THE GRAMMAR LEARNING STRATEGIES EMPLOYED BY TURKISH

UNIVERSITY PREPARATORY SCHOOL EFL STUDENTS

The Graduate School of Education
of
Bilkent University

by

ALİ GÜRATA

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

July 2008

BILKENT UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

MA THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

July 3, 2008

The examining committee appointed by the Graduate School of Education for the

thesis examination of the MA TEFL student

Ali Gürata

has read the thesis of the student.

The committee has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Thesis Title:	The Grammar Learning Strategies Employed by Turkish University Preparatory School EFL Students
Thesis Advisor:	Asst. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program
Committee Members:	Asst. Prof. Dr. Necmi Akşit Bilkent University, Graduate School of Education
	Asst. Prof. Dr. Arif Sarıçoban Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education Department of Foreign Language Teaching Division of English Language Teaching

ABSTRACT

THE GRAMMAR LEARNING STRATEGIES EMPLOYED BY TURKISH

UNIVERSITY PREPARATORY SCHOOL EFL STUDENTS

Ali Gürata

M.A., Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters

July 2008

This study mainly investigated (a) which learning strategies Turkish EFL learners use when learning and using grammar structures, and (b) the difference in learning strategy use by several variables, such as gender, proficiency level, and achievement on grammar tests. The study was conducted at Middle East Technical University (METU), School of Foreign Languages, with the participation of 176 students from three different proficiency levels (pre-intermediate, intermediate, and upper-intermediate). The data were collected through a 35-item questionnaire regarding grammar learning strategies.

The analysis of the quantitative data revealed that Turkish EFL learners think learning English grammar is important, and that these learners use a variety of learning strategies when they learn and use grammar structures. The findings from this study also indicated that there is a difference in learning strategy use among different proficiency levels. Similarly, a significant difference was found between

males and females in terms of their strategy use. Finally, the study showed that using grammar learning strategies is influential in grammar achievement.

Keywords: Grammar, learning strategies, proficiency level, gender, achievement

ÖZET

İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENEN TÜRK ÜNİVERSİTE HAZIRLIK SINIFI ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN KULLANDIĞI DİLBİLGİSİ ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİ

Ali Gürata

Yüksek lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. JoDee Walters

Temmuz 2008

Bu çalışma, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin dilbilgisi yapılarını öğrenirken ve kullanırken uyguladıkları öğrenme stratejileri ile öğrenme stratejileri kullanımında cinsiyet, seviye ve dilbilgisi sınavlarındaki başarı gibi çeşitli değişkenlere bağlı farklılıkları incelemektedir. Çalışma, Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi (ODTÜ), Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu'nda üç farklı seviyede (orta altı, orta ve orta üstü) öğrenim gören 176 öğrencinin katılımıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Veri toplama aracı olarak 35 maddelik dilbilgisi öğrenme stratejileri anketi kullanılmıştır.

Elde edilen sayısal verilerin incelenmesi sonucunda, Türkiye'deki İngilizce öğrencilerinin, bu dildeki dilbilgisi kurallarını öğrenmenin önemli olduğunu düşündükleri görülmüş ve ayrıca bu öğrencilerin dilbilgisi yapılarını öğrenirken ve kullanırken çeşitli öğrenme stratejileri kullandıkları ortaya çıkmıştır. Ayrıca, bu çalışmadan elde edilen bulgular, farklı dil seviyelerindeki öğrencilerin strateji kullanımında farklılıklar olduğunu göstermiştir. Aynı şekilde, kadın ve erkekler

arasında da öğrenme stratejileri bakımından belirgin farklılık olduğu gözlenmiştir. Son olarak, bu çalışma, öğrenme stratejileri kullanımının dilbilgisi sınavlarında başarıya etkisi olduğunu göstermiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Dilbilgisi, öğrenme stratejileri, dil seviyesi, cinsiyet, başarı

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my profound gratitude to my advisor, Dr. JoDee Walters for her guidance, patience and encouragement throughout this research work. Without her continuous support, this thesis would never have been completed in the right way.

My sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Julie Matthews-Aydınlı, who shared her invaluable knowledge with us all through the year. Her guidance and expert advice enabled me to complete this thesis successfully.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my wife Eser for simply being there.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Although controversies arise from time to time over its place in language classrooms, grammar is still necessary for accurate language production. It has been shown that exposure to the target language is not enough for learners to 'pick up' accurate linguistic form, especially when the exposure is limited to the EFL classroom (Larsen-Freeman, 2001). This finding validates the importance of grammar, especially for EFL settings.

Today, our understanding of grammar instruction is mainly shaped by the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach. Although there are various interpretations of this approach in terms of grammar instruction, one can say that grammar in CLT is presented in a meaningful context, and thus it serves as a means of accurate and fluent communication. In addition, a CLT lesson should ideally focus on all of the components (grammatical, discourse, functional, sociolinguistic, and strategic) of communicative competence (H. D. Brown, 2001).

With the CLT approach, there has also been a shift in classrooms from teacher-centered to learner-centered instruction. Moreover, as Brown (2001) states, in a CLT classroom, "students are given opportunities to focus on their own learning process through an understanding of their own styles of learning and through the development of appropriate strategies for autonomous learning" (p. 43). Being aware of learning styles and strategies not only helps learners to learn better, but also enables teachers to attune their instruction so that they can reach more students (Oxford, 2001).

This study sets out to determine the strategies that EFL students use when they learn and use grammar structures. It will also investigate the relationship between the use of grammar learning strategies and students' achievement on grammar tests.

Background of the Study

The place of grammar in language classrooms has long been debated. Once, studying grammar was the only classroom practice (i.e., the Grammar Translation Method). Then, learning grammar was overshadowed by speaking (i.e., the Direct Method). Several years later, it regained importance (i.e., the Cognitive Code Learning).

In addition to the question of how much grammar should be provided, there are two dichotomies still prevalent in L2 literature: deductive versus inductive approaches, and explicit versus implicit approaches. The studies that investigated which of these approaches is better have yielded different results. In addition, several researchers point out that learners may benefit from different types of instruction as they have different learning styles and strategies (DeKeyser, 1994; Larsen-Freeman, 1979). Given the fact that grammar classes tend to be comprised of students who experience varying levels of success in grammar learning, in spite of being exposed to the same kind of instruction, individual differences probably play a part in grammar learning, and one of those individual differences may be the learners' learning styles and strategies.

The field of learning styles and strategies is relatively new. The research into learner differences has indicated that all learners use certain strategies in order to promote their learning. Further studies enabled several researchers (e.g., O'Malley &

Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990) to organize the commonly used learning strategies into different classification schemes, by determining certain strategy types, such as cognitive, metacognitive, social-affective, and compensation strategies.

Several researchers have also investigated the learning strategies that help specific language skills. For example, Hosenfeld (1977) studied the reading strategies of successful and unsuccessful learners, and her study revealed that successful readers employed contextual guessing strategies when reading, and that they evaluated the correctness of their guesses.

Cohen and Aphek (1980) investigated the impact of strategy training on the learning of vocabulary. They taught learners to make associations when learning new words in the second language. The study revealed that the participants performed better at vocabulary tasks for recall of words which were learnt through association techniques.

O'Malley, Chamot and Küpper (1989) explored the strategies that second language learners use in listening comprehension, and the differences in strategy use between effective and ineffective listeners. They observed that three strategies distinguished effective listeners from ineffective ones: self-monitoring, elaboration, and inferencing. They also added that while effective listeners used top-down and bottom-up processing strategies together, ineffective listeners drew only on the meanings of individual words.

Although the relationship between pronunciation and learning strategies has not been explored much, one study for a doctoral dissertation by Peterson (1997) investigated the pronunciation learning strategies that adult learners of Spanish use. Peterson identified 23 strategies that had not been identified before. She also

identified two types of strategies that had a relationship with pronunciation ability: authentic/functional practice strategies, and reflection strategies.

The learning strategies that are employed in grammar learning have not been thoroughly explored either. One study that concerned learning strategies and grammar was conducted by Vines Gimeno (2002). This researcher used cognitive and metacognitive learning strategies to teach grammar points. The study indicated that the experimental group which was given strategy instruction improved their grammar more than the control group did.

Sarıçoban (2005) investigated the employment of grammar learning strategies by university level students. The researcher used a questionnaire to determine the learning strategies used by the students. However, the items and the categorization used for these items are suspect; some of the items that are called learning strategies by the researcher seem to be attitudes or preferences.

Another study that aimed to investigate grammar learning strategies was conducted by Yalçın (2003). In this study, the researcher devised a grammar learning strategy questionnaire to explore the strategies that EFL learners use. In addition, Yalçın explored the correlation between grammar learning strategy use and overall student achievement. The results of this study indicated no significant relationship between grammar learning strategy use and achievement.

<div align="center">Statement of the problem</div>

In the second language literature, extensive research has been conducted in order to determine general language learning strategies. In addition, several studies have investigated the learning strategies that learners employ in specific language skills. Regarding grammar learning strategies there has been little research

conducted. One study (Vines Gimeno, 2002) aimed to investigate the effects of strategy-based instruction on grammar learning. In this study, the researcher built on the general learning strategies that have already been suggested by other researchers (i.e., O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Wenden & Rubin, 1987), yet she did not suggest any learning strategies that apply specifically to grammar learning. Two researchers working separately in Turkey (Sarıçoban, 2005; Yalçın, 2003) sought to determine the grammar learning strategies employed by EFL learners. However, in both studies, several items on the questionnaires that were used to collect data seem to represent learning styles or preferences rather than learning strategies. Some of these items were also considered by both of the researchers to be metacognitive strategies, although they were regarded by Oxford (1990) as either cognitive or affective strategies. Yalçın (2003) also investigated the relationship between grammar learning strategies and overall achievement. His study indicated no significant correlation between grammar learning strategy use and achievement in overall English courses. Therefore, first, there is a need for a dependable list of learning strategies that EFL learners use in learning grammar, and second, more research is necessary in terms of the variation in grammar learning strategy use according to several variables, such as gender and proficiency level, and the impact of grammar learning strategy use on achievement on grammar tests.

