings. Nunan and Bailey (2009) used the term 'empirical' as an umbrella term instead of primary research of J.D. Brown (1998). The term primary research was introduced by J.D. Brown (1988) and refers to the research derived from primary resources of information. To Nunan and Bailey (2009), if a research study is based on the collection of data and the analysis of data, it is called an empirical research. Nunan and Bailey (2009) mention two main classroom research traditions in their book: psychometric research tradition and naturalistic research tradition. The former one aims to measure psychological properties and psychological operations, and also is called experimental research as it is designed to test hypotheses. But the latter one aims to obtain insights into the complexities of teaching and learning through uncontrolled observation and description rather than to support any claim (Nunan & and Bailey).

The top-down categorization of research types by J.D. Brown can be accepted logical and reasonable. Razi (2010) also finds the categorization of J.D. Brown more reasonable compared to others.

Brown J.D. (1998) divides research types first into two broad sections: primary research and secondary research. For Brown, former one gathers information from primary sources such as learners and teachers of EFL or ESL. On the other hand, the second one retrieves information from secondary type of sources such as books, research studies conducted on language learning in an EFL classroom environment. Brown also calls it '*library research*'. Brown (1998) divides primary research into two sub-categories: the first one is case studies, which deal with a group or an individual to provide comments in the end in terms of EFL/ESL learning. Case studies are longitudinal as this type of study demands in-depth observation and analysis. The latter one is statistical studies which deal with group phenomena or individual behaviour. Statistical studies mostly include more than one variable or sections and aim to determine the effect of one variable on the other one/s. Similarity between variables, and the possibility of case occurrence appear to be the main issues dealt with in statistical studies.

The type of study utilized in this thesis is mainly statistical instruments of statistical studies match with the research characteristics of this study. Brown (1998) indicates that surveys, which deal with the beliefs, attitudes and characteristics of a group, and experimental studies, which aim to display the effect of an experiment in a group comparing to a control group, are the types of statistical studies. As stated at the beginning of the paragraph, the present study does not include any instructional treatment to make it experimental: the present study collected its data through questionnaires, and interviews, thus, statistical survey can be an accepted type of research for the study.

Rationale for a Statistical Survey Research Design

Doctoral dissertation of Razi (2010) provides a table of broadly selected research types. To the table of research types drawn by Razi (2010), this study can be categorized under the heading of statistical survey method of research as it focused on gathering data on

individual attitudes and utilized questionnaires, and interviews. The researcher neither had an effect on the outcomes of the study nor applied an experiment in classroom. That is, the study does not have an experimental side. Therefore, experimental research design was not needed to conduct the study. The data needed in the study is the level of learner strategy use among students, level of their self-esteem in learning English and their self-perception of achievement. It was possible to collect the data through close ended and open ended questionnaires, and interviews. The questionnaires utilized in the study were taken or adopted from some other research studies. Therefore, any piloting for the data collection instruments was not needed.

Restatement of Research Questions

For the convenience of the readers, this chapter re-mentions the research questions.

The study aims to find answers to the following questions:

RQ1. Do the vocational college students use language learning strategies? If so, to what extent?

RQ2. What are the types and frequency of language learning strategies employed by vocational college students?

RQ3-A. Does the level of strategy use vary according to the school type students graduated?

RQ3-B. Does the level of strategy use vary according to gender?

RQ4-A. What is the relationship between language learning strategy use and the level of academic self-esteem?

RQ4-B. What is the relationship between language learning strategy use and the actual achievement grades received in the English course?

RQ4-C. What is the relationship between language learning strategy use and self-perceived achievement level?

RQ5-A. What is the role of the use of language learning strategies in explaining the self-perception of achievement?

RQ5-B. How does the use of language learning strategies change in successful and unsuccessful students?

The Study

In this section of the chapter, setting, participants, data collection tools and procedures for data collection and analysis are presented in the mentioned order.

Setting.

The study was conducted in a local vocational college of Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University in the Republic of Turkey. The school accommodates mainly technical and social education programs and has 6 technical and 3 social, totally 9 departments. Two hours EFL courses per week during the academic year are provided by the school for the 1st year students as the course is compulsory for all the 1st year students at universities in Turkey according to the regulations of the Council of Higher Education. The school gives significant support to language education and encourages its students to learn to communicate in at least one foreign language. Most of the companies to which the graduates of the school apply for the vacant positions demand communicative and technical language skills in their areas.

Participants.

The study was conducted with 74 females and 220 males; totally 294 beginner and elementary level learners of English. The study was conducted in 14 classes of the school. The participants have different backgrounds of English language learning. All the participants had started learning English at the age of 10 when they were in 4th grade in primary school. Despite this fact, most of the students do not accept their previous background of learning English as an experience in language learning. As a result of this acceptance, average period of learning English among the participants seems to be around 8 years, ($\bar{X} = 7.99$). The

reason for this acceptance may be the low quality of English courses the participants attended in previous school years. Students were administered an academic self-esteem, a self-perception of achievement, and a learner strategy use questionnaire. The answers provided by participants were entered into SPSS 21.0 data analysis program. The average age level of participants is around nineteen and a half, ($\bar{X} = 19.56$). The attendance rates change depending on classes, but as the study does not aim to answer any question about the attendance; the statistics about this aspect is not reported in the study. Table 5 displays some demographic data about the participants of the study.

Table 5

Descriptive Information about the Participants of the Study (N=294)

Gender		Mean Score of English (out of 100)	Mean Age	Mean Period of Learning English (year)
Male	Female			
220	74	40,35	19.56	7.99

As the table indicates, mean end of year English test scores of the participants is ($\bar{X} = 40.35$). The students have various educational backgrounds. As the students from vocational high schools are accepted in vocational colleges without any obligation of having an exam score in the university entrance exam, the academic level of the students might be insufficient compared to the students of the other faculties at university. Most of the participants in the study are graduates of Vocational, Trade, Anatolian Technical, and Technical High Schools. Table 6 below demonstrates the types of high schools that participants graduated from and the number of students from each type of school.

Table 6

School Types and Participants

Anatolian High School	Anatolian Technical High School	General High School	Vocational High School	Trade High School	Technical High School	Other High Schools
6	30	39	159	31	16	11

Interviews with the participants.

The procedure and detailed information about interview process is provided in this chapter under the title of ‘Interviews’. A total of 40 students were interviewed by the researcher. Some of the students did not complete all the phases of the questionnaires, and also did not provide the descriptive information about themselves. Those incomplete interviews were not taken into account and were not analysed.

34 students who completed all the procedures and provided descriptive data about them were illustrated in Table 7.

Table 7

The List and Descriptive Data of the Interviewed Participants

Number of Participants	Academic Programs	School Graduated from	Perceived Success
Participant 1	Bio-Medical	Anatolian Tech. High S.	2
Participant 2	Bio-Medical	Anatolian Tech. High S.	2
Participant 3	Bio-Medical	Anatolian Tech. High S.	4
Participant 4	Energy Production	Vocational High School	4
Participant 5	Energy Production	Vocational High School	1
Participant 6	Energy Production	Vocational High School	3
Participant 7	Energy Production	Vocational High School	2
Participant 8	Energy Production	Vocational High School	2
Participant 9	Electronic	Vocational High School	2
Participant 10	Electronic	Vocational High School	4
Participant 11	Electronic	Vocational High School	1
Participant 12	Mgmt. of Energy Plants	Vocational High School	1
Participant 13	Mgmt. of Energy Plants	Technical High School	3
Participant 14	Logistics	Trade High School	3
Participant 15	Logistics	Trade High School	2
Participant 16	Logistics	Trade High School	1
Participant 17	Logistics	Trade High School	3
Participant 18	Logistics	Technical High School	2
Participant 19	Logistics	General High School	2
Participant 20	Tech. of Mining	General High School	4
Participant 21	Tech. of Mining	General High School	2
Participant 22	Tech. of Mining	Trade High School	2
Participant 23	Tech. of Mining	Others	3
Participant 24	Tech. of Mining	General High School	3
Participant 25	Tech. of Mining	Vocational High School	1
Participant 26	Tech. of Mining	General High School	3
Participant 27	Mechatronics	Vocational High School	3
Participant 28	Mechatronics	Technical High School	2
Participant 29	Mechatronics	Anatolian Tech. High S.	3
Participant 30	Mechatronics	Vocational High School	2
Participant 31	Mechatronics	Anatolian Tech. High S.	4
Participant 32	Mechatronics	Others	3
Participant 33	Accounting	General High School	3
Participant 34	Accounting	General High School	2

As displayed in the table, five Anatolian Technical High Schools, twelve Vocational High Schools, three Technical High Schools, five Trade High Schools, and seven General High Schools students were interviewed totally. Two students did not indicate the schools they graduated. All the other interviewees had started to learn English in the fourth grade when they were in primary school. Therefore, they had 8 or 9 years of experience in learning English when they were interviewed. They all attend technical programs but graduated from different schools and have a perception of success ranging from 1 (never successful) to 4 (always successful).

12 subsamples of all these interviews were chosen to be analysed deeply and thus provide qualitatively rich data for discussions on the research questions. Subsamples are participants' numbers: 1, 3, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 20, 21, 25, 27, and 32. The new group of interviewees were given letters from A to L (1-A, 3-B, 9-C, 10-D, 11-E, 16-F, 17-G, 20-H, 21-I, 25-J, 27-K, and 32-L) concerning the order mentioned above. These participants were chosen according to the perceived success rates in order to represent all the interviewed groups of students. Consequently, subsamples include three 'never successful', three 'rarely successful', three 'sometimes successful', and three 'usually successful' category of students. The group include four females and eight males. Table 8 indicates the descriptive information of subsamples.

Table 8

Subsamples of the Interviewed Students

Name	Gender	Academic Programme	School Graduated from	Perceived Success
Participant A	Female	Bio-Medical	Anatolian Tech. High S.	2
Participant B	Male	Bio-Medical	Anatolian Tech. High S.	4
Participant C	Female	Electronic	Vocational High School	2
Participant D	Male	Electronic	Vocational High School	4
Participant E	Male	Electronic	Vocational High School	1
Participant F	Male	Logistics	Trade High School	1
Participant G	Female	Logistics	Trade High School	3
Participant H	Male	Tech. of Mining	General High School	4
Participant I	Female	Tech. of Mining	General High School	2
Participant J	Male	Tech. of Mining	Vocational High School	1
Participant K	Male	Mechatronics	Vocational High School	3
Participant L	Male	Mechatronics	Others	3

Subsamples include 3 students from each perceived success level. Therefore it might be accepted as a sufficient representation of the interviewed students.

Materials and Instruments.

In this section, the data collection tools of the study are provided with their data of reliability and validity. First, a literature review related to the topic was carried out and some studies and instruments were studied by the researcher in order to retrieve the proper data collection tools for the study.

Strategy inventory for language learning.

In order to collect the data of language learning strategy use among the participants, a Turkish version of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford R. (1990) was used. The questionnaire developed by Oxford R. (pp.293-300) was the main source of instrument for the study. A version of SILL translated into Turkish was studied by Cesur O.

and Fer S. (2007) in terms of reliability and validity. Their study was applied to 768 English Prep Class students from seven different universities such as Bogazici University, Istanbul Technical University, Yildiz Technical University, Sabanci University, Maltepe University, Bahcesehir University, and Istanbul Bilgi University in Istanbul, Turkey. In their study, for internal consistent reliability of the Turkish version questionnaire, Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanteri (DÖSE) (see Appendix I), they revealed a total cronbach alfa score of $\alpha = .92$ for all the items in the questionnaire. Actually, a study including more than 1000 participants would be needed to analyse the reliability and validity of such a questionnaire including 50 items. Therefore, the number of the participants can be accepted as a limitation of their study. As it is cited in their study, Tercanlioğlu (2004) revealed a cronbach alfa score of $\alpha = .89$ and Altan (2004) found a cronbach alfa score of $\alpha = .94$. Taking those internal consistent reliability scores, it can be stated that the Turkish version of SILL, DÖSE can be utilized as an instrument.

It is stated in the study of Cesur O. and Fer S. (2007), factor analysis was applied to reveal the construct validity and found out 6 main categories including direct strategies such as memory strategies, cognitive strategies, and compensation strategies, and indirect strategies such as metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and socio-affective strategies. They state that their results pointed at six different factors which showed a total variance of (.42). This result points at construct validity of the instrument.

Questionnaire of academic self-esteem in learning English.

In order to measure the academic self-esteem level of participants in learning English, a questionnaire, Academic Self-Esteem Questionnaire (see Appendix II), used in a study by Lipnevich A. A. (2006) was translated into Turkish by two professional interpreters and adopted to use in the present study (see Appendix III). Original form of the questionnaire was designed to measure general academic self-esteem in school subjects. The questions included

an overview of one's perception of self-esteem for all school subjects. The questions in that instrument were adapted to measure self-esteem in learning a foreign language. As it is stated in her study, Lipnevich based the questionnaire on a survey by Pentelev (1993). Global self-esteem and other components were excluded: only the academic self-esteem section was included in the study.¹

The new developed questionnaire was named as Academic Self-Esteem in Learning English Questionnaire (İngilizce Öğreniminde Akademik Özsaygı Anketi, see Appendix III). 5 questions were answered on a 5-likert scale (Never true-1, Rarely true-2, Sometimes true-3, Often true-4, Always true-5). The answers to the third item, which was written negatively comparing to the other items, were re-coded in a way that the negative answers had 1 (Never true) and the positive ones 5 (Always true) in statistical terms.

To reveal the internal consistency reliability of the developed questionnaire, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient value is calculated with SPSS 21. The value for the 5 items about academic confidence displays a marginal reliability level with $\alpha = .78$. Thus, the Turkish version can be used as an acceptable instrument in terms of internal consistency reliability.

Questionnaire of perception of success and failure in learning English.

The third instrument of data collection is Questionnaire of Perception for Success and Failure in Learning English (QPSFLE). The questionnaire was retrieved from the study of Williams, Burden, Poulet and Maun (2004) and was translated into Turkish by two interpreters. It includes two main parts. The first one aims to collect quantitative data about the success perceptions of the students and the latter part is designed to collect data about their reasons for success and failure in a qualitative data collection way.

The first question is a statement: 'I like learning English'. The students expressed their idea about this statement on a 4-point likert-scale (Disagree-1, Partially Agree-2, Agree -3,

Certainly Agree-4). Initially, students responded to the question above. Following the first question, they were asked whether they perceived themselves successful or not. Answers were coded in 4-likert scale (usually successful-4, sometimes successful-3, rarely successful-2, never successful-1).

Subsequently, they were demanded to provide details about their self-perception of achievement completing the phrases ‘When I am successful, the main reasons are....’, and ‘When I fail, the main reasons are....’ As aforementioned, semi-structured, open-ended questions in this part of the questionnaire aim to reveal the students’ perceptions about success and failure. The responses of the students for the open-ended questions were analysed and categorised according to the reasons listed by the students to account for their success and failure.

The responses to two likert-scaled questions were coded in SPSS 21. The method of categorisation was mainly retrieved from a study by Williams, Burden, Poulet and Maun (2004). The categorised reasons are ‘effort’, ‘strategy use’, ‘ability’, ‘mood’, ‘behaviours’, ‘personal organisation’, ‘need/importance’, ‘interest’, ‘teacher’, ‘task’, ‘ease of the tasks or the subject itself’, ‘peers’, ‘circumstances’, ‘teaching materials’, ‘time’, ‘other people’, ‘family’, ‘rewards’, and ‘luck’.

Interviews.

As a phase of qualitative data collection, 40 semi-structured interviews were arranged with voluntary students. Through these semi-structured interviews, the role of language learning strategies among other reasons of success and failure perception is explored. More than 50 students were invited by the researcher on the basis of their success and failure perceptions stated by them. 40 of them agreed to be interviewed. Interviews were conducted to recheck the reasons expressed by the interviewees previously in open-ended questionnaire and to reveal new reasons behind their perceptions of success or failure. Each student was

interviewed for 5-6 minutes. The questions that were posed to the students during the interviews are in the interview protocol (Appendix V). 11 female and 23 male participants attended the interview sessions. 4 students out of 40 did not complete the other phases of the data collection in the study. Therefore they were excluded in the analysis. Three perceived themselves as 'never successful', three perceived '*rarely successful*', nineteen perceived 'sometimes successful', and eleven perceived '*usually successful*' in learning English. Prior to the interviews, students were informed about the aim of the interviews. All interviews were guided by the same interview protocol (Appendix V) in general. The questions were posed to the students to guide their thoughts and feelings but not aimed to control the responses. By guiding and opening the pathways through the interviews, the students provided varying responses in detail.