At many universities in Turkey, grammar and accuracy are the dominant foci in the curriculum and in examinations. Some quizzes are particularly based on grammar. Therefore, students are expected to gain a great understanding of grammar structures. However, the overall achievement of the students on exams does not match the expectations of the school directors. One reason for this may be that the

learners are not aware of the strategies that would work better for them. In addition, the teachers may not be helping their students employ effective grammar learning strategies.

Research questions

This study aims to address the following research questions:

1. What grammar learning strategies do Turkish university preparatory school EFL students use?

2. Which strategies are used most frequently?

3. Which strategies do students find most useful?

4. Does grammar strategy use vary in terms of the following variables?

    a. Proficiency level

    b. Gender

    c. Perceived importance of grammar

    d. Grammar achievement

Significance of the Study

More research is needed into learning strategies, especially into those language points that have not been adequately explored, such as grammar learning. This study may provide the literature with more data about the learning strategies that EFL learners employ when they deal with grammar. It may also yield more data concerning the differences in strategy use according to proficiency level, gender, and perceived importance of grammar.

This study may also help Turkish EFL students to become aware of several strategies that would promote the learning of grammar. Being aware of the strategies they currently use, and monitoring the effectiveness of these strategies may help

them regulate their learning. Learning about the other strategies that learners of grammar use may help them try different learning strategies. In order for the students to learn these strategies, their teachers should help them. Therefore, the teachers, if they are given information about the findings of this study, may provide their students with grammar learning strategy instruction.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, and significance of the problem have been presented. The next chapter reviews the literature on the place of grammar in language instruction, and synthesizes the research into language learning strategies. In the third chapter, the research methodology is presented. The fourth chapter presents data analysis procedures and findings. Finally, the fifth chapter discusses the findings, and presents the pedagogical implications, limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This study sets out to investigate the strategies that EFL students use when they learn grammar. It also explores the relationship between the use of grammar learning strategies and students' achievement. In this chapter, following a description of the place of grammar in the language classroom throughout time, the literature on language learning strategies will be synthesized.

Historical Background of Grammar Instruction

Language teaching in the early nineteenth century was far from being communicative. As Richards and Rodgers (2001) put it, the main goal of foreign language study of the time was "to learn a language in order to read its literature or in order to benefit from the mental discipline and intellectual development that result from foreign language study" (p. 5). The general practices in classrooms were memorization of grammar rules and vocabulary, and translations, beginning with sentences and then literary texts, into the native language. Therefore, the methodology of the time is known as the Grammar Translation Method.

The major focus in the language classrooms was reading and writing; speaking and pronunciation were of little or no importance. Grammar was taught deductively; following the explicit presentation of the rules, several sentences were translated for practice. The students were expected to memorize a list of target vocabulary provided with their equivalents in the mother tongue. Moreover, the instruction was in the native language.

The Grammar Translation Method was the prevailing method until the mid-twentieth century, and it is still in practice in some schools (H. D. Brown, 2001; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Although this method does not improve learners' communicative competence, the fact that it requires fewer professional skills and less planning for the teachers, and that it is easier to prepare and score tests of grammar rules and translations can account for its popularity (H. D. Brown, 2001).

The second half of the nineteenth century witnessed a rising interest in the study of spoken language through the efforts of linguists of the time, and a "naturalistic" approach to second language learning. According to the proponents of this natural method, or, as it was later called, the Direct Method, second language acquisition was considered similar to first language acquisition. Therefore, the medium of instruction was the target language, and exposure to the spoken target language and oral production were emphasized over reading and writing. Furthermore, grammar was taught inductively, without much attention given to its rules; language learners were, in fact, supposed to 'pick up' the grammar structures by being actively involved in language, in the way that children do when they are learning the mother tongue (Thornbury, 1999). In contrast to the way vocabulary had been taught in the Grammar Translation Method by giving lists, with the Direct Method, pictures, objects, and demonstrations were used to teach vocabulary. The popularity of the Direct Method declined in the twentieth century; it was criticized for having weak theoretical foundations, and its effectiveness depended on small classes and native speakers as instructors, and thus it failed to find a place in public schools (H. D. Brown, 2001; Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

In the 1950s, another method emerged in the U.S., the Audiolingual Method. This method resembled the Direct Method in its placement of aural/oral skills at the center of language learning. In contrast to the Direct Method, this method was based on linguistic and psychological theories, namely structural linguistics and behaviorist psychology. According to the linguists of the time, learning a language meant learning its sounds (phonology), followed by the words and sentences (structures). Therefore, paying much attention to pronunciation and oral drilling of basic patterns were the center of instruction. Similarly, behaviorists considered language learning to be habit formation through practice and imitation. The classes usually began with the memorization of dialogues, and then the structures in the dialogues were practiced more, again with utmost attention given to pronunciation. With regard to grammar, it was even more limited than the Direct Method, with little or no explicit provision of rules (H. D. Brown, 2001; Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

After enjoying popularity for about a decade, the Audiolingual Method fell out of favor as a result of the changes in American linguistic theory in the 1960s. Furthermore, it was observed that the skills acquired in language classrooms failed to be transferred to real communication outside the classroom, and the practices were found to be boring and unsatisfying by the learners (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Chomsky was the pioneer to challenge the behaviorist perspective of the time that viewed language acquisition as habit formation. His theory of transformational generative grammar posited that children are born with an innate knowledge of language structure which is common to all human languages. This deep structure was called Universal Grammar, and it was asserted that it consists of principles which underlie the knowledge of language (White, 1995). According to Chomsky, language

learning was not the result of imitation and repetition, but created or generated from this underlying knowledge (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). This notion was in line with the nativist perspective in philosophy, and cognitive psychology. Its impact on language teaching gave rise to another approach, Cognitive Code Learning. As Richards and Rodgers (2001) point out, this approach "allowed for a conscious focus on grammar and acknowledged the role of abstract mental processes in learning rather than defining learning in terms of habit formation" (p. 66). Meaningful learning and language use were also emphasized. In addition, learners were expected to draw on their existing knowledge and their mental skills in order to acquire a second language. This methodology did not last for long because it lacked clear methodological guidelines, and the learners were overburdened with too much drilling and explanation of all grammar rules (H. D. Brown, 2001; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). However, the term cognitive code or cognitive approach is still used to refer to practices of conscious focus on grammar along with meaningful practice and use of language (Fotos, 2001; Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

In the 1970s, the importance of sociolinguistics and pragmatics were emphasized in second language teaching, which led to another approach, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). This was the time when several researchers argued that knowing the rules of grammar was not always sufficient to convey an appropriate meaning. Canale and Swain (1980) were among these researchers, and they identified three main strands of 'communicative competence': grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence. Grammatical competence includes knowledge of lexis, morphology, syntax, semantics, and phonology. Sociolinguistic competence consists of two sets of rules:

sociocultural rules of use and rules of discourse. Sociocultural rules of use are associated with the choice of propositions that are appropriate for a given sociocultural context. The rules of discourse refer to coherence of utterances. Strategic competence, on the other hand, includes verbal and non-verbal communication strategies, such as paraphrasing, which help the speaker continue a conversation. This idea of communicative competence had a significant impact on classroom applications in CLT (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

In the 1980s, there seemed to be two versions of CLT in terms of grammar: the shallow-end version, and the deep-end version (Thornbury, 1999). In the shallow-end version, grammar was not rejected, but it was introduced in order to serve as a function. In this version, a common approach to grammar instruction was the presentation-practice-production (PPP) model, which is still popular at many institutions (Hedge, 2000). In this approach, a grammatical structure is taught in three stages: first, it is presented to the learner, then, it is practiced in a controlled way, usually with drills, and finally, the learner is given freer and more natural activities in which to produce the target form. Teacher correction is considered to be important in the first two stages; however, in the production stage the teacher is supposed not to interrupt the activity, but give feedback afterwards (Hedge, 2000; Johnson & Johnson, 1998).

The deep-end version, on the other hand, considered explicit grammar instruction unnecessary. However, several researchers argue that strong communicative approaches which neglect grammar instruction result in poor accuracy (Fotos, 2001; Hinkel & Fotos, 2002; Larsen-Freeman, 2001; Thornbury, 1999). In addition, among several other studies, one study by Spada and Lightbown

(1989, cited by Spada, 2005), revealed that young ESL learners' communicative exposure to English for five months contributed to their fluency, but in terms of accuracy, they were observed to have made many morphological and syntactic errors.

As a result of the ongoing debates, in the 1990s, an alternative approach to traditional structure-based grammar teaching was suggested by Long (1991). According to this "focus-on-form" approach, grammar should be presented in meaningful contexts. This was in contrast to the traditional "focus-on-forms" approach, which introduced grammar in an isolated, decontextualized way. The argument over focus-on-form and focus-on-forms approaches has found a place in the literature up until the present time. There is no consensus among researchers on which form-focused instruction is more effective, and while some researchers support a focus-on-form approach (e.g., Doughty, 2001), others support focus-on-forms (e.g., DeKeyser, 1998), and still others think that there is room for both approaches in classrooms (e.g., Ellis, 2006).

As Ellis (2006) points out, there is also disagreement concerning the pedagogic practices of focus-on-form approach. The presentation of a target structure can be provided as the need arises (incidentally) or it can be a planned (predetermined) event. Moreover, the focus-on-form approach can be implemented implicitly, that is by enhancing input (e.g., highlighting or underlining the target structures) included in a listening or a reading task, or explicitly (by the teacher's presenting a rule).

In addition to the discussions mentioned above, there are two dichotomies concerning grammar instruction which are still widely discussed today: (1) explicit

versus implicit and (2) deductive versus inductive. Usually these terms are used interchangeably, and the distinction between these terms is not very clear. As DeKeyser (1994) puts it,

> Deductive means that the rules are given before any examples are seen; inductive means that the rules are inferred from examples presented (first). Implicit means that no rules are formulated; explicit means rules are formulated (either by the teacher or the student, either before or after examples/practice). (p. 188)

It has also been argued that different types of instruction give better results with different grammatical structures, and likewise, learners with different learner styles benefit more from different kinds of teaching (DeKeyser, 1994). According to Larsen-Freeman (1979), "a course designed to best meet the needs of all students would have to be one which included both inductive and deductive presentations of a language learning task" (p. 219).

The review of the literature on grammar instruction thus reveals that although it has changed in terms of approach and the amount of time given in class, grammar instruction is still considered to be an important part of language teaching. It has also been shown that the traces of the above-mentioned methodologies, even grammar translation method, can still be seen in today's classrooms.

Grammar Instruction in Turkey

Learning the grammar of a foreign language is considered to be important in Turkey, and grammar is usually taught and assessed with a discrete point approach. In fact, at many institutions in Turkey, teachers equate teaching English with teaching grammar; the syllabus they follow is a grammar-based syllabus (Rathert, 2007). Moreover, these teachers are seen as "knowledge imparters" who introduce grammar deductively, and who ask their students to do drill-like exercises after

giving the rules and explanations; basically, a shortened version of PPP model in which presentation and practice are provided, yet the production stage is avoided (Rathert, 2007).

However, there are signs that grammar instruction may be changing in Turkey; some researchers are studying different approaches to grammar instruction. One study by Pakyıldız (1997) investigated the differences and similarities in grammar instruction in a discrete skills program (DSP) in which grammar is taught separately and an integrated skills program (ISP) in which grammar is taught in an integral manner. The results of the study revealed that grammar instruction has both differences and similarities in curriculum design, instructional materials and textbook activities, and grammar teaching procedures in terms of the presentation, practice, correction and evaluation stages in the DSP and ISP.

In another study, Mor Mutlu (2001) compared the task-based approach with the traditional presentation-practice-production (PPP) approach to grammar instruction in terms of effectiveness on students' achievement in learning two grammatical structures "present perfect tense" and "passive voice". The results of the study indicated that the task-based group gained more achievement in learning the first grammar structure in the long term, yet both instruction types proved to be equally effective in the short term. For the second grammar structure, the task-based instruction was found to be more effective in the short term, whereas both instruction types provided success in the long term.

Another study by Eş (2003) sought to find out which type of focus-on-form – input flood, input+output, or input+output+feedback – is more effective in promoting the learning of "conditionals". The study indicated that the output-based focus-on-

form treatment, whether it is complemented with corrective feedback or not, has positive effects on learning of the target grammar structures.

In conclusion, the research on grammar instruction suggests that there is room for different instructional approaches. One reason for learners' varying responses to different grammar teaching approaches might be that each learner possesses different learning styles and strategies. The next section aims to discuss the place of learning styles and strategies in the literature.

Learning Styles and Strategies

All humans have their own way of learning things. Learning styles and strategies are thought to be influential in this. They are also considered to have a role in success in language learning.

Learning Styles

Oxford (2001) defines learning styles as "the *general* approaches that students use in acquiring a new language or in learning any other subject" (p. 359). In the literature more than 21 learning styles have been identified. Some of these learning styles are more associated with second language learning, for instance the four perceptual learning preferences of visual learning, auditory learning, kinesthetic learning, and tactile learning. Whereas visual learners prefer reading or studying charts, auditory learners appear to learn better by listening to lectures or audio materials. Kinesthetic learners are associated with experiential learning in which there is physical involvement, and tactile learners prefer hands-on activities such as building models or doing laboratory experiments. In a study by Reid (1987), it has been shown that there is a variation in these learning preferences according to gender and cultural differences.

One other distinction in terms of learning styles which has been studied extensively is field independence/field dependence. The research on learner differences suggests that a learner with a field independent (FI) style tends to easily see the details of a subject, whereas a field dependent (FD) learner can see the subject as a whole. According to a study by Abraham (1985) in which the relationship between FI/FD and deductive/inductive grammar instruction was investigated, it was found that while FI learners perform better in deductive lessons, FD learners are more successful in inductive lessons. Researchers (e.g., H. D. Brown, 2000; Oxford, 2001), however, conclude that learning styles are not to be seen as clear-cut distinctions among people, but rather a continuum along which people tend to be placed, according to the time and context of learning.

Personality types have also been considered to play a role on successful L2 learning (Stern, 1983). Building on the work of psychologist Carl Jung, four major dimensions of personality types have been suggested: extroverted versus introverted, sensing versus intuitive, thinking versus feeling, and judging versus perceiving. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), an inventory designed to identify 16 personality types, which are the combination of the four above-mentioned dimensions, has been used by researchers such as Ehrman and Oxford (1988) in order to investigate the relationship between personality types and L2 proficiency.

Research into learning styles has thus shaped language instruction; contemporary language teaching today necessitates teachers to use various methods or techniques that would appeal to the different learning styles of their students. Another equally important issue in today's classroom is language learning strategies,

which improve proficiency and self-confidence in language learning, when used
appropriately (Oxford, 1990).

<p style="text-align:center">*Learning Strategies*</p>

Learning strategies differ from learning styles in that they are "*specific
actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques used by students to enhance their own
learning*" (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992, p. 63). However, they are related to each other;
the choice of a strategy or a series of strategies depends on the individual's learning
style together with the task that he/she is approaching to (H. D. Brown, 2000;
Oxford, 2001). This might account for the fact that learning strategies may also vary
from person to person, and that a particular learning strategy may not always help
learning of a particular language point. Furthermore, several researchers (e.g.,
Ehrman & Oxford, 1988; Green & Oxford, 1995) have shown that differences in
strategy use by females and males may be explained by their different learning
styles.

Determining the Learning Strategies

The research into learning styles and strategies began in the 1970s, following
the developments in second language acquisition and cognitive psychology. This was
also the time when the focus of second language learning moved from teaching
processes to learning processes. Therefore, several researchers began to investigate
learner differences, and sought to find out why some learners are more successful
than others in learning a foreign language.

Rubin's (1975) study of successful language learners is considered, in the
literature, to be one of the earliest investigations into learner differences. Rubin
observed language classes directly or on videotape and identified several strategies –

rather techniques or devices – of good language learners. She suggested that the good language learner: (1) is a willing and accurate guesser, (2) has a strong drive to communicate, (3) is often uninhibited about his/her weakness in the second language and ready to risk making mistakes, (4) is willing to attend to form, (5) practices, (6) monitors his/her speech and compares it to the native standard, and (7) attends to meaning in its social context. Rubin also suggested that these strategies could also be learned to help less successful learners.

Just about the same time Stern (1975, cited in Stern, 1983) identified ten strategies that were employed by successful learners. These strategies were:

1. Planning strategy: a personal learning style or positive learning strategy.

2. Active strategy: an active approach to the learning task.

3. Empathic strategy: a tolerant and outgoing approach to the target language and its speakers.

4. Formal strategy: technical know-how of how to tackle a language.

5. Experimental strategy: a methodical but flexible approach, developing the new language into an ordered system and constantly revising it.

6. Semantic strategy: constant searching for meaning.

7. Practice strategy: willingness to practice.

8. Communication strategy: willingness to use the language in real communication.

9. Monitoring strategy: self-monitoring and critical sensitivity to language use.

10. Internalization strategy: developing the second language more and more as a separate reference system and learning to think in it. (Stern, 1983, pp. 414-415)

As Stern's study appeared to be based on anecdotal evidence (Greenfell & Macaro, 2007), more scientific research was needed to determine the strategies deployed by good language learners. With this intention in mind, Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern, and Todesco (1978, cited in O'Malley & Chamot, 1990) drew upon Stern's list of strategies, and proposed a different classification scheme after interviewing thirty-four good language learners. Naiman et al.'s scheme consists of five broad categories of strategies and several secondary categories. The broad categories comprise the strategies that were commonly used by all the good language learners interviewed, and the second categories include those reported by some of the participants. The major strategies and some specific examples of them are: (1) active task approach (practicing and analyzing individual problems), (2) realization of language as a system (making L1/L2 comparisons and analyzing the target language), (3) realization of language as a means of communication and interaction (emphasizing fluency over accuracy and seeking communicative situations with L2 speakers), (4) management of affective demands (coping with affective demands in learning), and (5) monitoring L2 performance (constantly revising the L2 system by testing inferences and asking L2 speakers for feedback).

Naiman et al. also identified several techniques which focused on specific aspects of language learning, such as the four language skills along with pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar. These techniques formed the basis for further research into learning strategies of specific skill areas:

1. Pronunciation: repeating aloud after a teacher, a native speaker, or a tape; listening carefully; and talking aloud, including role playing.

2. Grammar: following rules given in texts; inferring grammar rules from texts; comparing L1 and L2; and memorizing structures and using them often.

3. Vocabulary: making up charts and memorizing them; learning words that are associated; using new words in phrases; using a dictionary when necessary; and carrying a notebook to note new items.

4. Listening: listening to the radio, records, TV, movies; and exposing oneself to different accents and registers.

5. Speaking: not being afraid to make mistakes; making contact with native speakers; asking for corrections; and memorizing dialogues.

6. Writing: having pen pals; writing frequently; and frequent reading of what you expect to write.

7. Reading: reading something every day; reading things that are familiar; reading texts at the beginner's level; and looking for meaning from context without consulting a dictionary.

Rubin (1981) revised her earlier description of learner characteristics after analyzing a classroom observation, an observation of a small group of students working on a task, and student self reports and daily journals. She grouped the strategies into two primary categories. In the first categories, there are the processes that may contribute *directly* to learning such as clarification/verification, monitoring, memorization, guessing/inductive inferencing, deductive reasoning, and practice. The second categories consist of the processes that may contribute *indirectly* to

learning, which include creating opportunity to practice and use of production tricks. Oxford (1990) later followed this primary categorization for her own taxonomy.

In the late 1970s social strategies were identified by Wong-Fillmore (1976, cited in Wenden & Rubin, 1987). These were the strategies that help one continue the conversation. In addition, communication strategies, which were distinguished from learning strategies by Tarone (1981), also helped speaking ability by using several techniques such as coining words and circumlocution.

An important distinction was made in the 1980s, between cognitive and metacognitive strategies, by several researchers (e.g., A. L. Brown & Palinscar, 1982; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). As a result, O'Malley and Chamot (1990) devised one of the most comprehensive lists of strategies. Their list consisted of three major and twenty-four secondary categories. These three categories and some sub-categories are as follows: (1) Metacognitive strategies (selective attention, monitoring, and evaluation); (2) cognitive strategies (repetition, grouping, and note-taking); and (3) social-affective strategies (cooperation and question for clarification).