According to the perception of success and failure by the students, some extra questions were added to reveal the main reason or some other factors such as the use of language learning strategies, interest in English, and some other serendipitous effects. All the interviews were conducted in Turkish and tape-recorded. Findings of the interviews were analysed and categorised according to perception of success and failure, language learning strategy use, and whether the students like or dislike learning English.

Interviews were conducted and transcribed in Turkish and carefully evaluated to develop emerging patterns. Research questions 1, 2, and 5A were the main concern in the analysis procedure of interviews. The main focus was to transcribe every detail that was stated by the participants. This way of analysis is stated as 'open coding' by Strauss & Corbin (1990). To categorise the retrieved data appropriately, connections among the emerging categories mentioned by the interviewees were analysed as in 'axial coding' technique. All the procedures such as transcriptions, analysis, translating the transcriptions into English were carried out together with the help of another researcher who is working as an English

Instructor in the School of Foreign Languages at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University. In cases of contradictions between researchers, discussions were carried out until a consensus was reached. Analysis of the qualitative data obtained through the interviews is reported together with quantitative data in Chapter IV.

Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis

The study was conducted at the school where the researcher was an instructor of English classes. Therefore, the classes and the participants were the ones who the researcher taught English 2 hours per week. The quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures which are explained in detail in this section were applied after the class hours and during breaks.

Initially, the researcher held a briefing with the students to inform them of the purposes and design of the study and the data collection procedures. This uniform procedure was applied with all the groups to collect questionnaire data. The quantitative data was collected with three questionnaires. The Turkish version of SILL (DÖSE) was administered to the students to reveal the extent of the learner strategy use among students. And then, to study the academic self-esteem levels of participants in learning English, the adapted version of Academic Self-Esteem questionnaire was delivered to the participants. In order to find out about their self-perception of achievement, a 5 scaled-questionnaire was delivered.

Following the collection of quantitative data, qualitative data was collected with two instruments. The latter part of the QPSFLE includes semi-structured and open-ended statements. Students were also asked to write down their reasons or thoughts about their perceptions of achievement and their reasons for success and failure. The qualitative data obtained through the questionnaire was analysed and reasons expressed by the students were categorized according to the table by Williams, Burden, Poulet and Maun (2004).

The following phase includes interviews which were conducted to cross-check and to find out about other reasons for the answers to the questionnaire of self-perception of achievement. 34 students were chosen from high, medium and low level perceived success groups and those students were interviewed about their reasons for success and failure. Later on, the responses to the questions by participants were analysed and categorized with the same method applied for the open-ended part of QPSFLE.

All the quantitative data was entered into SPSS 21.00 data analysis program. The statistical calculations were carried out to reveal the data such as frequency values, descriptive information, correlations between the obtained values. Initially, for all types of calculations, tests of normality were conducted in order to decide the type of tests to conduct. For differences between multiple values of the data Anova and Kruskal Wallis tests were conducted. Mann Whitney U Tests and Independent Sample T-Tests were conducted to reveal the differences between two groups of participants. Regression analysis was applied in order to reveal the prediction levels between some variables. The results, findings and analysis are discussed in Chapter IV.

With the help of study's findings, the author aims to reveal the relation between the use of learner strategies and academic self- esteem, gender, the type of graduated high school and self-perception of achievement, differences between genders in terms of some variables and also prediction levels between some issues in the study. The findings and the discussion in the study also provide detailed information on 'what type of learner strategies are related to self- esteem in learning English and positive self-perception of achievement and the type of graduated high school.'

Summary of the Chapter

In this chapter, initially, approaches and types of educational research were introduced providing various categorizations and views from leading scholars of the area. Following the

overall view of the educational research, rationale for the present study is discussed. It is stated that among the research types, statistical survey research design could be accepted as a method to conduct the present study.

The details about the setting and the participants of the study are also included in the chapter. Quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments and the procedures for data collection and analysis are introduced in detail at the end of chapter.

Chapter IV: Findings and Discussions

This chapter introduces the results retrieved from the statistical analysis of students' responses to the questions in the data collection tools and discusses the findings related to the results by referring to previous studies carried out in the field.

Initially, the quantitative data was entered into SPSS 21.00 data analysis program. For research questions 1, 2, 4A, 4B, 4C, and 5A frequency values, descriptive data and mean values of the responses of the students were studied. To reveal the results for research questions 4A, 4B, and 4C, Pearson's correlation calculations were studied. Results for research question 3A, Anova analysis, Kruskal Wallis and Mann-Whitney U Tests were utilized since the dependent variables, which were studied on, demonstrated both parametric and non-parametric results and independent variable contained more than two groups (Büyüköztürk Ş. 2010). For the analysis of research question 3B and 5B, independent sample t-test was conducted. Subsequently, for research 4B and 5A, regression analysis was carried out to reveal the prediction level of issues in the question (Büyüköztürk Ş. 2010). The qualitative data obtained from the interviews was analysed and studied under the analysis of related questions.

The results from both quantitative and qualitative data are presented together with the findings of previous studies on the issues discussed in this study. This chapter also draws some conclusions based on the findings of the study when answering each research question.

Restatement of Research Questions of the Study

Since this chapter reports the results of the analysis and discusses the answers to the research questions, revising them would be critical at this point.

The research questions of the study are:

RQ1. Do the vocational college students use language learning strategies? If so, to what extent?

RQ2. What are the types and frequency of language learning strategies employed by vocational college students?

RQ3-A. Does the level of strategy use vary according to the school type students graduated?

RQ3-B. Does the level of strategy use vary according to gender?

RQ4-A. What is the relationship between language learning strategy use and the level of academic self-esteem?

RQ4-B. What is the relationship between language learning strategy use and the actual achievement grades received in the English course?

RQ4-C. What is the relationship between language learning strategy use and self-perceived achievement level?

RQ5-A. What is the role of the use of language learning strategies in explaining the self-perception of achievement?

RQ5-B. How does the use of language learning strategies change in successful and unsuccessful students?

Findings and Discussions of the Research Questions

The collected data was analysed using SPSS 21. In order to report the descriptive values of the study and the participants, and to reveal answers for the research questions; descriptive and frequency reports including mean values, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values of the data, Pearson's bivariate correlation calculations, and post hoc analysis using the Scheffé post hoc criterion for significance were studied. The reports of the analysis were presented in APA academic writing criterion.

Findings and discussions of research question 1.

RQ1. Do the vocational college students use language learning strategies? If so, to what extent?

At the initial stage of the study, participants were asked to state their use of language learning strategies. According to analysis of study, use of strategies in language learning change in a range from ($\bar{X} = 1.02$) at minimum to ($\bar{X} = 4.00$) at maximum among participants. Overall mean value for all the participants was ($\bar{X} = 2.50$) with a standard deviation of .59). Oxford (1990) proposes a scale for evaluating the mean values for strategy use; Table 9 displays the scale provided by Oxford.

Table 9

Key to Understand the Averages for Using Learning Strategies

Level	What the Level Means	Score
High	Always or almost always used	4.5 to 5.0
	Usually used	3.5 to 4.4
Medium	Sometimes used	2.5 to 3.4
Low	Generally not used	1.5 to 2.4
	Never or almost never used	1.0 to 1.4

The mean value retrieved from the analysis is ($X = 2.50$), which suggests that the participants of the study utilize the strategies for language learning at a medium level according to the categorization presented in Table 9.

The least frequent strategies coded by the participants in the questionnaire are reported as following; ‘The item 47 ‘*I practise English with other students - Okulda arkadaşlarımla İngilizce konuşurum.*’ ($\bar{X} = 1.52$), the item 17 ‘*I write notes, messages, letters, or reports in English - İngilizce mesaj, mektup veya rapor yazarım.*’ ($\bar{X} = 1.54$), the item 43 ‘*While learning a language, I write down my feelings.-Dil öğrenirken yaşadığım duyguları bir yere yazarım.*’ ($\bar{X} = 1.59$), the item 23 ‘*I write down the summary of the text that I listen or read-Dinlediğim ya da okuduğum metnin özetini çıkarırım.*’ ($\bar{X} = 1.66$), and

the item 14 '*I start English chats-İngilizce sohbetleri ben başlatırım.*' ($\bar{x} = 1.82$). The three of five least frequently referred to items are direct-cognitive strategies. The other two strategies including one affective and one socio-affective are indirect strategies.

On the other hand, the item 32 ($\bar{x} = 3.48$) '*I pay attention when someone is speaking in English - İngilizce konuşan bir kişi duyduğumda dikkatimi ona veririm.*' and the item 45 ($\bar{x} = 3.30$) '*If I don't understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again - Herhangi bir şeyi anlamadığımda, karşımdaki kişiden daha yavaş konuşmasını ya da söylediklerini tekrar etmesini isterim.*', the item 24 '*I try to guess and find out the meaning of the English words that I do not know.- Bilmediğim İngilizce kelimelerin anlamını, tahmin ederek bulmaya çalışırım.*' ($\bar{x} = 3.25$), the item 33 '*I search the answer to the question of 'How can I learn English better?'- 'İngilizce'yi daha iyi nasıl öğrenirim?' sorusunun yanıtını araştırırım.*' ($\bar{x} = 3.24$), and the item 46 '*When I talk, I expect the listener to correct my mistakes.- Konuşurken karşımdakinin yanlışlarımı düzeltmesini isterim.*' ($\bar{x} = 3.12$) are the most frequent strategies among participants. Almost all of the most frequent strategies except '*I try to guess and find out the meaning of the English words that I do not know.- Bilmediğim İngilizce kelimelerin anlamını, tahmin ederek bulmaya çalışırım.*' are indirect strategies, two are metacognitive and the other two are socio-affective strategies.

In addition to the quantitative data from the questionnaire, the study collected qualitative data through the interviews about use of language learning strategy use.

Participant A, a student who graduated from an Anatolian Technical high school, declared a lack of strategy use. She recalled: '*..... I do not practice after the classes.*'

Participant K uttered: '*I do not revise what we learned.*' The same lack of strategy use was reported by participants E, F, I, and J, indicating a reason that they do not even like learning English.

Other participants stated that they also employed some strategies. For example: Participant B, who graduated from an Anatolian high school, stated how he used language learning strategies: *'I worked in Kuşadası (a town which is a tourist attraction in Turkey). I have foreign friends there, thus, we are always in contact in English and talk in English.'*

Participant C, a student who graduated from a vocational high school, uttered: *'When I revise with my friends, I become successful trying various strategies. I revise the notes that my previous teachers handed out. ... I practise and revise with my friends mostly before the exams.'*

Participant D, a student who came from a vocational high school, recalled: *'I watch movies which are subtitled in English. By the way, I learn also from computer games and I have some foreign friends and talk to them in English.'* He also indicated a negative effect of not using a strategy stating: *'I know that this will affect me badly when I do not revise what I learn in class.'* This statement indicates that he revises what he learns after the class.

Participant G, a student from a trade high school, also mentioned about some direct strategies. She uttered: *'I attended a course when I was in 11th grade. It was useful for me. I contacted some people from abroad. It was also useful. I have recently started to watch movies subtitled in English and study from books.'*

Participant H, a student from a general high school, expressed a use of cognitive strategy and a help from a family member. He stated: *'.... for example: Even when I play a game, I form English sentences. I ask my elder brother the things that I couldn't cope with. My elder brother is an English teacher and he encourages me. ...'*

Some participants stated the lack of strategy use as a reason for failure. Participant K stated: *'I forget when I do not revise and this leads me towards failure.'*

The homework studies by the students also provide some information about this category of reason. During the year, almost more than 900 students were assigned homework

but only 110 studies of homework were received from the students. This case also approves the high percentage of lack of strategy and lack of effort as reason for failure.

As it can be inferred from the statements by the students that the participants use language learning strategies but with a lack of direction. Both quantitative and qualitative analyses display the use of language learning strategies by vocational college students.

Findings and discussions of research question 2.

RQ2. What are the types and frequency of language learning strategies employed by vocational college students?

With the analysis of the data, the study also tried to find out the least and the most frequent strategy types. The direct strategies are cited with a mean value of ($\bar{x} = 2.47$) which displays a ‘moderate level of usage’ according to Oxford and the indirect strategies are chosen by students with a mean value of ($\bar{x} = 2.56$) which also demonstrates a ‘moderate level of usage’. The result indicates that there is not a significant difference between the uses of both main categories of strategies. Table 10 displays the mean uses of strategy types.

Table 10

Mean Uses of Language Learning Strategy Types

Language Learning Strategy Types	Use of Strategy Type
Cognitive strategies	2.34
Compensation strategies	2.59
Memory strategies	2.49
Meta-cognitive strategies	2.73
Affective strategies	2.36
Social strategies	2.61

To analyse more specifically the sub categories of main strategy types, the study reports that '*cognitive strategies*' are the least employed strategies by the students with a mean value of ($\bar{X}=2.34$) and followed by '*affective strategies*' ($\bar{X}=2.36$), '*memory strategies*' ($\bar{X}=2.49$), '*compensation strategies*' ($\bar{X}=2.59$), '*social strategies*' ($\bar{X}=2.61$) and '*meta-cognitive strategies*' which are the most frequent strategy type with a mean value of ($\bar{X}=2.73$).

The utterances by the participants in the interviews are reported in the analysis of research question 1. It might be inferred from these utterances that the students utilize mostly memory, cognitive and socio-affective strategies. Among the strategies reported by the students; '*watching movies with English subtitles*', and '*studying and revising with friends*' are the most commonly cited ones.

Salashour et al. (2012) reports similar results in Iranian high school context. The age of participant in their study is 17 (young adult learners of English). The same as in the present study, they reported '*metacognitive strategy*' use ($\bar{X}=3.2$) with the highest frequency and '*cognitive strategy*' use ($\bar{X}=2.65$) with the lowest frequency.

The study of Sun M. (2009) was conducted with 250 students in a technological university and reported medium level of overall strategy use among the participants. Compensation and metacognitive strategies were the most common strategy types. On the other hand, affective strategies were the least common. Su M.M. (2005) also resulted in medium level of overall strategy use among 419 vocational college students in Taiwan. Social learning strategies ($\bar{X}=3.04$) were the most common strategies but memory strategies ($\bar{X}=2.65$) were the least common strategies. Ghavamnia et al. (2011) reports a different order of strategy use in their study conducted in Department of English at the University of Isfahan. '*Cognitive strategy*' indicates the highest frequency ($\bar{X}=3.81$), '*metacognitive strategy*' use the second highest one ($\bar{X}=3.39$) and '*socio-affective strategy*' use the lowest frequency (\bar{X}

=2.88). Their results might have indicated a different order of strategy use as the study conducted in Department of English of a university. As the reported results of some previous studies suggest, the frequency of different types of strategy use is varied.

According to quantitative results, the study indicates that the participants utilize cognitive strategies which demands physical effort or time with the least frequency but on the other hand, they seem to utilize '*metacognitive strategies*' which demands less physical effort and time but more planning and self-evaluation with the highest frequency. The usage level of '*metacognitive strategies*' are moderate according to Oxford's averages of language learning strategy use.

On the other hand, when the students were interviewed, '*watching films with English subtitles*' which is a strategy reflecting cognitive properties was cited the most frequently by them.

The medium level of strategy use and not having a type of strategy that the students to report significantly different from the other types might be the result of not being instructed about the use of language learning strategies in the present year and previous years when they were taught English. Since, there has not been a study discussing the use of language learning strategy use, it is not easy to compare the findings or refer to the discussion from a study. The studies, (Salashour et al., 2012; Ghavamnia et al., 2011) reported above, are the studies conducted in different context and not in Turkish context. To that extend, the findings of the present study are critical.

The relation between mean strategy use and mean exam scores is not the issue concerned in the study but it may open a pathway for a further study to mention some points. Although the participants use language learning strategies at a medium level, the overall exam scores is below average ($\bar{X}=40.35$). Contradicting levels of mean strategy use and mean exam scores might be explained only with the non-efficient strategy use by the participants.

Findings and discussions of research question 3A.

RQ3-A. Does the level of strategy use vary according to the school type students graduated?

Initially, to test the normality of the data, independent sample test is applied to overall mean strategy use values. Table 11 displays the normality of the data to be studied on.

Table 11

Test of Normality of Mean Language Learning Strategy Use

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Mean	Language Learning Strategy Use	.038	294	.200	.996	294	.700

Kolmogorov –Simirnov values is taken into account as 294 participants are included in the study. Significance of normality is ($p > .05$). Therefore, the data is parametric. Thus, Anova analysis can be applied to see the change in language learning strategy use according to the types of schools.

The study was conducted with 294 students graduated from 7 different schools. The mean language learning strategy use according to school type is indicated in Table 12.

Table 12

Descriptive Information about Schools According to Mean Values of Strategy Use (N = 294)

Schools	Mean Values of Language Learning Strategy Use			
	\bar{X}	SD	Maximum	Minimum
Anatolian High Schools	2.85	.45	3.40	2.32
Anatolian Technical High Schools	2.43	.57	3.60	1.02
General High Schools	2.56	.53	3.54	1.44
Vocational High Schools	2.50	.56	3.88	1.08
Trade High Schools	2.39	.74	4.00	1.16
Technical High Schools	2.38	.60	3.68	1.48
Other High Schools	2.81	.56	3.84	1.86
Total	2.50	.58	4.00	1.02

The table indicates that the students who came from trade high schools and technical high schools use language learning strategies at low level. On the other hand, the students from all the other schools use learning strategies at medium level.

Table 13 indicates change in language learning strategies according to types of schools the participants graduated from. To calculate the change, post hoc analysis using the Scheffé post hoc criterion was applied.

Table 13

*Multiple Comparisons between High Schools according to Language Learning Strategy Use**(N=294)*

(I) School Types	(J) School Types	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Anatolian High School	Anatolian Tech. High School	.41200	.25897	.864	-.5139	1.3379
	General High School	.29077	.25394	.971	-.6171	1.1987
	Vocational High School	.34428	.24082	.915	-.5167	1.2053
	Trade High School	.45634	.25827	.793	-.4671	1.3797
	Technical High School	.46542	.27721	.831	-.5257	1.4565
	Others	.03576	.29389	1.000	-1.0150	1.0865
Anatolian Technical High School	Anatolian High School	-.41200	.25897	.864	-1.3379	.5139
	General High School	-.12123	.14063	.993	-.6240	.3815
	Vocational High School	-.06772	.11527	.999	-.4798	.3444
	Trade High School	.04434	.14831	1.000	-.4859	.5746
	Technical High School	.05342	.17926	1.000	-.5875	.6943
	Others	-.37624	.20411	.757	-1.1060	.3535
General High School	Anatolian High School	-.29077	.25394	.971	-1.1987	.6171
	Anatolian Tech. High School	.12123	.14063	.993	-.3815	.6240
	Vocational High School	.05351	.10347	1.000	-.3164	.4235
	Trade High School	.16557	.13934	.965	-.3326	.6637
	Technical High School	.17465	.17192	.984	-.4400	.7893
	Others	-.25501	.19769	.947	-.9618	.4518

	Anatolian High School	-.34428	.24082	.915	-1.2053	.5167
Vocational	Anatolian Tech. High School	.06772	.11527	.999	-.3444	.4798
High	General High School	-.05351	.10347	1.000	-.4235	.3164
School	Trade High School	.11207	.11369	.986	-.2944	.5186
	Technical High School	.12114	.15188	.996	-.4219	.6641
	Others	-.30852	.18054	.818	-.9540	.3369
	Anatolian High School	-.45634	.25827	.793	-1.3797	.4671
Trade	Anatolian Tech. High School	-.04434	.14831	1.000	-.5746	.4859
High	General High School	-.16557	.13934	.965	-.6637	.3326
School	Vocational High School	-.11207	.11369	.986	-.5186	.2944
	Technical High School	.00907	.17825	1.000	-.6282	.6464
	Others	-.42059	.20323	.639	-1.1472	.3060
	Anatolian High School	-.46542	.27721	.831	-1.4565	.5257
Technical	Anatolian Tech. High School	-.05342	.17926	1.000	-.6943	.5875
High	General High School	-.17465	.17192	.984	-.7893	.4400
School	Vocational High School	-.12114	.15188	.996	-.6641	.4219
	Trade High School	-.00907	.17825	1.000	-.6464	.6282
	Others	-.42966	.22681	.732	-1.2406	.3812
	Anatolian High School	-.03576	.29389	1.000	-1.0865	1.0150
	Anatolian Tech. High School	.37624	.20411	.757	-.3535	1.1060
Others	General High School	.25501	.19769	.947	-.4518	.9618
	Vocational High School	.30852	.18054	.818	-.3369	.9540
	Trade High School	.42059	.20323	.639	-.3060	1.1472
	Technical High School	.42966	.22681	.732	-.3812	1.2406

As Table 13 indicates, there is no significant difference between schools in terms of using language learning strategies. Post hoc analysis of mean strategy use values between and within schools is displayed in Table 14. As the results do not indicate any difference direction of differences is not indicated with a value.

Table 14

Anova Analysis of Strategy Use Differences between Seven School Types

Schools	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between School	2.632	6	.439	1.308	.253
Within schools	95.568	285	.335		
Total	98.199	291			

To sum up, educational background difference does not play any significant role on language learning strategy use. Normally, Anatolian High Schools are accepted as one of the leading school types in terms of qualified education among the other school types. Anatolian High School has the second place in the list of schools mentioned in present study. Schools such as Vocational High School, Trade High School and Tourisms might be accepted as lower level ones comparing two schools noted before. So, what explains the insignificant difference in terms of language learning strategy use? This might be because of the overall academic level of the students. As it is stated before, vocational colleges do not prerequisite any mark for most of their departments according to the rules of the Council of Higher Education in Turkey. Therefore, students in vocational colleges are mostly low academic level students. Even if they have graduated from qualified schools, students might have low academic levels. The lack of ability might be accepted as a proof of this hypothesis. This case, which is explained above, might have caused the present result.

Another reason might be learning English background. As noted previously, poor background of English is a significant reason among the others. Students reported poor qualified English teachers and teaching methods in their previous schools even in western cities of Turkey, the area which is accepted to provide a better education compared to the other regions of Turkey. Having poor quality of language education might have caused an insignificant difference among schools.

On the other hand, the levels of using different language learning strategy types are different according to the analysis of research question 2. The study also revealed a difference between the school types the participant graduated from in terms of using different language learning types.

Initially, the procedure carried out for the analysis of the previous question was also applied for the present question. The data normality of the use of language learning strategy types is tested using independent sample test. Table 15 displays the analysis of normality.

Table 15

Test of Normality of Mean Language Learning Strategy Use

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Mean Memory Strategy Use	.058	294	.018	.992	294	.102
Mean Cognitive Strategy Use	.060	294	.014	.979	294	.000
Mean Compensation Strategy Use	.074	294	.000	.981	294	.001
Mean Metacognitive Strategy Use	.053	294	.049	.991	294	.064
Mean Affective Strategy Use	.066	294	.003	.980	294	.000
Mean Socio-affective Strategy Use	.073	294	.001	.980	294	.000

Kolmogorov –Simirnov values is taken into account as 294 participants are included in the study. Significance of normality is ($p < .05$). Therefore, the data is non-parametric, thus, Kruskal Wallis Test can be applied to see the change in language learning strategy use according to the types of schools. Table 16 displays the Kruskal Wallis Test of language learning types' mean use.

Table 16

Kruskall Vallis Test of Language Learning Strategy Types' Mean Use

<i>Types of Strategies</i>	Chi-Square	<i>df</i>	Asymp. Sig.
Memory Strategy Use	9.381	6	.153
Cognitive Strategy Use	9.805	6	.133
Compensation Strategy Use	15.459	6	.017
Metacognitive Strategy Use	7.205	6	.302
Affective Strategy Use	8.948	6	.177
Socio-affective Strategy Use	2.375	6	.882

Kruskall Vallis test results indicates that there is a change in compensation strategy use among the participant according to the schools they graduated from ($p < .05$). Concerning the result mentioned above, Mann-Whitney U test was applied to see the difference between school types in terms of compensation strategy use. The differences are indicated in the 'Difference' section of Table 17. The table illustrates the mean ranks of the school types according to use of strategy. As the use of other strategy types apart from compensation strategy does not refer to any difference according to Kruskal Vallis analysis, Mann-Whitney U Test was not applied for them.

Table 17

Mann-Whitney U Test Results of Changes among the School Types the Students Graduated from according to the Types of Language Strategy Use

Mean Str. Use	Graduated School Type	N	Mean Rank	sd	\bar{x}^2	p*	Difference
Memory Strategy Use	(1) Anatolian High School	6	173.83	6			
	(2) Anatolian Tech. High S.	30	143.93	6			
	(3) General High School	39	169.37	6			
	(4) Vocational High School	159	143.28	6	9.381	.153	-
	(5) Trade High School	31	119.27	6			
	(6) Technical High School	16	143.25	6			
	(7) Others	11	185.55	6			
Cognitive Strategy Use	(1) Anatolian High School	6	233.83	6			
	(2) Anatolian Tech. High S.	30	145.70	6			
	(3) General High School	39	142.54	6			
	(4) Vocational High School	159	142.26	6	9.805	.133	-
	(5) Trade High School	31	146.40	6			
	(6) Technical High School	16	138.31	6			
	(7) Others	11	188.59	6			
Compensation Strategy Use	(1) Anatolian High School	6	225.17	6			
	(2) Anatolian Tech. High S.	30	135.67	6			
	(3) General High School	39	128.67	6			
	(4) Vocational High School	159	156.64	6	15.459	.017	(1-2), (1-3), (1-4), (1-5), (1-6), (4-5)
	(5) Trade High School	31	118.03	6			
	(6) Technical High School	16	120.91	6			
	(7) Others	11	167.27	6			

Metacognitive Strategy Use	(1) Anatolian High School	6	166.83	6		
	(2) Anatolian Tech. High S.	30	147.90	6		
	(3) General High School	39	157.14	6		
	(4) Vocational High School	159	146.03	6	7.205	.302
	(5) Trade High School	31	125.45	6		
	(6) Technical High School	16	124.47	6		
	(7) Others	11	192.00	6		
Affective Strategy Use	(1) Anatolian High School	6	124.00	6		
	(2) Anatolian Tech. High S.	30	133.70	6		
	(3) General High School	39	164.05	6		
	(4) Vocational High School	159	149.61	6	8.948	.177
	(5) Trade High School	31	118.21	6		
	(6) Technical High School	16	134.75	6		
	(7) Others	11	183.36	6		
Socio-affective Strategy Use	(1) Anatolian High School	6	144.08	6		
	(2) Anatolian Tech. High S.	30	133.45	6		
	(3) General High School	39	158.73	6		
	(4) Vocational High School	159	147.39	6	2.375	.882
	(5) Trade High School	31	146.92	6		
	(6) Technical High School	16	128.25	6		
	(7) Others	11	152.55	6		

$p < .05$, 1(Anatolian High School)-2 (Anatolian Tech. High School), $p < .05$, 1(Anatolian High School)-3 (General High School), $p < .05$, 1(Anatolian High School)-4 (Vocational High School), $p < .05$, 1(Anatolian High School)-3 (Trade High School), $p < .05$, 1(Anatolian High School)-6 (Technical High School), $p < .05$, 4(Vocational High School)-5 (Trade High School).

Mann-Whitney U test results refer to a difference between the graduates of Anatolian High Schools and the graduates of some other schools such as Trade High Schools ($p < .05$), Technical High Schools ($p < .05$), General High Schools ($p < .05$), Anatolian Technical High

Schools ($p < .05$), Vocational High Schools ($p < .05$). The results also indicate a difference between Vocational and Trade High Schools. Mann-Whitney U test result point a difference a difference between Vocational High Schools and Trade High Schools ($p < .05$) with respect to compensation strategy use as indicated in Table 17.

Consequently, there might be a natural ability of compensation in a school subject among the students of Anatolian High Schools since these schools accept high level academic students. Moreover, as stated before in Chapter II students who attend these schools receive 648 hours of English language education which is one of the highest amount of teaching hours assigned to English classes among the high school types. Having high academic level and being imposed with a high amount of English language hours might have resulted in ability in compensation strategies. Actually, these variables should have affected positively not only one strategy type but also use of more strategy types in learning English. This result may also indicate that the language education system or curriculum in these schools offer techniques or strategies on how to compensate any problematic case in school subject or the overall educating system in these schools may result in an ability to compensate problematic cases.

The difference between Vocational and Trade High Schools is also critical. According to the English language teaching hours, there is not any difference between these school types. Vocational High Schools offer an education on technical issues. The result might not be because of the language education the students received in their previous education but it may be because of their technical thinking and problem solving skills that they obtain through their high school education. This point of discussion might be a suggestion for a further research.

As a conclusion, it can be inferred from the analysis that in overall language strategy use there is not a significant difference between schools the students graduated from. On the other hand, in the use of different language learning strategy types there is a significant difference between schools as aforementioned.

Findings and discussions of research question 3B.

RQ3-B. Does the level of strategy use vary according to gender?

Initially, before conducting a test to reveal the difference between gender groups, test of normality was applied to check whether the data is parametric or non-parametric. Table 18 indicates the results for the normality test of language learning strategy use according to gender.

Table 18

Test of Normality of Mean Language Learning Strategy Use according to Genders

	Gender	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Mean Language Learning	Male	.042	220	.200	.996	220	.851
Strategy Use	Female	.066	74	.200	.990	74	.830

Kolmogorov –Simirnov values is taken into account as 294 participants are included in the study. Significance of normality is ($p > .05$). Therefore, the data is parametric, thus, Independent Sample T-Test can be applied to see the difference in language learning strategy use according to genders. Table 19 displays the Independent Sample T-Test results of language learning types' mean use according to genders.

Table 19

Independent Sample T-Test Results for Language Learning Strategy Use of the Genders

Gender	N	\bar{x}	SD	df	t	p
Male	220	2.4757	.57409	292	-1.232	.219
Female	74	2.5719	.60099			

$p > .001$ is not significant.

The results of independent sample t-test analysis in the Table 19 displays the values for male group ($\bar{x} = 2.47$, $SD = .57$) and the female group ($\bar{x} = 2.57$, $SD = .60$), $t(294) = -1.232$, $p < .001$. The results indicate that there is no significant difference between genders in language learning strategy use.

In the literature, there are both consistent and inconsistent results with the present study. For example, the findings of Mahfouz A. R. I. M. & Ma'ajini O. B. H. (2013) and also Asadifard and Biria (2013) revealed no significant difference between genders. On the other hand, the study of Benjamin F. (2009) reported a difference between genders in study aids strategies.

Consequently, the study has revealed that there is not a significant difference between genders in terms of gender among the vocational college students and the result is consistent with the findings of some previous studies.

Findings and discussions of research question 4A.

RQ4-A. What is the relationship between language learning strategy use and the level of academic self-esteem?

The level of language learning strategy use among the participants is reported in the analysis of research question 1. In order to reveal the correlation between these variables, initially, the level of academic self-esteem in learning English is studied.

At the second stage of the survey, participants completed a questionnaire adapted from the questionnaire of general self-esteem in education. The instrument includes 5 questions about their academic self-esteem in learning English and a 5-likert scale. The minimum value is coded as 1.0 and the maximum value is coded as 5.0 in the analysis. Overall mean value of the self-esteem in learning English as a foreign language among participants is ($\bar{x} = 3.14$) with a standard deviation of .85). It can be revealed from the results that academic self-esteem

in learning English among participants is at a medium level. Table 20 indicates the statistical analysis of the data retrieved by ‘Questionnaire of Self-Esteem in Learning English’.