Oxford (1990) was another researcher to provide language teachers with a comprehensive and practical taxonomy of language learning strategies as well as several strategy training exercises covering the four language skills. In terms of strategy training, Oxford also devised a structured survey called the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), which is based on her taxonomy, in order for the teachers to diagnose their students' use of strategies before the provision of strategy training.

With regard to her list of strategies, she explains in her book that the four language skills are addressed; that is, listening, reading, speaking, and writing. Oxford further states that although culture and grammar are sometimes considered to be skills, they are different from the other "big" four, and in fact, they intersect and overlap with these four skills in particular ways. Therefore, there are no particular strategies or techniques suggested in her book concerning grammar.

Most of the items in this taxonomy resemble the lists suggested by other researchers, but with six major categories it is broader than other lists. As was mentioned earlier, Oxford determined two major categories of strategies: the strategies that *directly* affect language learning and those that *indirectly* affect learning. Under the *direct* strategies there are memory, cognitive and compensation strategies. She distinguishes memory and cognitive strategies from each other as she thinks the strategies that are especially used in vocabulary learning, such as creating mental linkages and applying images and sounds, are specific actions used to memorize words. However, she acknowledges that memory strategies are usually included among cognitive strategies in the literature. *Indirect* strategies, on the other hand, comprise metacognitive, affective and social strategies. Again, she differentiates affective strategies from social strategies, in contrast to O'Malley and Chamot's scheme.

Cohen (1998) suggests an alternative way of viewing language learning strategies. He prefers to use an umbrella term, second language learner strategies, to refer to "the processes which are consciously selected by learners and which may result in actions taken to enhance the *learning* or *use* of a foreign language, through the storage, retention, recall, and application of information about the target

language" (p. 4). Therefore, he distinguishes language *learning* strategies from language *use* strategies. Cohen also states that some examples of language *learning* strategies are identifying the material to be learned and distinguishing it from the other materials, and also grouping and revising or memorizing that particular material. On the other hand, language *use* strategies are divided into four groups: retrieval strategies (e.g., using the keyword mnemonic in order to retrieve the meaning of a given word), rehearsal strategies (e.g., form-focused practice), cover strategies (e.g., using a partially-understood phrase in a classroom drill) and communication strategies (e.g., overgeneralization, negative transfer, and topic avoidance).

In the preparation of the grammar learning strategies used in this study, the researcher benefited from the general language learning strategy definitions that were suggested by O'Malley and Chamot (1990) and Oxford (1990). In addition to the three major strategy categories of O'Malley and Chamot (i.e., cognitive, metacognitive, and social-affective) compensation strategies from Oxford's taxonomy were used as the fourth category of the list used for this study. "Practicing", which is listed under memory strategies by Oxford, is included among cognitive strategies for this study since Oxford (1990) herself acknowledges the fact that memory strategies are occasionally considered to be cognitive strategies. The type of strategies that represent grammar learning strategies written for this study can be seen in Table 1. The strategies taken from Oxford are indicated with citations; all the others are from O'Malley and Chamot (1990).

Table 1 - Categorization used for the grammar learning strategies of this study

LEARNING STRATEGY	DEFINITION
Cognitive Strategies	
Practicing (Oxford, 1990)	Repeating, formally practicing with sounds and writing systems, recognizing and using formulas, recombining, and practicing naturalistically.
Resourcing	Using target language reference materials (i.e. dictionaries, textbooks, etc.)
Grouping	Classifying words, terminology, numbers, or concepts according to their attributes.
Note Taking	Writing down key words and concepts in abbreviated verbal, graphic, or numerical form to assist performance of a language task.
Highlighting (Oxford, 1990)	Using a variety of emphasis techniques (e.g. underlining, starring, or color-coding) to focus on important information in a passage
Deduction/Induction	Applying rules to understand or produce the second language or making up rules based on language analysis.
Imagery	Relating new information to visual concepts in memory via familiar, easily retrievable visualizations, phrases, or locations
Elaboration	Relating new information to prior knowledge; relating different parts of the new information to each other; making meaningful personal associations to information presented; using mental or actual pictures or visuals to represent information
Transfer	Using previously acquired linguistic and/or conceptual knowledge to assist comprehension or production
Inferencing	Using available information to guess meanings of new items, predict outcomes, or fill in missing information
Analyzing expressions (Oxford, 1990)	Determining the meaning of a new expression by breaking it down into parts; using the meanings of various parts to understand the meaning of the whole expression
Analyzing Contrastively (Oxford, 1990)	Comparing elements of the new language with elements of one's own language to determine similarities and differences
Translating (Oxford, 1990)	Using the first language as a base for understanding and/or producing the second language
Metacognitive Strategies	
Advance Organization (Planning)	Previewing the main ideas and concepts of the material to be learned.
Selective Attention	Attending to phrases, linguistic markers, sentences, or types of information.
Self-Management	Seeking or arranging conditions that help one learn, such as finding opportunities for additional language or content input and practice.
Self-Monitoring	Checking one's oral or written production while it is taking place.
Social-affective Strategies	
Cooperation	Working with one or more peers to obtain feedback, pool information, or model a language activity
Question for Clarification	Asking a teacher or other native speaker for repetition, paraphrasing, explanation, and/or examples
Self-talk	Reducing anxiety by using mental techniques that make one feel competent to do the learning task
Compensation Strategies (Oxford, 1990)	
Overcoming limitations in speaking or writing	Avoiding communication partially or totally, adjusting or approximating the message, using circumlocution or synonym

Variations in Strategy use

Research on learning strategies has also investigated the variations in strategy use according to several variables such as gender, proficiency level, or motivation. A study by O'Malley et al. (1985), which aimed to classify learning strategies and to investigate whether learning strategies could be taught to ESL learners, indicated that the strategies employed by beginning-level students differ from those of intermediate-level students. For instance, among metacognitive strategies, while beginning students relied more on selective attention, intermediate students were shown to use more self-management and advanced preparation.

Several researchers have investigated gender difference in strategy use. Ehrman and Oxford (1988) sought to find out the effects of sex differences on learning strategies, and their study revealed that females use more strategies than males. A later study by Green and Oxford (1995), in which the difference in strategy use was explored in terms of both proficiency level and gender, showed a significant difference in strategy use between pre-basic level and higher level groups (basic and intermediate). It was further shown that females use more strategies in comparison to males.

Learning Strategies for Specific Skills

A number of studies have been conducted since the 1970s in order to explore the learning strategies that help certain skill areas. Hosenfeld (1977), for example, studied the reading strategies of successful and unsuccessful learners through think-aloud protocols. Her study revealed that successful readers employed contextual guessing when reading, and that they evaluated the correctness of their guesses.

Cohen and Aphek (1980) mainly focused on the strategies that learners use when they are learning vocabulary. They relied on the previous studies conducted with association techniques for their strategy training for ESL learners, so as to achieve vocabulary retention. The students were given several association techniques such as imagery links or acoustic links, and they were expected to employ the techniques of their preference. The findings indicated that the students performed better at vocabulary learning tasks after the training.

Another study by Schmitt (1997) addressed the lack of a comprehensive list of vocabulary learning strategies, and suggested a more specific list of strategies, specifically focused on vocabulary strategies. The results of the survey conducted by Schmitt also provided an insight into the level of usage of vocabulary strategies and learners' attitudes towards them.

O'Malley, Chamot and Küpper (1989) studied the mental processes that second language learners use in listening comprehension, the strategies they use in different phases of comprehension, and the differences in strategy use between effective and ineffective listeners. The researchers observed that three strategies distinguished effective listeners from ineffective ones: self-monitoring, elaboration, and inferencing. They also added that while effective listeners used top-down and bottom-up processing strategies together, ineffective listeners drew only on the meanings of individual words.

Peterson (1997) investigated the pronunciation learning strategies that adult learners of Spanish use. She used a three-stage study to explore these strategies. First, she interviewed 11 learners from three different proficiency levels, and she also analyzed their language diaries. Second, she modified Oxford's SILL by adding

several strategies from the first stage of the study, and administered the questionnaire to 64 university students. The results of the questionnaire were analyzed through factor analysis and six factors, or types of strategies were determined. Third, these students were given a pronunciation task (reading aloud) in order to rate their pronunciation ability. The data from the last two stages enabled the researcher to determine the strategies that were most influential in pronunciation ability. Two types of strategies were seen to have a relationship with pronunciation ability: authentic/functional practice strategies, and reflection strategies.

In terms of grammar learning strategies, one of three studies in the literature is by Vines Gimeno (2002), who conducted an experimental study in which strategy training was given to help secondary school EFL students learn conditionals, and become autonomous learners at the same time. As a part of a "macro-grammar strategy", which she devised, the experimental group students were taught cognitive and metacognitive strategies in addition to grammar lessons by the cognitive approach, which actually meant explicit instruction. As a result of the study, the students of the experimental group improved their grammar more than the control group. This study, however, did not suggest any grammar learning strategies, but depended on strategies suggested by other researchers (i.e., O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Wenden & Rubin, 1987) in order to help learners learn certain grammar structures.

The study by Sarıçoban (2005) sought to identify the strategies used by Turkish EFL learners when learning English grammar. He administered a questionnaire to 100 students in order to determine the learning strategies they used. The researcher also aimed to categorize these strategies in the way that O'Malley and

Chamot (1990) suggested: cognitive, metacognitive, and social-affective strategies. However, some of the items that are called strategies by the researcher seem to be learner preferences (e.g. "I prefer teacher's presentation of new structures from simple to complex"; "I would like my teacher explain me a new structure with all the details, and in a formulaic way.") In addition, the categorization of these items seem to be confused. For instance, "If there is an abundance of structures and materials to master, I get annoyed" sounds more like an affective utterance of a learner (and it may not possibly be a strategy employed by a good learner); however, it is considered to be a metacognitive strategy.

Another study that aimed to investigate grammar learning strategies was conducted in a public university in Turkey with 425 EFL students. Yalçın (2003) devised a grammar learning strategy questionnaire to explore the relationship between the use of grammar learning strategies and student achievement. He used a 43-item questionnaire that was adapted from Oxford's (1990) taxonomy to gather information about the grammar strategy use of his participants. Additionally, Yalçın used the students' overall term grades to explore the correlation between strategy use and overall achievement. Two problems, however, are inherent in his study. First, several items of the questionnaire he prepared appear to represent learning styles or preferences, rather than learning strategies. In addition, several other items were treated as metacognitive strategies in the analysis, although they reflect either cognitive strategies (e.g., analyzing the details of new structures, and relating newly learnt information to the existing grammar knowledge), or affective strategies (e.g., noticing self when tense or nervous). Second, the test scores, used as variables to compare with grammar strategy use, reflect the students' general language

achievement, but not grammar achievement. Yalçın's study found no significant relationship between grammar learning strategy use and achievement.