Table 20

Statistical Analysis of the Questionnaire of Self-Esteem in Learning English (N=294)

Questions	\bar{X}	SD
Q1. I can do as well or better than others in learning English.	2.83	1.18
Q2. I have a good understanding of the things I learn in English class.	2.98	1.05
Q3. My skills are stronger than other people in English class.	3.56	1.27
Q4. I can understand the ideas and skills in English class.	3.18	1.01
Q5. I am as smart as most people in learning English.	3.14	1.26

The items 1, 2, 4, and 5 are positively stated items. Therefore, the responds of the participants coded from 1 to 5 in the analysis procedure. On the other hand, the third item in the applied questionnaire recoded since it includes a negative statement. Taking into consideration this recoding, we can restate this item as ‘*My skills are stronger than other people in this class - İngilizce öğrenmedeki yeteneklerim sınıftaki diğerlerinden daha güçlüdür.*’ Restatement and recoding of the third item was analysed with the other statements. Analysis presented the values in the table above. As it is seen in the table above, the item 3 ‘*My skills are stonger than other people in this class - İngilizce öğrenmedeki yeteneklerim sınıftaki diğerlerinden daha güçlüdür.*’ has the highest ($\bar{X} = 3.56$) value among the participants. It might be retrieved from the results that most of the students see themselves

superior to their classmates in terms of self-esteem level in learning a foreign language. In other terms, they do not see the others better than themselves in terms of foreign language learning skills. It is an interesting result that even though the participants suppose their skills to be better than the others in learning language, they perceive themselves to have a medium level of self-esteem in learning a foreign language ($\bar{X} = 3.14$).

The item 1 '*I can do as well or better than others at school - İngilizce öğreniminde diğerleri kadar veya daha iyi şeyler yapabildiğimi düşünüyorum.*' is the weakest valued ($\bar{X} = 2.83$) item in the questionnaire.

Subsequently, it might be inferred from the findings that in production level, the participants do not see themselves as good as the others in language learning but they see themselves better than the others in terms of skills. Perceiving the same talented as others but not as productive as the others might mean that the participants believe in their talent but, as they do not spend enough time or utilize enough or affective strategies for learning English, they cannot be successful.

Before discussing the relation between language learning strategy use and academic self-esteem among vocational college students, it is essential to refer to the results of some studies (Suwanarak, 2012. Ghavamnia, Kassaian, and Dabaghi, 2011) on the relation between learning beliefs, as an umbrella term, and language learning strategies. All these studies reported a relation between these two variables. The studies (Asadifard A., Biria R., 2013; Mahfouz A. R. I. M. & Ma'ajini O. B. H. 2013; Seabi J., 2011) reporting relation specifically between self-esteem and learning strategies are reported in detail in Chapter III. As aforementioned, Asadifard and Biria (2013) revealed a moderate correlation between these issues. Cognitive and compensation strategies are reported strongly correlated with self-esteem but affective strategies are in a weak correlation with self-esteem in their studies. Mahfouz A. R. I. M. & Ma'ajini O. B. H. (2013) also reported a strong correlation between

cognitive strategy use and self-esteem. Another study which reports correlation between self-esteem and learning strategies was the research of Seabi J. (2011). On the other hand, the study of Zarei et al. (2012) was an experimental research and revealed no significant difference between experimental group which was trained specifically for learning strategies and control group in terms of self-esteem. Gázquez J.J. et al. (2006) also did not reveal a relation between these variables. The result of later two studies is inconsistent with the results of other studies.

Secondly, it might be meaningful to remind some previous statistical analysis of two variables discussed in this question. Use of language learning strategy among the participants is reported at a medium level ($\bar{x}=2.5$, $SD=.58$) and self-esteem in learning English is indicated at a medium level ($\bar{x}=3.13$, $SD=.85$). Thus, mean values of both variables are at medium level. Table 21 indicates the correlation between language learning strategy use and academic self-esteem among the participants.

Table 21

Correlation between Language Learning Strategy Use and Academic Self-Esteem.

		Lang.	Learn.	Academic	Self-
		Strategy Use		Esteem	
		Pearson Correlation	1	.504	
Lang.	Learn.	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	
		N	294	294	
		Pearson Correlation	.504	1	
Academic	Self-	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		
		N	294	294	

p < .001 is significant.

Statistical analysis of the data retrieved from the study indicates that Pearson correlation between language learning strategy use and self-esteem in learning English as a foreign language among vocational school students is $r(294) = .504, p < .001$. The result refers to a moderate correlation between the variables. The retrieved data is significant at < .001 level. Thus, the use of language learning strategy and self-esteem in learning English has moderate effects on each other. His result is in consistency with the results of some previous studies (Asadifard A., Biria R., 2013; Mahfouz A. R. I. M. & Ma'ajini O. B. H. 2013; Seabi J., 2011) but is inconsistent with the results of the studies of Zarei et al. (2012) and Gázquez J.J. et al. (2006)

It might be inferred from the result of the present study that it is not clear which variable affect the other. Thus, it is possible that learners' esteem may lead the students to the use of language learner strategies, or that the use of language learning strategies may cause academic self-esteem in learning English. Also, there is a possibility that some other factors may affect both variables and the affected variable may lead to the occurrences of the other variable.

Consequently, using language learning strategies at a medium level might result a medium level of self-esteem in language learning. In other words, having medium level of self-esteem in language learning might lead to medium level of language learning strategy use.

Findings and discussions of research question 4B.

RQ4-B. What is the relationship between language learning strategy use and the actual achievement grades received in the English course?

Overall language learning strategy use of the participants is ($\bar{x} = 2.50, SD = .59$). According to Oxford's (1990), this indicates a medium level of usage. On the other hand,

English exam mean score is ($\bar{X} = 40.35$) out of 100 among the participants. Thus, this result can be accepted below average. Research question 4B aims to reveal the relationship is between these two variables. Table 22 displays the correlation between language learning strategy use and English exam scores of the participants.

Table 22

Correlation between Language Learning Strategy Use and English Exam Score.

		English Exam Score	Language Learning Strategy Use
	Pearson Correlation	1	.225
English Exam Score	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	294	294
	Pearson Correlation	.225	1
Language Learning Strategy Use	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	294	294

p < .001 is significant.

The data retrieved from the analysis indicates that Pearson correlation between language learning strategy use and English exam score among the participants is $r(294) = .225, p < .001$. The result refers to a weak correlation between the variables. The result is significant at $< .001$ level. Thus, the use of language learning strategy and English exam score has low effects on each other.

The result is consistent, to some extent, to some of the previous studies conducted in the area. The experimental study by Zarei et al. (2012) studied the effect of cognitive and metacognitive learning strategy use on the total scores of students and revealed significant difference between the experimental groups of both strategy users and control groups. Seabi

(2011) also refers to some previous studies resulting that poor learning strategies are responsible for academic failure among the first year students in universities. His study also reports significant relation between test strategies and academic achievement and test strategy use is a significant predictor of academic achievement with attitude and anxiety. Wang et al. (2008) carried out a study researching the effect of language learning strategies. They found that learning strategy use, together with some other factors such as self-efficacy and learning motivation, affects learning results.

At this point, in order to reveal to what extent using language learning strategy use explain scores in English exam, linear regression analysis was conducted. Table 23 indicates the model of regression between language learning strategy use and English exam scores.

Table 23

Model Summary of Regression between Language Learning Strategy Use and English Exam Scores

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.225 ^a	.050	.047	14.198

a. Predictors: (Constant), Language Learning Strategy Use

Table 24 indicates the regression analysis of language learning strategy use on exam scores in English.

Table 24

Regression Analysis of Language Learning Strategy Use and English Exam Score

Coefficients ^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error				Beta
1	(Constant)	26,304	3.661		7.185	.000
	Language	5.617	1.426	.225	3.938	.000
	Learnin Strategy Use					

a. Dependent Variable: English Exam Scores

Linear regression analysis which was conducted to reveal the effect of language learning strategy use on scores in English exam displays a significant relation ($R = 0.225$, $R^2 = 0.050$) between language learning strategy use and English exam scores. It is retrieved from the analysis that language learning strategy use predicts % 5 of English exam scores. Unstandardized coefficients value in the table ($B = 5.617$) displays that language learning strategy use is a significant ($p < 0.01$) factor in predicting English exam scores. The resulting prediction level of learning strategy use for actual achievement scores is in consistency with the previously reported studies of Zarei et al. (2012), Wang et al. (2008) and Seabi (2011).

The question is mainly about the relation between language learning strategy use and actual achievement grades. The results display a weak correlation between variables and indicate that learning strategies is a significant predictor of actual achieved grades. Another dimension of this issue is discussed in question 5B dividing the participants into two groups as successful and unsuccessful students and studying the difference between these groups in terms of learning strategy use.

Findings and discussions of research question 4C.

RQ4-C. What is the relationship between language learning strategy use and self-perceived achievement level?

Initially, it is meaningful to reveal the level of self-perceived achievement level among the participants. The third questionnaire utilized in the study to collect data includes a question about their perception of success or failure, ‘*What is your perception of success in learning English?*’ The students were offered four responds to choose;

1. I usually perceive myself successful in learning English.
2. I sometimes perceive myself successful in learning English.
3. I rarely perceive myself successful in learning English.
4. I never perceive myself successful in learning English.

The answers of the participants were coded into SPSS 21 data analysis program. The choices were entered with the following numbers; ‘*usually perceive successful*’- 4, ‘*sometimes perceive successful*’- 3, ‘*rarely perceive successful*’- 2, ‘*never perceive successful*’- 1. The frequencies of the responds are illustrated in Table 25.

Table 25

Frequency of Perceived Success Levels (N=294)

Perceptions	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Never	28	9.5
Rarely	166	56.5
Sometimes	85	28.9
Usually	15	5.1

As a result of the statistical analysis, most of the students (166 out of 294, thus, 56.5 %) perceive themselves ‘*rarely successful*’ in foreign language learning. The second frequent

perception among the participants is '*sometimes successful*' with a reference of 85 times (28.9%). The students who perceive themselves '*never successful*' and '*usually successful*' have totally 14.6 per cent of all the participants. The first group has 9.5 per cent and the latter one 5.1 per cent. Analysis also indicates that perception of success and failure has a mean value of ($\bar{X} = 2.30, SD=.709$). As consequence of analysis, it might be inferred from the results that the students in vocational college mostly perceive themselves '*rarely perceive successful*' in learning English.

The same question was asked to the students during the interviews. The procedure and the phases of analysis are explained in Chapter III. The participants uttered their perceived success and failure indicating various reasons during the interviews. The perceived success levels of the interviewed participants are indicated in Table 7.

Following the same procedure, it is critical to report some values of two variables retrieved from the analysis of data. As reported before in the analysis of previous question, use of language learning strategy among vocational college students is reported at a medium level ($\bar{X} = 2.5, SD=.58$) and the mean value of perceiving themselves successful in language learning is resulted also at a medium level ($\bar{X} = 2.30, SD=.709$). Thus, mean values of both variables are at medium level. Table 26 indicates the correlation between language learning strategy use and self-perception of achievement among the participants.

Table 26

Correlation between Language Learning Strategy Use and Self-Perception of Achievement.

		<i>Lang. Learn. Strategy Use</i>	<i>Perceived Success</i>
Pearson Correlation		<i>1</i>	<i>.373</i>
Lang. Learn. Strategy Use	Sig. (2-tailed)		<i>.000</i>
	N	<i>294</i>	<i>294</i>
Pearson Correlation		<i>.373</i>	<i>1</i>
Perceived Success	Sig. (2-tailed)	<i>.000</i>	
	N	<i>294</i>	<i>294</i>

p < .001 is significant.

The Pearson correlation between language learning strategy use and self-perception of achievement is calculated as $r(294) = .373, p < .001$. The result indicates to a low level of correlation between the variables. The retrieved data is significant at $< .001$ level. Thus, the use of language learning strategy and self-perception of achievement have positive but low effects on each other.

Studies on the relationship between language learning strategies and self-perception of achievement (Matzin et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2008; and Su, 2005) reported a relation between these two variables. Matzin et al. resulted that students who referred to internal reasons for success utilized socio-affective strategies more than the others. Additionally, Wang et al. reported a relation between these two variables. The study of Suwanarak (2012) also indicated a relation self-perception of achievement and learning strategy use. She resulted in her study that higher self-perception of achievement; the greater the use of language learning strategy use is reported. Qualitative findings of her study also support the

quantitative analysis of the study. Su M.M. (2005) also revealed a bivariate correlation between self-perceived English proficiency and the use of language learning strategies in a study conducted with 419 students in a vocational college.

A study conducted in a vocational college in Turkish context as the present one is a critical in terms of setting and participants. Thus, it can be stated that the results of the present study is in consistency with the studies of Matzin et al. (2013), Wang et al. (2008), Su (2005) and Suwanarak (2012).

As it is a correlational result it is difficult to say what affects the other. Both may cause the other variable. It is noteworthy to comment that using language learning strategy and not, respectively, perceiving low achievement level, or in other words, perceiving oneself successful but having low level of strategy use is a confusing result to some extent. Providing the mean scores of the participants in English test ($\bar{X}=40.35$) might be meaningful to understand in that case.

At this point, another question arises to be answered: *‘Why do the students perceive themselves successful although they have a low level of language learning strategy use?’*. Answering this contradiction might be a suggestion for further studies.

Consequently, this kind of contradicting results may be caused by the overall academic level of vocational college students. Departments in vocational colleges in Turkey mostly do not prerequisite their students to have a score form university entrance exams according to the rules of the Council of Higher Education (CHE). Thus, overall academic levels of these students are generally lower than the students of other departments of universities. Even if they utilize some strategies in language learning strategies, it may have a lower positive affect on their exam scores and also perception of achievement because of overall academic level. These students might display a low level of academic success not only in English learning but also in other classes. Further studies on their perception of success in

other classes, overall life, and their academic success levels in those classes might be critical to reveal an answer to this contradicting result retrieved from the analysis.

Findings and discussions of research question 5A.

RQ5-A. What is the role of the use of language learning strategies in explaining the self-perception of achievement?

As it is stated in Chapter III, the data of language learning strategy use was collected with SILL. The collected data was entered into SPSS 21 program. Initially, in order to find out to what extent using language learning strategy use explain self-perception of achievement, linear regression analysis was conducted. Table 27 indicates the model of regression between language learning strategy use and self-perception of achievement.

Table 27

Model Summary of Regression between Language Learning Strategy Use and Self-Perception of Achievement

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.373 ^a	.139	.137	.659

a. Predictors: (Constant), Language Learning Strategy Use

The regression analysis of language learning strategy use on exam scores in English is displayed in Table 28

Table 28

Regression Analysis of Language Learning Strategy Use and Self-Perception of Achievement

Coefficients ^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Coefficients Beta			
	(Constant)	1.158	.170		6.815	.000
1	Language Learning Strategy Use	.455	.066	.373	6.880	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Self-Perception of Achievement

Linear regression analysis which was conducted to reveal the prediction of language learning strategy use on self-perception of achievement displays a significant relation ($R=0.373$, $R^2= 0.139$) between language learning strategy use and self-perception of achievement. It is retrieved from the analysis that language learning strategy use predicts % 13.9 of the self-perception of achievement. Unstandardized coefficients value in the table ($B=.455$) displays that language learning strategy use is a significant ($p < 0.01$) factor in predicting English exam scores.

QPSFLE is the third instrument of data collection in the study. The last section of the questionnaire includes two semi-structured open-ended phrases and the students were asked to complete the one which is appropriate for their perception of success. The first statement is ‘*When I am successful, the main reasons are....*’, and the second phrase is ‘*When I fail, the main reasons are ...*’

The perceived reasons for success and failure were written in list or paragraphs by the students. The expressions were analysed and categorized under the headings of ‘effort’, ‘strategy use’, ‘ability’, ‘mood’, ‘behaviours’, ‘personal organisation’, ‘need/importance’, ‘interest’, ‘teacher’, ‘the nature of task’, ‘ease of the tasks or the subject itself’, ‘peers’,

‘circumstances’, ‘teaching materials’, ‘time’, ‘other people’, ‘family’, ‘rewards’, and ‘luck’.

Williams, Burden, Poulet and Maun (2004) found out and listed these reasons to explain success in their study. The same categorisation is also used for the present study. As an additional reason of success, ‘good background knowledge of English’ was noted by some students.

Students referred to 552 reasons for success totally. Table 29 indicates the frequencies of reasons for success stated in written form by the students in the questionnaire.

Table 29

Descriptive Analysis of Reasons for Success (N=294)

Reasons	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strategy use	141	25.6
Effort	122	22.1
Personal Interest	63	11.4
Ability	26	4.7
Background knowledge of English	23	4.1
Need / Importance	19	3.4
Behaviour	17	3
Personal Organisation	14	2.5
Mood	10	1.8
Teacher	34	6.3
Attraction, ease of English	19	3.4
Tasks	17	3
Environment	16	2.9
Peers	13	2.4
Other people/Family	8	1.5
Circumstances	5	0.9
Teaching materials	3	0.6
Time	2	0.4

The study revealed totally eighteen reasons for success as displayed in Table 29. The study revealed similar type categories of reasons with the studies of Williams, Burden, Poulet and Maun (2004) in western context and Erten and Burden (2014), Yılmaz (2012), and Besimoğlu, Serdar, and Yavuz (2010) in Turkish context. The study of Yılmaz (2012) was conducted on reasons of success in reading comprehension. As the context of the study is on reading, the frequencies of reasons were unusual for the studies reported in overall English learning. With the help of findings and the retrieved percentages in the table, the present study aims to reveal the place of language learning strategy use in explaining self-perception of achievement.

As the table indicates, almost a fourth (25.6%) of the referred to reasons is concerned with strategy. Processes and directed efforts of the students are concerned as strategies in analysis. The statements include: revising subjects and new vocabulary items at home, talking to English speaking friends or other people, writing messages and mails to their friends in English, finding English speaking people on the net to practice the language, memorizing new words or phrases, note-taking. The variety of strategy use in explaining success indicates the lack of direction in strategy use. Thus the students need to be trained on what strategy to use.

The next reason emerged from the analysis was 'effort'. The statements evaluated under this category included: I do my homework, I spend time on English, I work hard, I listen to the lessons, I concentrate on the lesson, I pay attention. As stated in Williams, Burden, Poulet and Maun (2004), Besimoğlu, Serdar, and Yavuz (2010), and Erten and Burden (2014), these statements refer to a sense of trying hard to learn but difficulty in directing the effort to achieve. The participants referred to 122 times with a percentage of 22.1.

63 students cited ‘personal interest to learn English’ (11.4%). Liking/enjoying English, liking/enjoying to learn a new language, and wanting to learn English/a new language were some statements to be noted in this category. In Williams, Burden, Poulet and Maun (2004), and Besimoğlu, Serdar, and Yavuz (2010), both personal interest to the subject and the referred to interesting characteristics of the subject were categorized under the same title. But in the present study, another category is formed under the title of ‘attraction, ease of the subject’ as a reason.

Another frequently referred to reason for success was ‘ability’ and it was cited 26 times (4.7%). This category includes having a good vocabulary, knowing some subjects, understanding the lesson, being able to in English learning, and having a good understanding ability. The reason of ‘teacher’ was referred to 34 times (6.3%). The statements includes; ‘the teacher is good at teaching’, ‘the teacher answers any questions when we need’, ‘the teacher explains well in detail’, ‘the teacher is nice to the students’, and ‘the teacher teaches in an interesting way’. Another frequent reason, ‘background knowledge’ was cited 23 times (4.1%). This category has not been cited very frequently except in Turkish context (Besimoğlu, Serdar, and Yavuz , 2010). As it is displayed in the table, the other reasons were cited less frequently by the students.

Similar results are retrieved from the analysis of interviews with the students. The qualitative findings of the study retrieved from the interviews support quantitative results. The students who perceived successful indicated the use of strategy with a high frequency among the other reasons for success. The statements of some interviewed participants are reported again in order to provide a qualitative answer to research question 5A. Use of some strategies is reported by the participants B, C, D, G, and H:

Participant B uttered: ‘*I worked in Kuşadası (a town which is a tourist attraction in Turkey). I have foreign friends there, thus, we are always in contact in English and talk in*

English. Participant C stated: *'When I revise with my friends, I become successful trying various strategies. I revise the notes that my previous teachers handed out. I practise and revise with my friends mostly before the exams.'* Participant D recalled: *'I watch movies which are subtitled in English. By the way, I learn also from computer games and I have some foreign friends and talk to them in English.'* He also stated: *'I know that this will affect me badly when I do not revise what I learn in class.'* These statements indicate that the participant is aware of the effect of learning strategy use and he revises what he learns after the class. The use of some direct strategies is reported by the participant G: *'I attended a course when I was in 11th grade. It was useful for me. I contacted some people from abroad. It was also useful. I have recently started to watch movies subtitled in English and study from books.'* Participant H referred to help from a family member and use of cognitive strategy. He uttered: *'.... for example: Even when I play a game, I form English sentences. I ask my elder brother the things that I couldn't cope with. My elder brother is an English teacher and he encourages me. ...'*

It might be retrieved from the statements that the students refer to language learning strategy use, mostly memory, cognitive and socio-affective strategies, to explain their success in learning English. Among the strategies reported by the students; *'watching movies with English subtitles'*, and *'studying and revising with friends'* are the most common ones. During the interviews, among the referred to reasons for success, learning strategy use was the most common one. On the other hand, the participants uttered some other reasons for their success. *'Personal interest'*, *'effort'*, *'ability'*, *'effect of teacher'* was the other common reasons reported by the participants during the interviews.

'Personal interest' was participants C, D, and K. Participant C recalled: *'I have studied English since primary school. I have great interest (of English) because of my teacher.'* Participant D stated: *'English is the most commonly spoken language and this makes me*

interested in it. I have plans about going abroad and it makes me motivated.' Participant K uttered: *'I comprehend the words better and as it is an enjoyable lesson, it attracts my interest.'* The extracts from interviews clearly demonstrate personal interest of students to English.

Having good vocabulary, knowing some subjects, understanding the lesson, being able to in English learning, and having a good understanding ability are the samples of utterances referring to ability and were reported by the students during the interviews. Participant A: *'I can keep the words in my mind.'* And she added *'I like and I understand the words fast.'* Participant K: *'I can comprehend the words. ...'* Some participants also stated 'teacher' as a reason for success. The utterances were: *'The teachers were so effective. ...'*, *'I have been dealing with English since primary school and been interested in because of my teacher there.'* Attraction of English was stated twice by the participants. Participant E recalled: *'It is an enjoyable lesson.'* Participant L uttered: *'.... it is the most contributing language in social life.'* And also added *'I spend time on*' Effort was stated by the participant H: *'Since I was little, I have been dealing with English and been interested in it.'* Need/importance was one of the most frequent ones and referred to by five participants. Participant A: *'If I go abroad for the purposes of travel, English will be necessary. ...'* participant D: *'If I can speak English, I can be in other positions (meaning to have better positions at jobs.)'*, participant I: *'It will be useful everywhere.'* participant L *'When I apply for a job in a company, being able to speak English will be a pre-requisition'* and the same participant again *'.... The use of being able to speak another languageBackground knowledge was referred to only once: 'I have poor background knowledge. ...'*

The participants of the study also referred to some reasons for their failure in learning English in the questionnaire and during the interviews. Totally 683 reasons were indicated for failure. These factors are categorised under 20 headings. The order of frequency and the

number of references by the students are illustrated in Table 30. Discussion and analysis of statements in the questionnaires and interviews are reported together in this section.

Table 30

Descriptive Analysis of Reasons for Failure (N=294)

Reasons	Number	Percentage (%)
Strategy use	104	15.2
Effort	101	14.8
Ability	84	12.4
Background knowledge of English	67	9.8
Personal Interest	59	8.7
Mood	24	3.5
Personal Organisation	24	3.5
Behaviour	14	2
Health	9	1.3
Need / Importance	3	0.4
Environment	42	6.2
Tasks	35	5.1
Teacher	35	5.1
Teaching materials	22	3.2
Time	22	3.2
Attraction, ease of the subject	15	2.2
Peers	10	1.5
Circumstances	6	0.9
Other people/Family	4	0.6
Luck	3	0.4

As it is illustrated in Table 30, the students cited more factors for failure than they did for success. Twenty reasons for failure retrieved from the data, corresponding to eighteen categories for success.

Contradicting with the results of the study by Williams, Burden, Poulet and Maun (2004) and corresponding with Besimoğlu, Serdar, and Yavuz (2010), the highest proportion goes to lack of appropriate strategy use in the results of the present study. In the study of Williams et al., lack of strategy use is in sixth place with a proportion of 5.5 but in the study of Besimoğlu et al. it is cited with the highest frequency among other factors (40.83%). This category is cited 104 times (15.2%). Statements display lack of strategy use: not participating group/pair works, not revising the subjects at home, not practising. Contradicting with the quantitative analysis which reports that strategy is the most frequent reason for failure, the students cited strategy only one time during the interviews. Participant K stated: *'I forget when I do not revise and this leads me towards failure.'*

The homework studies by the students also provide some information about this category of attribution. During the almost more than 900 students were assigned with homework but only 110 studies of homework were received from the students. This case also approves the high percentage of lack of strategy as an attribution for failure.

Lack of strategy use was followed by (lack of) effort with 101 citations (14.8%). The comments about lack of effort include; 'I do not concentrate', 'I do not listen', 'I'm lazy', 'I do not spend any time', 'I don't do my homework', and 'I don't work hard'. Citation of effort was also frequent during the interviews. Seven out of twelve participants referred to this reason for their failure. Participant A recalled: *'I cannot allow time. I spend my time for other lessons for my major.'* Participant E expressed also the reasons for this: *'I do not allow time since I do not like this lesson. As I do not like I do not say I am not bad at....'* Participant F referred to this during the interview two times: 'I do not allow time because of lack of interest.' and added *'I do not allow time since I do not understand anything'* Participant H uttered: *'I do not allow time here at university.'* Participant I also expressed the reason of this attribution: *'I sometimes allow time. I try to understand and when I feel that I do not*

understand I quit. It takes 10 minutes. I enjoy English in classes but when the class is over it is over for me too. I allow time just 10 minutes in a week. I spend more time for other class. Thus, I cannot deal with English.' Participant J stated: *'I even do not allow one hour for English.'* Participant K indicated this as a reason for failure but he also had plans to learn English in a course. He stated: *'I do not allow enough time but I am planning to attend a course.'* As it can be observed from the statements during the interviews, in general, effort, specifically, *'not allowing time'* is the most frequent reason for failure. Some interviewees expressed that they spend their time not for English but other subject at university.

Following reason was noted as *'lack of ability'*. The participants declared an overall limitation of ability in English 84 times (12.4%) and specifically in vocabulary, grammar subjects, listening, speaking and understanding. The problems in these issues were reported as *'difficulty in memorizing'*, *'problems in accent/pronunciation'*, *'not being good at grammar'*, *'listening'*, *'speaking'*, *'not being able to understand'*, *'not remembering vocabulary'*, *'grammar issues'*, and *'not knowing vocabulary'*. In the interviews, *'lack of ability'* was also a frequent category for failure. These four, out of twelve students referred to it for their failure. Participant A recalled a lack of ability in speaking: *'I do not have any problem in writing but I am not good at speaking.'* Participant F referred to the lack of ability in pronouncing and memorizing the words: *'I do not like because I cannot pronounce words. Thus, I do not like English. I do not see myself successful since I cannot pronounce. I cannot memorize the words. I have a problem in memorization. If I can memorize, probably I can do it. I do not allow time since I do not understand anything'* Participant J stated: *'I cannot remember the meaning of words. Thus, it disturbs me.'* Participant K connected his lack of ability to not revising. *'I forget when I do not revise and this leads me towards failure.'*

Poor background knowledge which has not been reported frequently in previous studies was cited 67 times (9.8%) in the questionnaire. The citation about poor background

knowledge has also been reported in a study by Besimoğlu, Serdar, and Yavuz (2010) in Turkish context.

It is noteworthy that although the class hours of English is limited with two hours, ‘circumstances’, as a reason including the statement, ‘*limitation of class hours*’ is reported quite rarely. The researcher of the study believes the limited introduction time of language teaching is a critical point which can be reported as a factor for failure.

At this point, some observations of the researcher gains importance. In the class hours, during all the academic year, when the students were asked to join even in a beginner level pair work activities including ‘*meeting a new person and introducing themselves*’ and ‘*telling the names of classroom objects to their friends*’, some of the students rejected to do blaming poor background knowledge in English. They generally blamed language education in their previous schools or their previous English teachers. During the informal conversations about their previous teachers, one of the students stated that his English teacher in primary school was a shop owner, and the other said that his teacher was worker in a building site. Some students expressed that even if they had a teacher, they did not do even an activity in their English classes. One of the students said that ‘*the only thing they learned in their English classes was two imperative sentences ‘open the window’, and ‘close the window’*’. The students also reported different kinds of assessment methods which were applied by their previous teachers. The statements about the testing and evaluating methods of their teachers, the students reported were:

We got the same marks of our Turkish classes since we did not do anything in English classes. The teacher wrote some marks on little pieces of papers such as 95, 90, 100, etc., folded the papers and put in a bowl. He told us to choose one of the papers. The mark on the paper we got in our hand was our mark for the English class.

These statements appeared to some extent during the interviews, the participants cited poor background knowledge but generally blaming the poor educational environment in English classes at the school they graduated from. Participant E expressed his attribution providing reasons:

I was not educated enough in primary school. Pupils who were better at classes were given importance. Thus; we were not interested in the lesson in such an atmosphere. ...Even if I learn something in the class, since I do not have a good background of English and also do not like the lesson, I cannot do it.

Participant I recalled: *'I do not see myself successful since I do not have a good background in English.'* Participant J was a student from a vocational school and stated: *'I do not see so successful myself. I graduated from a vocational school. There, English classes were not considered important.'* This attribution for failure was referred to three times. In Chapter 2, English hours in each grade in some high schools are reported. Vocational High Schools are indicated as the school offering the least hours with Trade High Schools among all the school types in Turkey. As it expected, this reason was cited by vocational high school graduates mostly.

Another frequent reason was lack of personal interest which was referred to 59 times (8.7%). In the study of Williams et al., this category was noted more for failure than success, but in the present study, a contradicting result has occurred. It is cited more for success than failure. The statements indicating this category were: 'not being interested in/ even hating', 'learning English', 'finding it boring', 'not liking', and 'not enjoying'. This category was also cited during the interviews. Participant D uttered a noteworthy reason: *'I do not give enough importance when I have exams of other subjects. I pass off thinking I can do it later. Thus, it declines my performance.'* Participant E referred to this reason during his interview a few times. He stated: *'I do not allow time since I do not like this lesson. As I do not like I do not*

say I am not bad at....' This participant repeated this lack of interest sometimes during the interview stating *'Even if I learn something in the class, since I do not have a good background of English and also do not like the lesson, I cannot do it.'* Participant F also repeated his lack of interest a few times: *'I do not allow time because of lack of interest.'* also stated this lack of interest again: *'I do not allow time since I do not understand anything'*

The researcher also observed the lack of personal interest of the students during the class contact hours. The students displayed their lack of interest by playing their mobiles, not bringing any class material with them, and chatting with their friends during the class.

Another frequent factor reported by the participants was environment. This category includes statements related to weather, conditions at school or in classroom. Task and teacher have the same proportion (5.1%) with a citation of 35 times. Task was reported for failure more than for success as in the study of Williams et.al (2004). The effect of teacher for failure was generally reported for the poor quality of teaching in previous learning environments, thus, seems to be more related to category of poor background knowledge.

On the other hand, mood, personal organization, behaviour, poor health, need/importance, teaching materials, lack of time, attraction and ease of the subject, peers, circumstances, other people and family, and luck were reasons for failure which were cited with an insignificant proportion .