In sum, a few studies in the literature have sought to determine the grammar learning strategies used by EFL learners although some of these strategies appear more to be attitudes or preferences about grammar learning. Only one study has been conducted on the differences in strategy use according to genders. Therefore, more research could be conducted in order to provide the literature with a dependable list of grammar strategies and to explore the relationship between strategy use and grammar achievement.

Conclusion

As can be seen from the review of the relevant literature, extensive research has been conducted concerning learning strategies since the 1970s, and variations in strategy use according to certain factors such as proficiency level and gender have been discussed. Moreover, learning strategies that help the four language skills have been explored. However, more research is needed into learning strategies that apply to grammar learning. The next chapter will describe a study conducted to address this gap in the literature.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The aim of this study was to investigate the strategies that English as a foreign language (EFL) learners use when they learn grammar. The study also sought to find out whether there is a difference in the employment of grammar learning strategies according to the learners' proficiency levels. Another aim of the study was to explore the impact of grammar learning strategy use on learners' achievement in grammar. During the study, the researcher attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What grammar learning strategies do Turkish university preparatory school EFL students use?

2. Which strategies are used most frequently?

3. Which strategies do students find most useful?

4. Does grammar strategy use vary in terms of the following variables?

    a. Proficiency level

    b. Gender

    c. Perceived importance of grammar

    d. Grammar achievement

In this chapter, information about the setting and participants, instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis procedures are given.

Setting and Participants

This study was conducted at Middle East Technical University (METU), School of Foreign Languages in March 2008. The medium of instruction at METU is English. Therefore, all students have to succeed in the proficiency examination or complete a one-year preparatory program at the Department of Basic English (DBE) in order to be accepted to their departments. In the beginning of the program, the students of the DBE are placed into four groups (beginners, elementary, intermediate, and upper-intermediate) according to the scores they have received on the Proficiency Exam or the Placement Exam. Weekly class hours for these four proficiency levels vary from 20 to 30 hours. In the second term, each group moves up one level, with the upper intermediate level moving up to advanced.

The students' yearly achievements are assessed by mid-terms, announced and unannounced quizzes, and performance grades. The students who have achieved a yearly total of at least 64.50 are allowed to take the Proficiency Exam in June. Those students who get 59.50 or above pass the exam and can begin studying in their departments.

The participants of this study were the students of four randomly-chosen classes from each of three different proficiency levels (see Tables 2 and 3). As can be seen from Table 2, two participants failed to report their gender. Therefore, these two participants were excluded from the investigations into gender difference in strategy use. The ages of the participants ranged from 17 to 26 with an average of 19.

Table 2 - Distribution of Participants by Gender

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Male	95	54.0
	Female	79	44.9
	Total	174	98.9
Missing	System	2	1.1
	Total	176	100.0

Table 3 - Distribution of Participants by Proficiency Level

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Pre-Intermediate	54	30.7
	Intermediate	64	36.4
	Upper-Intermediate	58	33.0
	Total	176	100.0

Instrument

In learning strategy research, various data collection instruments are used to assess language learners' use of strategies, such as interviews, observations, questionnaires, think-aloud protocols, and journals. In this study, a questionnaire was used to assess the students' employment of strategies when they learn and use grammar structures. According to Dörnyei (2002), "questionnaires are easy to construct, extremely versatile, and uniquely capable of gathering a large amount of information quickly in a form that is readily processable." Furthermore, as Dörnyei (2002) points out, using a questionnaire provides the researcher with factual data, behavioral data, and attitudinal data about the respondents, which formed the basis of this study.

The questionnaire used in this study was prepared by the researcher after reviewing the literature on both learning strategies and research methods. After the examination of the lists of learning strategies suggested by several researchers (e.g., O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990) in the literature, those that might apply to grammar learning were adapted to prepare this grammar learning strategy survey. The general language learning strategy definitions that inspired the researcher of this study in writing several of the items in this survey can be seen in Chapter 2 (see table 1 on page 25). Each strategy from the questionnaire was categorized according to the strategy types explained in the previous chapter. The list of grammar learning strategies and their strategy types can be seen in Appendix A. Two colleagues were asked whether they agreed on these strategy types. Cohen's (1998) distinction regarding "second language learner strategies" was also considered in the analysis of the questionnaire items, and they were further identified as either the strategies that enable the *learning* of grammar structures, or those that enable the *use* of them. This additional categorization can also be seen in Appendix A.

As can be seen in Appendices B and C, the questionnaire consists primarily of two parts. In the first part, background information about the participants was sought. Inquiries regarding gender and course level were elicited in this part, in addition to a question which aimed to determine whether the participants valued grammar in language learning ("Do you think grammar is important?"). The attitudinal data gathered through this question also enabled the researcher to explore whether perceived importance of grammar may account for any differences observed in strategy use.

The second part of the questionnaire included 35 statements of possible strategies that learners could use when learning and using grammar structures. In order to respond to this part of the questionnaire, the participants were expected to rate each item by considering two questions: (a) "How often do you use this strategy?" and (b) "I think this is a useful strategy (Even though I may not use it.)" A five-point Likert-scale, ranging from *never* (1) to *always* (5), was used for the first question. On the other hand, a three-point Likert-scale was used for the second question: *totally disagree* (1), *partly agree* (2), and *totally agree* (3).

Before the questionnaire was administered in large scale, it was piloted at Ankara University, School of Foreign Languages. Fifty-nine students from three different levels completed the questionnaire. The internal consistency of the questionnaire was checked using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS – version 11.5) program; the Cronbach alpha coefficients for the first scale (frequency) and the second scale (usefulness) were .93 and .89, respectively.

Procedure

The literature on learning strategies was reviewed to design a questionnaire that would provide data about the employment of strategies when learning and using grammar structures. The questionnaire was originally written in English, and then translated into Turkish by the researcher to ensure that students from different levels could understand and answer the questions easily. The Turkish translation was later translated back to English by a colleague. The two English versions were compared by a native speaker of English, and any problems in translation were addressed. Two other colleagues and two students were asked to evaluate the questionnaire in order

to make sure that all items could be clearly understood. Necessary changes were made taking this feedback into consideration.

Following the by piloting, the questionnaire was administered to four randomly-chosen classes from each of the three proficiency levels at the DBE. Because of limited time, four classes received the questionnaires in the same class hour, and thus class teachers, rather than the researcher, handed them out. The teachers, however, were given information about the aim of the questionnaire, and the time needed to complete it. An informed consent form was attached to the questionnaire which informed the students that the participation in the study was on a voluntary basis (see the informed consent forms in the Appendices A and B).

In addition to the data from the questionnaire, the grammar grades of the students were collected in order to investigate the relationship between strategy use and the students' achievement in grammar. The data obtained from these two sources were entered into SPSS in order to be analyzed.

Data Analysis

The quantitative data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed in various ways to seek answers to the research questions. In order to answer research questions one to three, the data from the two Likert-scales were gathered, and frequencies and averages for each of the 35 items were calculated. The averages were then ordered in such a way that the strategies that are most frequently used and those considered the most useful could be determined.

The total number of strategies used by each respondent, in addition to his/her average frequency of strategy use was calculated, and these data were used to investigate whether strategy use varies in terms of proficiency level, gender,

perceived importance of grammar, and grammar achievement. In order to explore the difference in strategy use among the three different proficiency levels, ANOVA tests were used. With regard to the difference between males and females, t-tests were used. The strategy use of the participants who think grammar is important and those who do not think it is important was also investigated again by t-tests.

To further explore the relationship between strategy use and grammar achievement, grammar test scores of the participants were collected, and the average scores were calculated within each of the three proficiency levels. The correlation between strategy use and achievement on grammar tests was investigated by calculating the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Finally, the variation in strategy use between high grammar achievers and low grammar achievers was explored by t-tests.

Conclusion

This chapter included information about the research questions, the setting and participants, instrument, data collection procedure, and a brief account of the data analysis procedure. The data analysis procedure and results will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The main purpose of this study was to explore the extent to which certain learning strategies are employed when learning and using grammar structures, and whether these grammar learning strategies influence EFL learners' performance in grammar tests. Moreover, the study aimed to investigate the difference in strategy use among different proficiency levels and between genders.

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. What grammar learning strategies do Turkish university preparatory school EFL students use?

2. Which strategies are used most frequently?

3. Which strategies do students find most useful?

4. Does grammar strategy use vary in terms of the following variables?

    a. Proficiency level

    b. Gender

    c. Perceived importance of grammar

    d. Grammar achievement

Data Analysis Procedure

In order to address the above-mentioned research questions, a 35-item questionnaire was used. The answers related to the frequency of grammar learning and using strategies were gathered by using a five-point Likert-scale (1 = *never*; 2 = *seldom*; 3 = *sometimes*; 4 = *usually*; and 5 = *always*). Concerning the perceived usefulness of these strategies, a three-point Likert-scale was used (1 = *totally*

disagree; 2 = *partly agree*; and 3 = *totally agree*). The data obtained from the

questionnaire were entered into the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS –

version 11.5) and the internal consistency of the questionnaire was checked; the

Cronbach alpha coefficients for the first scale (frequency) and the second scale

(usefulness) were 0.90 and 0.88, respectively. Then, frequencies and percentages

were calculated in order to find answers to the first three research questions. The

means for the two Likert-scales were interpreted using the scales in Table 4.

Table 4 - Scales used in the interpretation of responses

Frequency	Usefulness
1.0-1.4 – never 1.5-2.4 – seldom 2.5-3.4 – sometimes 3.5-4.4 – usually 4.5-5.0 – always	1.0-1.4 – totally disagree 1.5-2.4 – partly agree 2.5-3.0 – totally agree

In order to examine the effects of proficiency level, gender and perceived

importance of grammar, t-tests and ANOVA tests were used. Finally, the

participants' grammar test scores were gathered and the correlation between strategy

use and achievement in grammar was investigated by calculating the Pearson

product-moment correlation coefficient.