Additionally, there were also some less frequent reasons for failure during the interviews. Participant 1 uttered the environment: *'There's not appropriate atmosphere here. ... I do not have appropriate environment to practice with my friends.'* Participant B mentioned inappropriate methodology:

We have grammar in English. It is not like Turkish, you have to place the right word to the right place. I have been learning English for thirteen years. Since the teaching is based on memorization we cannot do it. There is a problem in methodology.

Participant G also recalled environmental factors: *‘Moreover, when there is a noise in the class, it causes lack of interest. ...’* Participant I stated some factor related to mood:

I sometimes allow time. I try to understand and when I feel that I do not understand I quit. It takes 10 minutes. I enjoy English in classes but when the class is over it is over for me too. I allow time just 10 minutes in a week. I spend more time for other class. Thus, I cannot deal with English.

Participant J referred to his previous school: *‘I do not see so successful myself. I graduated from a vocational school. There, English classes were not considered to be important.’* Participant L referred to self-esteem and poor methodological issues in teaching English. His reasons are quite rare in literature and need to be noted: *‘Lack of self-esteem is a critical factor. Apart from this, teaching method is not appropriate. I think speaking based method would be more efficient. Otherwise, we feel like we have to and this make us demotivated.’*

Consequently, the findings of regression analysis indicate that language learning strategy use is a significant predictor of self-perception of achievement and the categorization of written statements by the students also displays that it is the most frequent reason to explain both success and failure in learning English. Moreover, the qualitative analysis of interviews by the participants also indicates that it is one of the common reasons to explain success and failure. The results of the present study can be accepted consistent with some of the previous studies in the area. For example, the findings of Suwanarak (2012) also reported the use of compensation and memory strategy use by the students regardless of actual achievement or proficiency levels. Additionally, another study by Wang et al. (2008) stated a general perspective in its results: *‘higher the learning strategy use, the higher self-assessment level of the students’*.

Findings and discussions of research question 5B.

RQ5-B. How does the use of language learning strategies change in successful and unsuccessful students?

At the end of the year the final exam of English class was applied. The exam consisted of 25 multiple choice questions on the subjects which were taught during the year. Each right answer for 25 questions was given 4 points. Thus, the total mark which was given for all the right answers was 100 points. The participants are divided into two groups according to their exam scores in English. The group of students who got grades lower than 50 out of 100 was categorised as ‘unsuccessful group’ and the group of students who got 50 and higher was named as ‘successful group’. Test of normality was applied to check whether the data is parametric or non-parametric before conducting a test to reveal the difference between success groups. The results for the normality test of language learning strategy use according to success groups is indicated in Table 31

Table 31

Test of Normality of Mean Language Learning Strategy Use according to Success Groups in English Exam

		Exam Score	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Groups	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Language Learning	Unsuccessful	.044	223	.200	.994	223	.460	
Strategy Use	Successful	.094	71	.197	.980	71	.320	

The study consists of 294 participants. Thus, Kolmogorov –Simirnov values is taken into account to check the normality of data. Significance of normality is ($p > .05$). Therefore, the data is parametric, thus, Independent Sample T-Test can be applied to see the difference in

language learning strategy use according to success groups. Independent Sample T-Test result of language learning types' mean use according to success groups is displayed in Table 32.

Table 32

Independent Sample T-Test Results for Language Learning Strategy Use of Success Groups in English Exam

Exam Groups	Score N	\bar{X}	SD	df	t	p
Unsuccessful	223	2.4274	.55203	292	-3.878	.000
Successful	71	2.7276	.61590			

p < .001 is significant.

The results of independent sample t-test analysis in the Table 30 displays the values for unsuccessful group ($\bar{X} = 2.42$, $SD = .55$) and the successful group ($\bar{X} = 2.72$, $SD = .61$), $t(292) = -3.878$, $p < .001$. The results indicate that there is a significant difference between success groups in language learning strategy use.

The study also analysed the difference between success groups in terms of use of different strategy types. The result of normality test indicates that the values are parametric. Therefore, independent sample t-test is applied to check the differences between groups. Table 33 displays the differences between groups according to the use of strategy types.

Table 33

Independent Sample T-Test Results for Use of Different Language Learning Strategy Types for Success Groups in English Exam

Strategy Types	Success Groups	N	\bar{X}	SD	df	t	p
Memory Strategies	Unsuccessful	223	2,40	,631	292	-3.974	.000
	Successful	71	2,75	,690			
Cognitive Strategies	Unsuccessful	223	2,26	,633	292	-3.533	.000
	Successful	71	2,58	,748			
Compensation Strategies	Unsuccessful	223	2,53	,801	292	-2.369	.019
	Successful	71	2,79	,792			
Metacognitive Strategies	Unsuccessful	223	2,62	,767	292	-3.565	.000
	Successful	71	3,04	,882			
Affective Strategies	Unsuccessful	223	2,31	,726	292	-1.847	.066
	Successful	71	2,50	,828			
Socio-affective Strategies	Unsuccessful	223	2,57	,771	292	-1.524	.129
	Successful	71	2,73	,808			

The results of independent sample t-test analysis for different strategy types in Table 31 displays that memory strategy use ($t(292) = -3.974, p < .001$), cognitive strategy use ($t(292) = -3.533, p < .001$), and metacognitive strategy use ($t(292) = -3.565, p < .001$) are significantly different between success groups. Thus, successful vocational college students utilize memory, cognitive and metacognitive language learning strategies more than unsuccessful students.

Previous studies also report some differences between proficiency levels. For example, the study of Suwanarak (2012) indicates that low achieving students compensation strategies but high achieving students use memory strategies. Her study was conducted among the

students who were studying for master degree in Thailand. Ghavamnia et al. (2011) also found different level of strategy use in the favour of more proficient students. As cited in Ghamania et al. (2011), the study of Oxford and Burry-Stock (1995) reported more frequent strategy use by more proficient and more advanced students. A study in Spain by Gázquez J.J. et al. (2006) resulted in a correlation between high scores and the use of learning strategies. The study of Sun M. (2009) which was conducted with 250 students of a technological university in Taiwan aimed to study the relationship between language learning strategy use and the scores of an English proficiency test. The findings display the students who passed the exam used compensation strategies and the students who failed the exam used metacognitive strategies more than the other types. The study also reports significant difference between both groups in terms of overall language learning strategy use.

As the findings of the previous studies referred to in this section indicate, the results of the present study are consistent in terms of overall strategy use by high achiever students but display some differences in terms of strategy types' use between high and low achiever students.

Chapter V: Conclusion and Implications

In this chapter, the study is summarized in terms of stated problem, aim, methodological issues such as the type of methodology used through the research, research questions and findings. The chapter also provides a conclusion discussing the findings and results of the study. The subsequent section discusses the implications which might be derived from the findings and also provides suggestions for further research studies.

Summary of the Study

For many centuries, not only education but also language education was dominated by the ideas or approaches which did not concern the role of learner in class. Teacher was the main source of knowledge and the student was only the receiver. When the old approaches started to be questioned, the methodologies in language learning, leaning to these approaches, commenced to change gradually. The student in the class started to receive the attention of scholars. To that extent, for almost the last two decades, beliefs, characteristics of learners and the language learning strategies that learners use have been in the centre of attraction.

The researcher of the study observed some students in terms of language strategy use, academic self-esteem, and their self- perception of achievement in learning English. Some students thought themselves to be successful but failed in exams; some others had no self-esteem and also stated that they did not use any language learning strategies. The researcher realized that there might be a relation between these variables. Reviewing the relevant literature, he found that there were studies concerning the correlation between some of these variables but not in a vocational college context in Turkey. Subsequently, an idea to conduct a research study investigating the relation between these variables in a vocational college context emerged in researchers mind.

Aim of the study.

Language learning strategies have been discussed in the field and developed for the last decades but their relationship to self-esteem and self-perception of achievement has been new a matter of subject. Some studies (Gázquez J.J., et al., 2006; Zarei et al., 2012; and Seabi J. 2011) are reported in literature on the relationship between self-esteem and success in language learning. Self-esteem was also found related to language learning strategies in some studies (Zarei et al., 2012; Seabi J. 2011; and Mahfouz A. R. I. M. & Ma'ajini O. B. H. 2013). Self-perception of achievement was also investigated in terms of its relation to self-esteem, success level and language learning strategy use in the field (Williams and Burden, 1999; Peacock, 2009; Stigler et al. 1985; Kurtovic 2012; Su, 2005; Sun, 2009; and Weiner, 2010).

As it can be observed from the referred to studies in the field, these variables have been studied by some researchers but a study which investigates all these three variables in a single research study has not been reported yet, specifically in Turkish context. This study handles these variables mentioned above and aims to reveal the relationship between language learning strategy use among vocational college students and their self-perception of achievement, academic self-esteem and achievement level. By interpreting the results of the data analysis and providing a thorough discussion of the findings, the researcher aims to provide some implications which might shed light on how the quality of language instruction in vocational colleges can further be increased.

Summary of methodology.

The study was conducted on 294 beginner and elementary level learners of English during the Spring Semester of 2013 in Çan Vocational College of Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University. The researcher taught English as a foreign language for two hours for each class in a week in the first grades of this college. The participants include 74 females and 220 males who are the graduates of seven different types of high schools. Each of the high schools that

the students graduated follows a different English teaching curriculum. Therefore all the students have a different background of learning English. Descriptive information about the participants of the study is illustrated in a table in Chapter III (See Table 5).

Statistical survey method was employed to carry out the study. The study mainly was based on quantitative data but also qualitative data was collected and analysed to support the findings of quantitative tools.

Three questionnaires were utilized to collect the quantitative data. The questionnaire, SILL developed by Oxford R. (pp.293-300) was the origin of the DÖSE (see Appendix I) which was used to collect the data on the use of language learning strategy among vocational college students. SILL was translated into Turkish and a new questionnaire was developed (DÖSE). DÖSE was studied by Cesur O. and Fer S. (2007) in terms of reliability and validity in university context. The instrument includes 50 questions asking the participants whether they use these strategies categorized under six strategy types. The responses of the participants were taken through a 5-point likert scale ranging from 'never true' to 'always true'. They revealed a total cronbach alfa score of $\alpha = .92$ for all the items in the questionnaire. Therefore, the instrument can be accepted reliable to use in a research study.

The second instrument to collect quantitative data about the level of self- esteem in learning English was the Questionnaire of Academic Self- Esteem in Learning English (see Appendix III). It was adapted from Academic Self-Esteem Questionnaire (see Appendix II), used in a study by Lipnevich A. A. (2006). The questionnaire of Lipnevich was designed to include questions to measure self-esteem on overall school subject. The researcher of the present study adapted the questions on the context of learning English. The new developed questionnaire was named as İngilizce Öğreniminde Akademik Özsaygı Anketi. 5 questions were answered on a 5-point likert scale (Never true-1, rarely true-2, sometimes true-3, often true-4, always ture-5). The answers to the third item, which was written negatively, were re-

coded in a way that the most negative answers had ‘Never true (1)’ and the positive ones ‘Always true (5)’ in statistical terms. To reveal the internal consistency reliability of the questionnaire’s Turkish version, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient value is calculated with SPSS 21. The value for the 5 items about academic self-esteem displays a marginal reliability level with $\alpha = .78$. Thus, the Turkish version can be as an acceptable instrument in terms of internal consistency reliability.

The third instrument was retrieved from the study of Williams, Burden, Poulet and Maun (2004) and translated into Turkish by two interpreters. The original tool includes two questions. The first one asks the students if they like English. The participants coded their answer on a 4-point likert scale ranging from ‘never like’ to like a lot’. The latter collects quantitative data about the success perceptions of the students. In this part the students are asked to write down their reasons for success and failure in a list-wise manner. If the students had a positive perception of their success, they were asked to list the reasons for their relatively higher achievement; and if they felt to be unsuccessful, they were required to write the reasons behind their failure in language learning. Thus, the last part is used to collect qualitative data about the reasons for both success and failure.

The responses of the students for the open-ended questions were analysed and categorised, using open coding technique, under four headings; internal reasons for success, external reasons for success, internal reasons for failure, and external reasons for failure.

As the second phase of qualitative data collection, 36 semi-structured interviews were conducted with voluntary students. More than 50 students were invited for the interviews by the researcher on the basis of their success and failure perceptions stated by them. 40 of them accepted to be interviewed. 34 participants completed the interview section. Each interview lasted for about 5-6 minutes. The questions that were posed to the students were listed in the interview protocol (Appendix V). The questions were mainly about whether they like

English, whether they find themselves successful in learning English, and what their reasons are for success or failure. All the interviews were conducted in Turkish and tape recorded. The transcriptions of the interviews were written in detail. Open coding and axial coding analysis of the interviews were reported and discussed under the related research questions. The parts of statements cited in the findings (Chapter IV) were translated into English by two interpreters.

All the quantitative data was entered into SPSS 21 data analysis program. Data such as frequency values, descriptive information, and Pearson's correlations between the obtained values were revealed by carrying out statistical calculations. Test of normality was applied to the data before conducting any type of statistical calculations. For differences between multiple values of the data, Anova and Kruskal Vallis Tests and for differences between two groups Independent Sample T-Tests and Mann-Whitney U-Tests were conducted. The results, findings and analysis are discussed in Chapter IV.

Summary of main findings.

The study aimed to answer totally nine questions about the issues discussed throughout the research. For the convenience of readers of the present thesis, the questions are grouped under three main categories: the first group, research questions 1, and 2 are descriptive questions about the types of language learning strategies used by the students in vocational colleges. The second group, research questions 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C, 5A and 5B are relational questions aiming to reveal the relationship between language learning strategies, academic self-esteem, and self-perception of achievement and differences between genders, school types and achievement groups in terms of learning strategy use.

The findings for the research question 1 and 2 deal with the use of overall language learning strategy use and the use of different types of strategies. The results indicate that the students in vocational colleges use overall language learning strategies at a moderate level (

$\bar{X} = 2.50$) with a standard deviation of .59. According to the main categorization of strategy types, the use of direct strategies is reported to be at a low-moderate level with a mean value of ($\bar{X} = 2.47$). On the other hand, indirect strategies are used by the students at a moderate level with a mean value of ($\bar{X} = 2.56$). The result indicates that the students use both direct and indirect strategies with an ignorable difference. The results also demonstrate the use of different sub-categories of language learning strategies. Beginning from the least frequent, ‘*cognitive strategies*’ are employed by students at a low level with a mean value of ($\bar{X} = 2.34$), ‘*affective strategies*’ also at a low level ($\bar{X} = 2.36$), ‘*memory strategies*’ at a low-moderate level ($\bar{X} = 2.49$), ‘*compensation strategies*’ at a moderate level ($\bar{X} = 2.59$), ‘*socio-affective strategies*’ also at a moderate level ($\bar{X} = 2.61$) and the most frequent sub-category, ‘*meta-cognitive strategies*’ at moderate level with a mean value of ($\bar{X} = 2.73$). Moreover, the analysis of qualitative data retrieved from the interviews also indicates that the use of memory, cognitive and socio-affective sub-categories of strategies. The most popular strategies cited by the students are: ‘watching movies with English subtitles’, and ‘studying and revising with friends’.

Another point of interest in the present study is the possible differences between school types in terms of overall language strategy use. Statistical analysis of the relevant results indicates an insignificant difference (See Table 13 and 14). It can be inferred from the results that the types of high schools, the participants graduated from, have not a significant effect on overall use of language learning strategy use. Another relevant concern of the study is to find out whether there is a change in different language learning types according to the school types the participant graduated from. Kruskal Vallis test (See Table 16 and 17) indicated a significant difference between some schools in terms of ‘compensation strategy use’. Anatolian High School graduates outperform all the other high schools’ graduates.

Additionally, Vocational High School graduates also outperform the graduates of Trade High Schools.

Overall language learning strategy use for male participants ($\bar{X} = 2.47$, $SD = .57$) and female participants ($\bar{X} = 2.57$, $SD = .60$) is at medium level. Independent t-test results ($t(294) = -1.232$, $p < .001$) indicate that there is no significant difference between male and female participants in language learning strategy use. The result of the present study is consistent with some of the previous studies (Mahfouz A. R. I. M. & Ma'ajini O. B. H. 2013; and Asadifard & Biria, 2013) but inconsistent with the result of the study of Benjamin F. (2009).