Results

What grammar learning strategies do Turkish university preparatory school EFL

students use?

The answers elicited by the question relating to the frequency of strategy use

("How often do you use this strategy?") and the five-point Likert-scale were entered

into SPSS, and frequencies and averages were calculated. The results of the

frequency of strategy use can be seen in Table 5. The items are presented in

descending order.

Table 5 - Frequency of grammar strategy use

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 30	174	1	5	3.76	1.059
ITEM 34	174	1	5	3.72	.995
ITEM 26	172	1	5	3.65	.928
ITEM 3	173	1	5	3.62	1.173
ITEM 4	173	1	5	3.61	1.124
ITEM 21	172	1	5	3.60	1.122
ITEM 9	175	1	5	3.59	1.301
ITEM 20	172	1	5	3.56	1.010
ITEM 25	172	1	5	3.48	1.147
ITEM 8	174	1	5	3.45	1.012
ITEM 13	172	1	5	3.44	1.027
ITEM 6	174	1	5	3.43	1.209
ITEM 27	168	1	5	3.43	.900
ITEM 1	174	1	5	3.38	.915
ITEM 31	172	1	5	3.35	1.142
ITEM 35	175	1	5	3.34	1.267
ITEM 7	173	1	5	3.32	1.176
ITEM 2	173	1	5	3.20	1.126
ITEM 15	171	1	5	3.15	1.106
ITEM 5	173	1	5	3.13	1.065
ITEM 11	172	1	5	3.08	1.320
ITEM 22	171	1	5	3.06	1.115
ITEM 29	173	1	5	2.95	1.122
ITEM 18	172	1	5	2.89	1.309
ITEM 32	172	1	5	2.89	1.340
ITEM 10	175	1	5	2.72	1.271
ITEM 16	168	1	5	2.67	1.070
ITEM 33	172	1	5	2.53	1.313
ITEM 17	171	1	5	2.52	1.290
ITEM 24	172	1	5	2.45	1.099
ITEM 14	169	1	5	2.40	1.202
ITEM 12	169	1	5	2.21	1.123
ITEM 23	171	1	5	1.94	1.039
ITEM 19	172	1	5	1.92	1.034
ITEM 28	172	1	4	1.73	.943
Valid N (listwise)	151				

Not all students answered all questions

As can be seen in the table, the means of the questionnaire items range

between 1.73 and 3.76. This means that there are no strategies commonly rated as

always used (4.5-5.0), nor are there any strategies reported to be *never used* (1.0-1.4).

This result may suggest that all the grammar learning strategies of the survey are employed by the respondents to some extent.

Which strategies are used most frequently?

The ten strategies on the top of the list fall into the *usually* range (3.5-4.4), and thus they are the most frequently used ones among the 35 items of the questionnaire.

Table 6 - Usually employed strategies

	Strategy	Mean
Item 30	I pay attention to grammar rules when I speak or write.	3.76
Item 34	While writing or speaking if I am not sure of a grammar structure, I try to use another one.	3.72
Item 26	I remember a new grammar structure by thinking of the context/situation it was used in.	3.65
Item 3	When I learn a new grammar structure, I compare it with my own language by thinking of its equivalent in my native language.	3.62
Item 4	When I see a new grammar structure, I use the context/situation, the dialogue, or the picture in order to understand its meaning.	3.61
Item 21	I examine the mistakes which my instructor has marked in a written assignment, and try to correct them.	3.60
Item 9	I take notes when my teacher explains a new grammar structure (e.g. I write down the meaning and the usage of the structure.)	3.59
Item 20	I determine the grammar structures that I have trouble with and make an effort to improve them.	3.56
Item 25	I remember a new grammar structure by thinking of its location in the book (e.g. in the picture or in the dialogue), in my notebook, or on the board.)	3.48
Item 8	If I do not understand my teacher's explanation, I ask my friends for help.	3.45

As can be seen from the strategies reported in Table 6, the first two most frequently used strategies are associated with language *use* strategies, which were differentiated by Cohen (1998) from language *learning* strategies. Moreover, with regard to the type of strategies, three of the above strategies are metacognitive strategies (item 30, item 21 and item 20), one is a social-affective strategy (item 8), one is a compensation strategy (item 34), and the remainder are cognitive strategies. These findings show that Turkish EFL learners employ strategies when they both learn and use grammar structures. In addition, all four types of grammar learning strategies appear among the *usually* employed strategies, yet cognitive strategies are employed more.

The five strategies that are at the bottom of the list fall into the *seldom* range (1.5-2.4). In other words, none of the strategies has been commonly rated as *never used* (1.0-1.4).

Table 7 - Seldom employed strategies

	Strategy	Mean
Item 14	I say a new grammar structure to myself several times in order to memorize it.	2.40
Item 12	I draw charts for the grammar rules I learn.	2.21
Item 23	I study grammar with a friend or a relative.	1.94
Item 19	I preview the grammar subjects that will be covered before coming to class.	1.92
Item 28	I write e-mails, letters or compositions in order to practice newly learnt grammar structures.	1.73

The least used strategy of them all, item 28, with a mean of 1.73, differs from the other least-used strategies as it is a language use strategy. In addition, in terms of its type it is a cognitive strategy, together with the items 12 and 14. Item 19 and item 23 are metacognitive and social-affective strategies, respectively. It is possible to conclude from the strategies in the table that the respondents to the questionnaire do not like writing compositions in order to practice new grammar structures. It is also interesting to find out that although most grammar reference books present grammar rules in charts, this is not a very common strategy among the participants of this study.

Other strategies added by the respondents

At the end of the questionnaire the respondents were asked to report if there were any strategies they used other than those listed in the questionnaire. Eight students responded to this question. Three of these responses were similar to those in the questionnaire (using new structures in writing – reported two times –, and thinking of the situations in which new structures can be used). Two responses were related to general language learning efforts (watching films with subtitles, and reading books in English). One strategy concerned vocabulary learning (creating mental pictures for the new words).

Two respondents reported grammar related strategies (making up stories that involve newly learnt grammar structures in order to remember them, and learning grammar structures from simple to complex). These two strategies appear to help *learning* grammar structures, and since they reflect manipulation and organization of the grammar structures at hand, they may be considered to be cognitive strategies.

Which strategies are considered to be the most useful?

The answers to the second question regarding the perceived usefulness of these strategies were again ranked in descending order (see Table 8 on page 45). The first seventeen items are those considered by the respondents to be the most useful ones with means ranging from 2.5 to 3.0.

The next eighteen items fall into the *partly agree* range with the means between 1.5 and 2.4. There are no items that fall into the *totally disagree* range (1.0-1.4). This result indicates that all of the strategies listed in the questionnaire were considered to be useful to some extent.

Among the ten most useful strategies reported by the respondents (see Table 9 on page 46), four of them (items 27, 30, and 35,) are strategies associated with language use, and the remainder represent language learning. Furthermore, items 7 and 35 are social-affective; items 20, 21, 30, and 31 are metacognitive; and the others are cognitive strategies. In other words, three types of strategies are represented among the useful strategies; the compensation strategy (Item 34 - using another structure when one is not sure), which was reported to be a *usually* employed strategy, was not considered to be a very useful strategy, with a mean of 2.34 (see Table 8).

Table 8 - Perceived usefulness of the strategies

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 35	155	1	3	2.75	.488
ITEM 21	157	1	3	2.75	.462
ITEM 20	154	1	3	2.74	.496
ITEM 27	150	1	3	2.69	.504
ITEM 16	160	1	3	2.68	.542
ITEM 9	157	1	3	2.68	.591
ITEM 7	158	1	3	2.66	.539
ITEM 30	156	1	3	2.60	.587
ITEM 31	157	1	3	2.60	.541
ITEM 4	159	1	3	2.60	.575
ITEM 22	155	1	3	2.58	.557
ITEM 26	154	1	3	2.55	.537
ITEM 18	156	1	3	2.54	.615
ITEM 13	155	1	3	2.51	.574
ITEM 15	157	1	3	2.50	.584
ITEM 29	157	1	3	2.50	.616
ITEM 25	155	1	3	2.49	.596
ITEM 24	154	1	3	2.44	.625
ITEM 17	156	1	3	2.40	.707
ITEM 2	162	1	3	2.40	.605
ITEM 11	160	1	3	2.39	.701
ITEM 8	158	1	3	2.39	.636
ITEM 1	161	1	3	2.37	.521
ITEM 19	157	1	3	2.36	.725
ITEM 32	158	1	3	2.35	.706
ITEM 6	156	1	3	2.35	.698
ITEM 34	155	1	3	2.34	.627
ITEM 5	152	1	3	2.26	.676
ITEM 3	157	1	3	2.19	.690
ITEM 28	160	1	3	2.16	.726
ITEM 33	157	1	3	2.15	.700
ITEM 12	161	1	3	2.11	.676
ITEM 23	157	1	3	2.04	.697
ITEM 14	160	1	3	2.02	.765
ITEM 10	157	1	3	1.93	.761
Valid N (listwise)	135				

Not all students answered all questions

Table 9 - Ten strategies that are reported as useful

		Mean	Mean (Use)
Item 35	I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a grammar mistake.	2.75	3.34
Item 21	**I examine the mistakes which my instructor has marked in a written assignment, and try to correct them.**	**2.75**	**3.60**
Item 20	**I determine the grammar structures that I have trouble with and make an effort to improve them.**	**2.74**	**3.56**
Item 27	I try to practice a new grammar structure in speaking or writing.	2.69	3.43
Item 16	I review the grammar structures I learn regularly.	2.68	2.67
Item 9	**I take notes when my teacher explains a new grammar structure (e.g. I write down the meaning and the usage of the structure).**	**2.68**	**3.59**
Item 7	If I do not understand my teacher's explanation of a new structure, I ask him/her to repeat.	2.66	3.32
Item 30	**I pay attention to grammar rules when I speak or write.**	**2.60**	**3.76**
Item 31	I try to notice my grammar mistakes and find out the reasons for them.	2.60	3.35
Item 4	**When I see a new grammar structure, I use the context/situation, the dialogue, or the picture in order to understand its meaning.**	**2.60**	**3.61**

(The items in bold are *usually* employed strategies)

The means given above for usefulness and use also indicate that the strategies considered to be the most useful do not exactly coincide with those used most frequently. Although five of the items in Table 8 (items 4, 9, 20, 21, and 30) are listed among the most frequently used ones, there are several other strategies that are believed to be useful by the participants, but not used very often. Those social-affective strategies (i.e., encouraging oneself to speak, and asking the teacher

questions) which are not frequently used may indicate that the respondents are rather shy in these aspects.

Table 10 - Ten strategies that are reported as less useful

		Mean	Mean (Use)
Item 6	When I see a new grammar structure, I try to infer the rules about that structure.	2.35	3.43
Item 34	While writing or speaking if I am not sure of a grammar structure, I try to use another one.	2.34	3.72
Item 5	When I see a new grammar structure, I examine the parts of that structure.	2.26	3.13
Item 3	When I learn a new grammar structure, I compare it with my own language by thinking of its equivalent in my native language.	2.19	3.62
Item 28	**I write e-mails, letters or compositions in order to practice newly learnt grammar structures.**	**2.16**	**1.73**
Item 33	When my teacher corrects my grammar mistake, I repeat the correct form.	2.15	2.53
Item 12	**I draw charts for the grammar rules I learn.**	**2.11**	**2.21**
Item 23	**I study grammar with a friend or a relative.**	**2.04**	**1.94**
Item 14	**I say a new grammar structure to myself several times in order to memorize it.**	**2.02**	**2.40**
Item 10	I use my own language to write the rules of a new grammar structure.	1.93	2.72

(The items in bold are seldom employed strategies)

Four items highlighted in Table 10 are among the least frequently (*seldom*) used strategies. In other words, these four strategies are not considered to be very useful by the respondents, and thus are not used frequently. On the other hand, although the items numbered 34 and 3 are reported to be less useful, they appear to be usually employed strategies with higher frequencies from the "use" scale. This finding may suggest that the learners in this study usually use these strategies

because they may feel themselves obliged to use another structure when they have

not acquired the correct usage of a difficult structure, or they have a tendency to

depend on their first language to understand the second language. However, they

may still think these strategies do not help the acquisition of certain grammar

structures.

Is there a difference among proficiency levels in terms of strategy use?

With regard to the difference in strategy use among proficiency levels, an

ANOVA test was used. The three different proficiency levels (pre-intermediate,

intermediate and upper-intermediate) were compared with each other in terms of

their average frequency of strategy use, after an average overall frequency mean had

been calculated for each participant. The means for the three groups' average

frequency of strategy use can be seen in the table below.

Table 11 - Means of the average frequency of strategy use for the three levels

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
PRE-INT	43	3.1960	.59732	1.60	4.06
INT	58	3.0458	.50296	1.74	4.14
UPPER	51	2.9182	.50661	1.71	4.14
Total	152*	3.0455	.54004	1.60	4.14
* Only the students who answered all the questions were included in this analysis					

The difference in the means of average strategy frequency is not found

significant according to the ANOVA test results ($p < .124$). In order to investigate the

relationship between proficiency and the total number of strategies used, the total

number of strategies was calculated by considering responses of 1 (*never*) and 2

(*seldom*) as "not used" and responses of 3 (*sometimes*), 4 (*usually*), and 5 (*always*) as

"used", and finally adding the number of strategies "used". The means of the total

number of strategies used for the three different groups can be seen in Table 12.

Table 12 - Means of the total number of strategy use for the three levels

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
PRE-INT	54	24.37	7.604	2	34
INT	64	23.17	6.091	4	34
UPPER	58	21.28	6.066	6	35
Total	176	22.91	6.665	2	35

ANOVA test results (Table 13) point out that there is a significant difference among proficiency levels (p<.05). The post-hoc Scheffe test reveals that the difference seen between the pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate levels is significant (p<.05), with pre-intermediate levels using more strategies.

Table 13 - ANOVA results comparing total number of strategy use and proficiency levels

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	274.433	2	137.217	3.165	.045
Within Groups	7499.288	173	43.348		
Total	7773.722	175			

To further explore the differences between pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate levels, Table 14 can be examined. The first thing that draws attention is that there are 13 strategies employed *usually* (rated higher than 3.5) by pre-intermediate students, whereas upper-intermediate students employ ten strategies with that frequency. A closer look into the table reveals that six of the strategies in the *usually* range for two groups are common (items 3, 4, 21, 26, 30, and 34). In addition, cognitive strategies are used more than the other types for both groups. Among the 13 strategies *usually* employed, there are six cognitive strategies, five metacognitive strategies, and two social-affective strategies within the pre-intermediate group. With the upper-intermediate group, five of the ten frequently used strategies are cognitive, three of them are social-affective, and two of them are metacognitive.

Table 14 - Strategies used by pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate students

(Items in bold are common for both groups)			
PRE-INTERMEDIATE		UPPER-INTERMEDIATE	
Strategy & Category	M	Strategy & Category	M
Item 9 – I take notes when my teacher explains a new grammar structure (e.g. I write down the meaning and the usage of the structure). (cog/learn)	3.81	**Item 30 –** I pay attention to grammar rules when I speak or write. (met/use)	3.93
Item 20 – I determine the grammar structures that I have trouble with and make an effort to improve them. (met/learn)	3.77	**Item 4** – When I see a new grammar structure, I use the context/situation, the dialogue, or the picture in order to understand its meaning. (cog/learn)	3.79
Item 21 – I examine the mistakes which my instructor has marked in a written assignment, and try to correct them. (met/learn)	3.72	**Item 21** – I examine the mistakes which my instructor has marked in a written assignment, and try to correct them. (met/learn)	3.70
Item 26 – I remember a new grammar structure by thinking of the context/situation it was used in. (cog/use)	3.71	**Item 34 –** While writing or speaking if I am not sure of a grammar structure, I try to use another one. (com/use)	3.67
Item 3 – When I learn a new grammar structure, I compare it with my own language by thinking of its equivalent in my native language. (cog/learn)	3.70	Item 35 – I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a grammar mistake. (soc/use)	3.57
Item 34 – While writing or speaking if I am not sure of a grammar structure, I try to use another one. (com/use)	3.66	Item 7 – If I do not understand my teacher's explanation of a new structure, I ask him/her to repeat. (soc/learn)	3.56
Item 4 – When I see a new grammar structure, I use the context/situation, the dialogue, or the picture in order to understand its meaning. (cog/learn)	3.60	**Item 26 –** I remember a new grammar structure by thinking of the context/situation it was used in. (cog/use)	3.54
Item 27 – I try to practice a new grammar structure in speaking or writing. (cog/learn/use)	3.57	Item 1 – When I learn a new grammar structure, I try to associate it with other structures that I already know. (cog/learn)	3.48
Item 6 – When I see a new grammar structure, I try to infer the rules about that structure. (cog/learn)	3.57	Item 25 – I remember a new grammar structure by thinking of its location in the book (e.g. in the picture or in the dialogue), in my notebook, or on the board. (cog/use)	3.47
Item 13 – I think about the situations in which I can use the newly learnt grammar structures. (met/use)	3.57	**Item 3** – When I learn a new grammar structure, I compare it with my own language by thinking of its equivalent in my native language. (cog/learn)	3.46
Item 31 – I try to notice my grammar mistakes and find out the reasons for them. (met/learn)			
Item 30 – I pay attention to grammar rules when I speak or write. (met/use)	3.58		
Item 8 – If I do not understand my teacher's explanation, I ask my friends for help. (soc /learn)			
Cog=Cognitive, Met=Metacognitive, Soc=Social-Affective			

To sum up, there is a significant difference between pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate levels in terms of the total number of strategies they used; pre-intermediate level students use more strategies. However, there is no significant difference in the two groups' strategy frequency. Although the difference in the frequency means of the two groups is not significant in general, two items that are common for both groups among *usually* employed strategies (Items 30 and 4) appear to have been rated quite differently. For instance, while Item 30 (paying attention to grammar rules when speaking or writing) was rated higher by the upper-intermediate level students, its smaller mean on the left column of the table indicates that the pre-intermediate students do not employ this strategy as often as the upper-intermediate students do.

Is there a difference between genders in terms of strategy use?

In order to investigate the difference in strategy use between males and females, first, the means of the average frequency of strategy use by the two groups were calculated (see Table 15). Then, a t-test was used to compare these two means. According to the results of the t-test, the difference is approaching significance (t=-1.97, p<.052). This finding indicates that there is a trend towards more frequent use by females.

Table 15 - Means of the average frequency of strategy use for the genders

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
average of freq	MALE	95	2.9125	.59704	.06125
	FEMALE	79	3.0814	.52939	.05956

To further explore the difference in strategy use between genders, the means
of the total number of strategies that males and females used were calculated. The
means are presented in Table 16. These means were then compared by a second t-
test. The results of the t-test indicated that there is a significant difference between
genders in relation to the number of strategies used (t=-2.03, p<.05). It appears that
the females in this study use more grammar learning strategies than do the males.

Table 16 - Means of the total number of strategy use for the genders

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
total no of strat	MALE	95	21.91	7.008	.719
	FEMALE	79	23.91	6.003	.675

The strategies that are *usually* employed by the males and the females in this
study can be seen in Table 17. There are 13 strategies *usually* employed by females,
whereas males reported to employ seven strategies at this frequency level. The
strategies used by females are quite different from those used by males; only four of
the strategies (the items in bold) are common.

In addition, females employ 11 language *learning* strategies and two *use*
strategies, whereas males employ two *learning* strategies and five *use* strategies.
Regarding the categories of strategies, both groups appear to be employing strategies
from each category. Table 16 thus indicates that females use more grammar learning
strategies with a wider variety, and they appear to use them slightly more frequently
than males do.