Research question 4A aims to reveal the relationship between academic self-esteem in learning English and the use of language learning strategy. Overall mean value of the data indicates a medium level self-esteem in learning English as a foreign language among participants with a mean value ($\bar{X} = 3.14$) It is noticeable that among the items in the questionnaire, the item 3 '*My skills are stronger than other people in this class - İngilizce öğrenmedeki yeteneklerim sınıftaki diğerlerinden daha güçlüdür.*' has the highest ($\bar{X} = 3.56$) value among the participants. On the other hand, the item 1 '*I can do as well or better than others at school - İngilizce öğreniminde diğerleri kadar veya daha iyi şeyler yapabildiğimi düşünüyorum.*' is has the lowest frequent ($\bar{X} = 2.83$) item in the questionnaire. Thus, although the students see themselves better than the others in terms of language learning skills, the participants do not see themselves so successful in producing language. As the second phase of the analysis Pearson's correlation was calculated. The results display a moderate correlation ($r(294) = .504$, $p < .001$) between language learning strategy use and self-esteem in learning English as a foreign language among vocational college students. Thus, it refers to a moderate correlation between the variables. As this finding is a correlation, it is possible that learners' esteem may cause the use of language learner strategies by the

students, or in other words, the use of language learning strategies may increase students' academic self-esteem in learning English. As it is stated in Chapter IV, some other factors also might have affected these two variables.

The present study aims to reveal the relationship language learning strategy use and the actual achievement grades received in the English course. Pearson' correlation analysis indicates a weak correlation $r(294) = .225, p < .001$ between variables. The result is significant at $< .001$ level. In order to reveal to what extent language learning strategy use predicts actual achievement grades in an English course, linear regression analysis was conducted. The results display a significant relation ($R= 0.225, R^2= 0.050$). That is, language learning strategy use predicts % 5 of English exam scores.

As a result of the analysis of the results for the research question 4C, '*rarely successful*' is the most cited perception of success noted by the students (166 students out of 294, thus, 56.5 %). Overall perception of success is at a moderate level with a mean value of ($\bar{x}=2.30, SD=.709$). Thus, findings indicate that the students in vocational collages perceive themselves '*rarely successful*' in foreign language learning. Pearson's correlational analysis indicates that the correlation between language learning strategy use and self-perception of achievement is at weak level, $r(294) = .373, p < .001$. Thus, as it is stated before in Chapter IV, the use of language learning strategy and self-perception of achievement have positive but low effects on each other. As it is commented for the previous findings of research question, it is difficult to say which affects the other.

Research question 5A aims to reveal to what extent language learning strategy use predicts the self-perception of achievement in learning English. Linear regression analysis displays a significant relation ($R=0.373, R^2= 0.139$). Thus, language learning strategy use predicts % 13.9 of the self-perception of achievement. The third instrument in the study, QPSFLE included two open-ended questions about the reasons of perceived achievement. The

collected data indicates that the participants stated 552 reasons for success. The frequency of the reasons are; strategy use (25.6%), effort (22.1%), personal interest (11.4%), teacher (6.3%) and ability (4.7). The other reasons were cited less frequently (See Table 29). On the other hand, 683 reasons were stated by the participants for failure. The highest proportions go to the lack of appropriate strategy use (15.2 %), the lack of effort (14.8%), the limitation of ability in English (12.4%), poor background knowledge of English (9.8%), and the lack of personal interest (8.7%), environment (6.78%), task (5.1%), and teacher (5.1%). The other reasons for failure were stated less than 5 per cent.

The researcher conducted interviews with the students to find out the self-perceived achievement of the participants and the actual reasons behind that. Quantitative analysis is supported by the qualitative findings retrieved from the interviews. That is, the use of language learning strategy was the most frequent reason for success, and lack of strategy use was the second frequent reason for failure.

As it can be inferred from both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the findings of the study, the use of language learning strategy use is a significant predictor of self-perceived achievement and plays a critical role in explaining success and failure.

The difference between success groups in terms of language learning strategy use is discussed in question 5B. The students were divided into two success groups according to the criteria stated in Chapter IV. Independent sample t-test was conducted to reveal the difference between groups. The result, $t(292) = -3.878, p < .001$, indicates that there is a significant difference between success groups in overall language learning strategy use. The difference between groups in terms of different types of language learning strategy use was also studied by applying independent sample t-tests. The results indicates that memory strategy use ($t(292) = -3.974, p < .001$), cognitive strategy use ($t(292) = -3.533, p < .001$), and metacognitive strategy use ($t(292) = -3.565, p < .001$) are significantly different between success groups.

Thus, use of memory, cognitive and metacognitive language learning strategies is more preferred by successful vocational college students than unsuccessful students.

Conclusion

A study of this kind which discusses the relations between the vocational college students' use of language learning strategies, self-esteem, self-perception of achievement and actual achievement grades may contribute language education in vocational colleges.

Findings of the study are discussed in Chapter IV in great detail for each research question. A summary of the main findings is also provided in this chapter. In this section, the conclusions for each research question are reported briefly.

The discussions for the research question 1 and 2 can be concluded that the students in vocational colleges utilize language learning strategies at a medium level. As it is aforementioned, this might be because of the relatively poor background of language education given to the students or might also be related to their overall academic levels in all school subjects. The students seem to employ metacognitive strategies more frequently than cognitive strategies. The reported strategies are various in kind and reflect a lack of direction.

According to the findings of research question 3A, graduated high school type has not a significant role on the use of overall language learning strategy use. Actually, Anatolian High Schools would be expected to have outperforming difference in using these strategies since they apply the strongest language teaching programme among the schools mentioned in the study. This result might be related with the overall academic level of students accepted to vocational colleges. Since these colleges do not prerequisite a grade in university entrance exam, both overall academic level and foreign language abilities of the students might not be as high as expected. The expected difference in learning strategy use appears in the analysis of the difference between high school types in the use of different strategy types. Not in all the strategy types but in only compensation strategy use, Anatolian High School graduates

outperform all the other high schools' graduates. Additionally, Vocational High School graduates also outperform the graduates of Trade High Schools. As a result, the difference between Anatolian High Schools and the other schools might be the result of offering much more English classes in Anatolian High Schools. The students in Anatolian High Schools are also more qualified in terms of academic skills. Thus, having high academic level and being imposed with a high amount of English language hours might have resulted ability in compensation strategies.

The analysis of the research question 3B reveals that there is no significant difference between genders in terms of language learning strategy use. Thus, both genders use same level, medium, of language learning strategies and this result is in consistency with the previous studies (Mahfouz A. R. I. M. & Ma'ajini O. B. H. 2013; and Asadifard & Biria, 2013) reported in Chapter III and IV.

Research question 4A aims to analyse the relationship between self-esteem in learning English and the use of language learning strategy use among the participants. Academic self-esteem analysis indicates that the students perceive themselves more skilful than their friends in learning a language although they have low self-esteem in producing language. Believing one's skills but not seeing oneself as successful as others might be the result of limitations or the lack of direction in the use of language learning strategies. The students might use some strategies but not be aware of the effective strategies for their level or purposes. In accordance with the results of previous studies, the findings of correlation analysis of the variables mentioned in research question 4A indicates a medium level of Pearson's correlation between using language learning strategies and academic self-esteem in language learning.

As it is aforementioned, the study revealed a weak correlation between language learning strategy use and actual achievement scores of the students in English exam. Additionally, the level of language learning strategy use predicts 5 % of the actual achieved

score in English exam. It can be concluded from the results that once the students are trained and encouraged to use language learning strategies, this might have a positive effect in their English exam scores.

Another issue which is discussed under the heading of research question 4C in the present study is the relationship between language learning strategy use and self-perceived achievement. Initially, the level of self-perceived achievement was measured and the result indicated a medium level of perceived achievement. Secondly, correlational calculations were carried out. The findings indicate that there is a weak correlation between language learning strategy use and self-perception of achievement. Thus, training the students on the use of language learning strategy use might create an advance in their self-perception of achievement.

Both quantitative and qualitative analysis of research question 5A revealed that language learning strategy use is a significant predictor of self-perception of achievement and it is also a critical reason among the others to explain success and failure in language learning. In consistency with the previous conclusions of the study, applications, which lead the student to use more language learning strategies, might provide an advance in their self-perception of achievement. This also might increase their intrinsic motivation in learning English.

As the last issue in the study, the difference between successful and unsuccessful students in terms of language learning strategy use was discussed in research question 5B. Analysis of independent sample t-test revealed that there is a significant difference between successful and unsuccessful groups in the uses of overall language learning strategies, memory strategies, cognitive strategies and metacognitive strategies, in the favour of successful group. It can be concluded from the analysis that, as it was revealed in the analysis of previous research questions, training and in-class or out of class applications on language

learning strategy use might lead the students to success in learning English in vocational schools.

Implications for Language Education and Suggestions for Further Research

With the help of careful analysis of findings, the following might be suggested:

1. Although the beginner-elementary level of course content is studied in the class hours, some of the participants explained their failure with 'poor background knowledge of English' which is a sign of 'learned helplessness'. At the beginning of the academic year, the course content might be introduced in detail making it clear for every student from the very beginning that the course is not dependent on any prerequisite linguistic knowledge.
2. New classroom applications might be developed considering the most frequently reported language learning strategies by the participants reported in the findings of research question 2. Learner strategy training sessions on how to use the most frequent strategies might have a positive effect on perception of achievement and self-esteem and actual achievement grades of the students in language learning.
3. The lack of direction in using language learning strategies is also a reported case in the findings of the study. Providing training for the students on language learning strategies might solve the problem of the lack of direction. This application may also be helpful to the students who believe in their skills but do not perceive themselves as successful as the others.
4. Reasons for failure reported by the students in the study might be used by the teachers to work with students who are struggling with learning English.

The suggestion for further studies might be listed as:

1. Contradicting mean values regarding the correlation between mean score of English test and perceived success seem to be a critical issue to be discussed in further

research studies. The mean score of the participants in the English achievement test is reported ($\bar{X}=40.35$). Perceiving successful at medium level but having low scores might be discussed with the students in interviews to reveal the reason of contradiction.

2. Findings also demonstrate that although some of the students stated the use of language learning strategies, it seems not to have a positive effect on their scores and their perception of success. The reason of this case might be studied not only in learning English context but in a study combining multiple disciplines related to education.
3. Structure modelling studies to formulate the relation between the issues discussed in the study might be conducted in further research studies.
4. Further research studies might be conducted taking all the beliefs into account about language learning. Thus, these further studies might reveal some other relationships between the variables discussed in the study.

References

- Altan, M. Z. (2004). Nationality and language learning strategies of ELT-major university students. *Asian EFL Journal*. http://www.asian-efljournal.com/Article_3_June_mza_nlls.2004.pdf
- Asadifard A. & Biria R. (2013). Affect and Strategy Use: The Relationship between EFL Learners' Self-esteem and Language Learning Strategies. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(9), pp. 1685-1690.
- Barcelos, A. M. F. (2003). Researching beliefs about SLA: A critical review. In P. Kalja, & A.M.F. Barcelos (Eds.). *Beliefs about SLA: New research approaches*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Press.
- Benjamin F. (2009). *Learning strategies, self-esteem and gender in first year university students*. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa, 2009)
- Besimoğlu S., Serdar H., & Yavuz Ş. (2010). Exploring students' attributions for their success and failures in English language learning. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14 (2), pp. 75-89.
- Bong M., & Skaalvik E.M. (2003). Academic self-concept and self-efficacy: how different are they really? *Educational Psychology Review*, 5 (1), pp. 1–40
- Brown H. D. (2002a). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H.D. (2002b). English language teaching in the "post-method" era: Towards better diagnosis, treatment and assessment," in Richards, J. C. and W. A. Renandya, (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching*, pp. 9-18. United Kingdom; Cambridge University Press.
- Brown J.D. (1988). *Understanding research in second language learning*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Sosyal Bilimler için Veri Analizi El Kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.

Cesur, O. & Fer, S. (2007) Dil öğrenme stratejileri envanterinin geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması nedir?. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4 (2), pp. 49-7.

Craig C. (2007). *Creating confidence*. (p. 2). Glasgow; The Centre for Confidence and Well-being.

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

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self-system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.) *Motivation, Language, Identity, and the L2 Self*, pp. 9-42. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Eaton M. J., & Dembo M. H. (1997). Differences in the motivation beliefs of Asian American and non-Asian students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, pp. 443-440.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition, 2nd ed.* Oxford: OxfordUniversity Press.

Erten İ.H., & Burden L. (2014). The relationship between academic self-concept, attributions and L2 achievement. Retrieved February 13, 2014 from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0346251X1400013X>

Gázquez J. J., Pérez M. C., Ruiz M. I., Miras F. & Vicente F. (2006). Estrategias de aprendizaje en estudiantes de enseñanza secundaria obligatoria y su relación con la autoestima: learning strategies in secondary-school students and relationship with self-esteem. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 6(1), pp.51-62.

- Ghavamnia M., Kassaian 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*, 2 (5), pp. 1156-1161
- Gobel P., & Mori S. (2007). Success and failure in the EFL classroom: exploring students' attributional beliefs in language learning. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, 7, pp. 149–169.
- Huang C. (2011). Self-concept and academic achievement: A meta-analysis of longitudinal relations. *Journal of School Psychology*, 49, pp. 505–528.
- Ku N.K (1999). A study of the relationships among self-efficacy, attribution for effort, and academic achievement for Asian and non-Asian fifth-grade students. (MA dissertation, California State University, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, (UMI No. 1397061)
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to post method*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kurtovic A. (2012). Relationship between attributions for success and failure and self-esteem, hopelessness and depression in secondary school students. *Croatian Journal of Education*, 14 (4), pp. 771-79
- Lipnevich A. A. (2006). Low Self-Esteem: Myth or Reality?. *Focus on Basics Connected Research and Practise*, Vol 8. Retrieved February 25, 2014 from <http://www.ncsall.net/?id=1105>.
- Mahfouz A. R. I. M. & Ma'ajini O. B. H. (2013). Self-learning strategies and their relationship with the development of motivation and self-esteem among a sample of students at King AbdullAziz University. *Life Science Journal*, 10(4), pp. 1323-1332.
- Matzin R., Shahrill M., Mahalle S., Hamid M.H.S., & Mundia L. (2013). A Comparison of learning styles and study strategies scores of Brunei secondary school students by test

- anxiety, success attributions, and failure attributions: Implications for teaching at-risk and vulnerable students. *Review of European Studies*, 5 (5), pp. 119-127.
- Ministry of Education . (2014) Orta öğretim kurumları haftalık ders çizelgesi. Retrieved February 13, 2014 from http://ogm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2012_09/05092630_ogmhd20122013.pdf.
- Mori S., Gobel P., Thepsiri K., & Pojanapunya P. (2010). Attributions for performance: a comparative study of Japanese and Thai university students. *JALT Journal*, 32 (1), pp. 5–28.
- Naiman, N., Fröhlich, M., Stern, H., & Todesco, A. (1978). The good language learner. *Research in Education Series*, 7. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Nunan D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan D. & Bailey K. (2009). *Exploring second language classroom research*. Boston: Heinle/Cengage.
- 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*. Boston, Mass: Heinle and Heinle.
- Pantelev, S. R. (1993). *Self-attitude Questionnaire*. Moscow: Smisl Publisher.
- Park G.-P. (1995). *Language learning strategies and beliefs about language learning of university students learning English in Korea*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.
- Peacock M. (2009). Attribution and learning English as a foreign language. *ELT Journal*, 64 (2), pp. 184–193.
- Razi, S. (2010). *Effects of a metacognitive reading program on the reading achievement and*

- metacognitive strategies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Çanakkale 18 Mart University, Turkey.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly* 9, pp. 41-51.
- Rubin J. (1987). Learner Strategies: Theoretical Assumptions, research, history, and typology. In Wenden, A. and Rubin, J. *Learner strategies in language learning*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Salashour F., Sharifi M., & Salashour N. (2013). The relationship between language learning strategy use, language proficiency level and learner gender. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, pp. 634 – 643.
- Seabi J. (2011). Relating learning strategies, self-esteem, intellectual functioning with academic achievement among first year engineering students. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 41(2), pp. 239-249.
- Siann G., Lightbody P., Stocks R., & Walsh D. (1996). Motivation and attribution at secondary school: The role of ethnic group and gender. *Gender and Education*, 8 (3), pp. 261-274
- Stern, H. H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31 (4), pp. 304-318.
- Stigler J.W., Smith S., & Mao L.W. (1985). The self-perception of competence by Chinese children. *Child development*, 56, pp. 1259–1270.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Su M. H. M. (2005). A study of EFL technological and vocational college students' language learning strategies and their self-perceived English proficiency. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 2(1), pp. 44-56.

- Sun M. (2009). The Study of EFL Technological University Students' Language Learning Strategies Use and Their CSEPT Performance. *Science and Thecnology*, 31, pp. 43-60.
- Suwanarak K. (2012). English language learning beliefs, learning strategies and achievement of Masters students in Thailand. *TESOL as a Global Trade: Ethics Equity and Ecology*, SE3.
- Thang S.M., Gobel P., Nor N.F.M., & Suppiah V.L., (2011). Students' attributions for success and failure in the learning of English as a second language: a comparison of undergraduates from six public universities in Malaysia. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 19 (2), pp. 459–474.
- Thomas L.F. & Harri-Augstein E.S. (1983). *The evaluation of an intelligent learning system, learning-to-learn and the CAL-Skills Trainer*. (Final report, Centre for the Study of Human Learning/Applied Psychology Unit of Admiralty Marine Technology Establishment Project), Centre for the Study of Human Learning. Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middx.
- Weiner B. (1992). *Human motivation: Metaphors, theories, and research*. Sage: Newbury Park
- Weiner B. (2010). The development of an attribution-based theory of motivation: a history of ideas. *Educational Psychologist*, 45 (1), pp. 28–36.
- Wenden, A. & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Williams M.D., & Burden R.L. (1999). Students' developing conceptions of themselves as language learners. *Modern Language Journal*, 83 (2), pp. 193–201.
- Williams M.D., Burden R.L., & Al-Baharna S. (2001). Making sense of success and failure:

the role of the individual in motivation theory. In Z. Dörnyei, R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition*, pp. 171–184. University of Hawai'i: Honolulu

Williams M., Burden R., Poulet G., & Maun I. (2004). Learners' perceptions of their successes and failures in foreign language learning. *The Language Learning Journal*, 30 (1), pp. 19-29

Yin C. (2008). Language learning strategies in relation to attitudes, motivations, and learner beliefs: Investigating learner variables in the context of English as a foreign language in China. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 2008). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, (UMI No. 3307947)

Yilmaz C. (2012). An investigation into Turkish EFL Students' attributions in reading comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 3(5), pp. 823-828.

Zaeri E., Shokrpour N., Nasiri E., & Kafipour R. (2012). Self-esteem and academic success as influenced by reading strategies. *English Language Teaching*, 5(2), p17.

Appendices

Appendix I

Dil Öğrenme Stratejileri Envanteri

Sevgili öğrenciler,

Bu anket dil öğrenme stratejileri ile dil öğrenmede kendine güven arasındaki karşılıklı ilişkiyi araştıran bir çalışmanın bir parçası olarak tasarlanmıştır. Lütfen ilk olarak sizin hakkınızda demografik bilgi içeren bölümleri doldurun ve daha sonra da dil öğrenme stratejileri ile ilgili sizin görüşleriniz hakkındaki soruları cevaplayın. Sizin tarafınızdan verilecek olan bu bilgilerin sadece araştırma amaçlı kullanılacağından emin olabilirsiniz.

Çalışmaya olan desteğinizden dolayı şimdiden teşekkür ederim,

Lütfen ilk önce aşağıdaki sorulara cevap verin.

A. Sınıfınız:

B. Cinsiyetiniz: Bay:..... Bayan:

DİL ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ ENVANTERİ Oxford (1990)

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 birinin üzerine (x) işareti koyarak belirtiniz. Verilen ifadenin, nasıl yapmanız gerektiği ya da başkalarının neler yaptığı değil, sadece sizin yaptıklarınızı ne kadar tasvir ettiğini işaretleyiniz. Maddeler üzerinde çok fazla düşünmeyiniz. Maddeleri yapabildiğiniz kadar hızlı şekilde, çok zaman harcamadan ve dikkatlice işaretleyip bir sonraki maddeye geçiniz. Anketi cevaplandırmak yaklaşık 10-15 dk. alır.

1= Hiçbir zaman doğru değil

2= Nadiren doğru

3= Bazen doğru

4= Sık sık doğru

5= Her zaman doğru

BÖLÜM A:

1. İngilizce'de bildiklerimle yeni öğrendiklerim arasında ilişki kurarım.

1

2

3

4

5

2. Yeni öğrendiğim kelimeleri hatırlamak için bir cümlede kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Yeni öğrendiğim kelimeleri akılda tutmak için kelimenin telaffuzuyla aklıma getirdiği bir resim ya da şekil arasında bağlantı kurarım.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Yeni bir kelimeyi o sözcüğün kullanılabileceği bir sahneyi ya da durumu aklımda canlandırarak, hatırlarım.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Yeni kelimeleri aklımda tutmak için, onları ses benzerliği olan kelimelerle ilişkilendiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Yeni öğrendiğim kelimeleri aklımda tutmak için küçük kartlara yazarım.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Yeni kelimeleri vücut dili kullanarak zihnimde canlandırırım.	1	2	3	4	5
8. İngilizce derslerinde öğrendiklerimi sık sık tekrar ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Yeni kelime ve kelime gruplarını ilk karşılaştığım yerleri (kitap, tahta ya da herhangi bir işaret levhasını) aklıma getirerek, hatırlarım.	1	2	3	4	5

BÖLÜM B:

10. Yeni sözcükleri birkaç kez yazarak, ya da söyleyerek, tekrarlarım.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Anadili İngilizce olan kişiler gibi konuşmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Anadilimde bulunmayan İngilizce'deki “th /θ / hw ” gibi sesleri çıkararak, telaffuz alıştırmaları yaparım.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Bildiğim kelimeleri cümlelerde farklı şekillerde kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
14. İngilizce sohbetleri ben başlatırım.	1	2	3	4	5
15. T.V.'de İngilizce programlar ya da İngilizce filmler izlerim.	1	2	3	4	5
16. İngilizce okumaktan hoşlanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
17. İngilizce mesaj, mektup veya rapor yazarım.	1	2	3	4	5
18. İngilizce bir metne ilk başta bir göz atarım, daha sonra metnin tamamını dikkatlice okurum.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Yeni öğrendiğim İngilizce kelimelerin benzerlerini Türkçe'de ararım.	1	2	3	4	5

20. İngilizce’de tekrarlanan kalıplar bulmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
21. İngilizce bir kelimenin, bildiğim kök ve eklerine ayırarak anlamını çıkarırım.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Kelimesi kelimesine çeviri yapmamaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Dinlediğim ya da okuduğum metnin özetini çıkarırım.	1	2	3	4	5
BÖLÜM C:					
24. Bilmediğim İngilizce kelimelerin anlamını, tahmin ederek bulmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
25. İngilizce konuşurken bir sözcük aklıma gelmediğinde, el kol hareketleriyle anlatmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Uygun ve doğru kelimeyi bilmediğim durumlarda kafamdan yeni sözcükler uydururum	1	2	3	4	5
27. Okurken her bilmediğim kelimeye sözlükten bakmadan, okumayı sürdürürüm.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Konuşma sırasında karşımdakinin söyleyeceği bir sonraki cümleyi tahmin etmeye çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Herhangi bir kelimeyi hatırlayamadığımda, aynı anlamı taşıyan başka bir kelime yada ifade kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
BÖLÜM D:					
30. İngilizce’mi kullanmak için her fırsatı değerlendiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
31. Yaptığım yanlışların farkına varır ve bunlardan daha doğru İngilizce kullanmak için faydalanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
32. İngilizce konuşan bir kişi duyduğumda dikkatimi ona veririm.	1	2	3	4	5
33. “İngilizce’yi daha iyi nasıl öğrenirim? “ sorusunun yanıtını araştırırım.	1	2	3	4	5
34. İngilizce çalışmaya yeterli zaman ayırmak için zamanımı planlarım.	1	2	3	4	5
35. İngilizce konuşabileceğim kişilerle tanışmak için fırsat kollarım.	1	2	3	4	5
36. İngilizce okumak için, elimden geldiği kadar fırsat yaratırım.	1	2	3	4	5
37. İngilizce’de becerilerimi nasıl geliştireceğim konusunda hedeflerim var.	1	2	3	4	5

38. İngilizce’mi ne kadar ilerlettiğimi değerlendiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

BÖLÜM E:

39. İngilizce’mi kullanırken tedirgin ve kaygılı olduğum anlar rahatlamaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Yanlış yaparım diye kaygılandığımda bile İngilizce konuşmaya gayret ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
41. İngilizce’de başarılı olduğum zamanlar kendimi ödüllendiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
42. İngilizce çalışırken ya da kullanırken gergin ve kaygılı isem, bunun farkına varırım.	1	2	3	4	5
43. Dil öğrenirken yaşadığım duyguları bir yere yazarım.	1	2	3	4	5
44. İngilizce çalışırken nasıl ya da neler hissettiğimi başka birine anlatırım.	1	2	3	4	5
BÖLÜM F:					
45. Herhangi bir şeyi anlamadığımda, karşımdaki kişiden daha yavaş konuşmasını ya da söylediklerini tekrar etmesini isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
46. Konuşurken karşımdakinin yanlışlarımı düzeltmesini isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
47. Okulda arkadaşlarımla İngilizce konuşurum.	1	2	3	4	5
48. İhtiyaç duyduğumda İngilizce konuşan kişilerden yardım isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
49. Derste İngilizce sorular sormaya gayret ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
50. İngilizce konuşanların kültürü hakkında bilgi edinmeye çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix II

Academic Self-Esteem Questionnaire

Academic Self-Esteem Questionnaire				
1. I can do as well or better than others at school.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Never true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Rarely true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Often true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Always true for me
2. I have a good understanding of the things I learn at school.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Never true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Rarely true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Often true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Always true for me
3. My skills are weaker than other people in this class.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Never true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Rarely true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Often true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Always true for me
4. I can understand the ideas and skills at school.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Never true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Rarely true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Often true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Always true for me
5. I am as smart as most people.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Never true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Rarely true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Often true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Always true for me

Appendix III

Academic Self-Esteem Questionnaire in Learning English

Academic Self-Esteem Questionnaire in Learning English				
1. I can do as well or better than others in learning English.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Never true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Rarely true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Often true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Always true for me
2. I have a good understanding of the things I learn in English class.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Never true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Rarely true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Often true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Always true for me
3. My skills are weaker than other people in learning English.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Never true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Rarely true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Often true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Always true for me
4. I can understand the ideas and skills in English class.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Never true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Rarely true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Often true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Always true for me
5. I am as smart as most people in learning English.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Never true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Rarely true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Often true for me	<input type="checkbox"/> Always true for me

Appendix IV

İngilizce Öğreniminde Akademik Özsaygı Anketi (Academic Self-Esteem Questionnaire in Learning English)

İngilizce Öğreniminde Akademik Özsaygı Anketi					
İngilizce Öğreniminde Akademik Özsaygı Anketi 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 birinin üzerine (x) işareti koyarak belirtiniz. Verilen ifadenin, nasıl olması gerektiğini değil sizin kendiniz hakkında neler hissettiğinizi veya düşündüğünüzü ne kadar tasvir ettiğini işaretleyiniz. Maddeler üzerinde çok fazla düşünmeyiniz. Maddeleri yapabildiğiniz kadar hızlı şekilde, çok zaman harcamadan ve dikkatlice işaretleyip bir sonraki maddeye geçiniz. Anketi cevaplandırmak yaklaşık 3-5 dk. alır.	1= Hiçbir zaman doğru değil	2= Nadiren doğru	3= Bazen doğru	4= Sık sık doğru	5= Her zaman doğru

1. İngilizce öğreniminde diğerleri kadar veya daha iyi şeyler yapabildiğimi düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
2. İngilizce dersinde öğrendiğim şeyleri iyi anladığımı düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
3. İngilizce öğrenmedeki yeteneklerim sınıftaki diğerlerinden daha zayıf.	1	2	3	4	5
4. İngilizce dersinde öğretilen yetenek ve görüşleri anlayabiliyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
5. İngilizce öğreniminde çoğu insan kadar yetenekliyim.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix V

İngilizce Öğrenmede Başarı ve Başarısızlık Algısı Anketi

Sevgili Öğrenciler,

Yapılan bu araştırmayla dil öğrenmede başarınızın veya başarısızlığınızın nedenlerini öğrenip, siz öğrencilerimizin bu alanda başarısına katkıda bulunabilmemiz için lütfen aşağıdaki bölümleri içtenlikle cevaplayınız.

Teşekkür ederiz.

A) Cinsiyet: Kız/ Erkek Sınıf: Bölüm:

B) İngilizce öğrenmeyi seviyorum.

Katılmıyorum		Kısmen Katılıyorum		Katılıyorum		Kesinlikle Katılıyorum	
--------------	--	--------------------	--	-------------	--	------------------------	--

C) İngilizce öğrenmedeki kendi başarı algınız nedir?

1. İngilizce öğrenmede çoğunlukla başarılı olduğumu düşünüyorum.
2. İngilizce öğrenmede bazen başarılı olduğumu düşünüyorum.
3. İngilizce öğrenmede nadiren başarılı olduğumu düşünüyorum.
4. İngilizce öğrenmede asla başarılı olduğumu düşünmüyorum.

D) İngilizce öğrenmede başarılı olduğumda, başlıca nedenlerimin şunlar olduğunu düşünüyorum:

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

E) İngilizce öğrenmede başarısız olduğumda, başlıca nedenlerimin şunlar olduğunu düşünüyorum:

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Teşekkürler

Appendix VI

Interviews Protocol

Time: _____

Date: _____

Place: _____

Interviewee Student ID: _____

The purpose of this interview is to understand;

- Whether the students like learning English or not.

-Whether the students perceive themselves successful in learning English or not.

-What are the factors effecting students success or failure (students' own reasons for success and failure)?

The questions in the interviews.

Questions:

1. Liking of learning English:

a) Do you like learning English?

b) Why or why not?

3. Do you find yourself successful in learning English?

(If the student finds himself/herself successful, interview continues with the question four.

If not, with the question six)

4. What makes you successful in learning English?

5. What other things might have been affective on your success?

6. What makes you failed in learning English?

7. What other things might have been affective on your failure?

Görüşme soruları

1. İngilizce öğrenmeyi sevmeye durumu:

a) İngilizce öğrenmeyi seviyor musun?

b) Neden seviyorsun veya neden sevmiyorsun?

3. İngilizce öğrenmede kendini başarılı buluyor musun?

(Öğrenci kendini başarılı buluyorsa, röportaj 4. Soruyla devam eder.Eğer başarılı bulmuyorsa 6. Soruyla devam eder.)

4. İngilizce öğrenmede seni başarılı yapan unsur nedir?

5. Başarına başka neler etki etmiş olabilir?

6. İngilizce öğrenmede seni başarısız yapan unsur nedir?

7. Başarısızlığına başka neler etki etmiş olabilir?



T.C.
ÇANAKKALE ONSEKİZ MART ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Çan Meslek Yüksekokulu Müdürlüğü

Sayı : 62845123/010.99/217
Konu : İngilizce Verilerinin Kullanımı

27/01/2014

Sayın : Okt. Adnan YAVUZ

Yazınızda belirtmiş olduğunuz 2012-2013 Akademik Yılında İngilizce Dili Öğretimi alanında yapmış olduğunuz anket ve röportaj verilerini, katılımcıların özel bilgilerini gizli tutmak kaydı ile yüksek lisans tez çalışmalarınızda ve bilimsel yayınlarda kullanma isteğiniz uygun görülmüştür.

Gereğini bilgilerinize rica ederim.

Doç.Dr. Özcan ÖZEN
Meslek Yüksekokul Müdürü