Table 17 - Strategies used by males and females

FEMALES Strategy & Category	Mean	MALES Strategy & Category	Mean
Item 9 – I take notes when my teacher explains a new grammar structure (e.g. I write down the meaning and the usage of the structure). (cog/learn)	4.18	**Item 30 –** I pay attention to grammar rules when I speak or write. (met/use)	3.72
Item 34 – While writing or speaking if I am not sure of a grammar structure, I try to use another one. (com/use)	3.91	**Item 3 –** When I learn a new grammar structure, I compare it with my own language by thinking of its equivalent in my native language. (cog/learn)	3.69
Item 21 – I examine the mistakes which my instructor has marked in a written assignment, and try to correct them. (met/learn)	3.87	**Item 26 –** I remember a new grammar structure by thinking of the context/situation it was used in. (cog/use)	3.59
Item 30 – I pay attention to grammar rules when I speak or write. (met/use)	3.81	Item 13 – I think about the situations in which I can use the newly learnt grammar structures. (met/use)	3.55
Item 4 – When I see a new grammar structure, I use the context/situation, the dialogue, or the picture in order to understand its meaning. (cog/learn)	3.78	**Item 34 –** While writing or speaking if I am not sure of a grammar structure, I try to use another one. (com/use)	3.54
Item 25 – I remember a new grammar structure by thinking of its location in the book (e.g. in the picture or in the dialogue), in my notebook, or on the board. (cog/use)	3.78	Item 27 – I try to practice a new grammar structure in speaking or writing. (cog/learn/use)	3.51
Item 20 – I determine the grammar structures that I have trouble with and make an effort to improve them. (met/learn)	3.71	Item 35 – I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a grammar mistake. (soc/use)	3.46
Item 26 – I remember a new grammar structure by thinking of the context/situation it was used in. (cog/use)	3.71		
Item 11 – I underline, use different colors or capital letters to emphasize the important parts of grammar rules and explanations. (cog/learn)	3.69		
Item 8 – If I do not understand my teacher's explanation, I ask my friends for help. (learn/soc)	3.58		
Item 6 – When I see a new grammar structure, I try to infer the rules about that structure. (cog/learn)	3.57		
Item 3 – When I learn a new grammar structure, I compare it with my own language by thinking of its equivalent in my native language. (cog/learn)	3.56		
Item 7 – If I do not understand my teacher's explanation of a new structure, I ask him/her to repeat. (soc/learn)	3.51		

Is there a relationship between strategy use and perceived importance of grammar?

In order to explore whether or not perceived importance of grammar may account for any difference in strategy use, a question was asked in the first part of the questionnaire (Do you think grammar is important?). Two different answers (a simple yes or no) given to this question were entered in SPSS, and the learners who thought that grammar is important were compared with those who thought it is not important, in terms of the frequency and total number of strategies they use. The frequency means for the two groups (important/not important) are presented in Table 18.

Table 18 -Means of the average frequency of strategy use for the two groups

	ATTITUDE	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
average of freq	yes	135	3.0593	.52401	.04510
	no	28	2.7796	.66270	.12524

As can be seen from the table above, the mean for the group of participants who thought grammar is important appears to be higher than that for the other group. The difference in the means was further checked by using a t-test. The t-test shows a trend towards more frequent strategy use by this group (t=2.10, p<.05).

Table 19 shows the means of the total number of strategies used by the two groups. The mean for the "important" group appears to be higher than the mean for the "not important" group. The t-test for the second group of means indicated a significant difference (t=2.26, p<.05). Thus, it can be concluded that students who believe grammar is important use more strategies than those who do not think it is important, and further, there is a trend towards more frequent use by them.

Table 19 - Means of the total number of strategies used by the two groups

	ATTITUDE	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
total no of strat	yes	135	23.59	6.162	.530
	no	28	20.07	7.741	1.463

Is there a relationship between strategy use and grammar achievement?

The relationship between strategy use and achievement in grammar tests was investigated by calculating the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Prior to this, the data from the grammar tests were split into three groups according to three proficiency levels as they took different grammar quizzes, and the number of quizzes was different. The averages of the test scores were calculated considering the number of tests within each group.

Table 20 - Means of grammar tests by each proficiency level

Pre-Intermediate

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AVGSCORE	53	26	79	59.38	12.963
Valid N (listwise)	53				

Intermediate

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AVGSCORE	64	32	92	73.95	10.841
Valid N (listwise)	64				

Upper-Intermediate

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AVGSCORE	55	20	87	56.64	14.226
Valid N (listwise)	55				

Following this calculation, the average frequency of strategy use and the average grammar scores were taken together to explore the correlation between these two variables. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients indicated that for the pre-intermediate and the intermediate levels there is significant correlation although

the correlation is not high (r=.437, p<.01; and r=.321, p<.01, respectively). With the

upper-intermediate group, however, there is no significant correlation seen.

The correlation between the total number of strategies used and the average

grammar scores yielded similar results. According to these results, there is a

significant correlation within the pre-intermediate (r=.447, p<.001) and intermediate

groups (r=.273, p<.05), whereas among the upper-intermediate students, there is no

significant correlation seen.

In order to determine the differences in strategy use between high grammar

achievers and low grammar achievers, the students in each proficiency group were

identified as either high or low grammar achievers; those with scores of 70 and

above were identified as high grammar achievers, and those with scores below 70

were designated as low grammar achievers. The two groups of high and low

grammar achievers were split from each other and the means for the two groups'

frequency of strategy use were compared (see the table below).

Table 21 - Means of the average frequency of strategy use for the two groups

	ACHIEVER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
average of freq	high	69	3.1391	.50792	.06115
	low	80	2.9761	.56335	.06298

The mean for the high grammar achievers appears to be higher than the mean

for the low grammar achievers. Further analysis of the means by a t-test showed that

the differences between the two groups in frequency of strategy use is approaching

significance (t=1.85, p<.07).

Table 22 - Means of the total number of strategies used by the two groups

	ACHIEVER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
total no of strat	high	76	24.14	6.207	.712
	low	96	22.13	6.951	.709

Table 22 shows that the mean for the high grammar achievers appears to be higher than that for the low grammar achievers. The difference between the means seen above is found to be significant according to the second t-test (t=2.00, p<.05). This result suggests that high grammar achievers use more grammar strategies than low grammar achievers, and that there is a trend towards more frequent use by high grammar achievers.

Table 23 illustrates the difference in the strategies used by the two groups. It indicates that the strategies *usually* employed by the two groups are mostly common, yet their frequency means are different; high grammar achievers use these strategies more frequently.

Table 23 - Strategies employed by high and low grammar achievers

High Grammar Achievers			Low Grammar Achievers		
	Mean	Std. Deviation		Mean	Std. Deviation
ITEM 34	3.88	1.013	ITEM 30	3.66	1.132
ITEM 30	3.87	.943	ITEM 3	3.63	1.236
ITEM 9	3.75	1.318	ITEM 26	3.62	.966
ITEM 20	3.73	.983	ITEM 34	3.62	.947
ITEM 4	3.71	.969	ITEM 21	3.60	1.081
ITEM 26	3.71	.851	ITEM 4	3.53	1.250
ITEM 25	3.69	1.039	ITEM 9	3.49	1.279
ITEM 21	3.66	1.114	ITEM 20	3.47	.991
ITEM 13	3.63	.997	**ITEM 31**	3.46	1.143
ITEM 3	3.60	1.115			
ITEM 8	3.49	.973			
ITEM 6	3.49	1.205			

(The items unique to each group are given in bold)

The four strategies that distinguish high grammar achievers from the low achievers are:

Item 25 – I remember a new grammar structure by thinking of its location in the book (e.g. in the picture or in the dialogue), in my notebook, or on the board.

Item 13 – I think about the situations in which I can use the newly learnt grammar structures.

Item 8 – When I see a new grammar structure, I try to infer the rules about that structure.

Item 6 – If I do not understand my teacher's explanation, I ask my friends for help.

Three of the strategies above (items 25, 8, and 6) are language learning strategies and one of them (item 13) is a language use strategy. In addition, while two items (25 and 8) represent cognitive processes, items 13 and 6 are metacognitive and social-affective strategies, respectively.

These results reveal that within the pre-intermediate and intermediate levels, there is a positive correlation between grammar strategy use and achievement in grammar tests. Moreover, high grammar achievers use more grammar strategies, and more frequently, compared to low grammar achievers. This is in contrast to what was seen with regards to proficiency groups; the pre-intermediate group was shown to use more grammar learning strategies than upper-intermediate group. This apparent contradiction will be discussed in the next chapter.

Conclusion

This chapter explained the data analysis procedures that are carried out in this study and reported the results gathered from them. According to these results, Turkish EFL learners use a variety of strategies when they learn and use grammar structures. The study also revealed that there are differences in grammar strategy use according to proficiency level, gender, perceived importance of grammar, and achievement in grammar learning. The next chapter will first discuss the results of the study in detail, then, present the pedagogical implications followed by the limitations, and finally make suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study investigated the extent to which grammar learning strategies are used by university level EFL students. It also sought to find out whether there were differences among different proficiency levels and between males and females in terms of grammar strategy use. Finally, this study explored whether grammar strategy use is influential in achievement on grammar tests.

The study was conducted at the preparatory program of Middle East Technical University (METU), and the participants were 176 students from three different proficiency levels (pre-intermediate, intermediate and upper-intermediate). The participants were given a 35-item questionnaire, and they were asked to respond to each item using two Likert-scales that elicited information about the frequency and perceived usefulness of certain grammar strategies. The data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed quantitatively in order to find answers to the research questions of the study.

This chapter will present and discuss the findings of the study in light of the relevant literature. Following the discussion of findings, the pedagogical implications of the study will be presented. Finally, the limitations of the study will be described and suggestions will be made for further research.

Findings and Results

What grammar learning strategies do Turkish university preparatory school EFL

students use and which strategies are used most frequently?

The means of the responses to the first Likert-scale yielded information about the strategies that are commonly used by the respondents. According to these means, the participants of the study use the majority of the strategies listed in the questionnaire to some extent. In fact, the means indicate that there are no strategies that fall into the *never* range. However, no strategy can be seen in the *always* range either. Ten strategies are commonly reported to be employed *usually*; twenty strategies are employed *sometimes*; and five strategies are *seldom* employed.

According to their types, it is revealed from the questionnaire that Turkish EFL students use a variety of strategies when learning and using grammar structures. It was stated earlier in the previous chapter that there are both language learning and use strategies in the three different ranges mentioned above. Among the usually employed ten strategies, the first two with the highest means are language use strategies; the others are language learning strategies. In addition, four types of strategies (cognitive, metacognitive, social-affective and compensation strategies) can be seen in the top ten. Half of the ten strategies employed most frequently are cognitive strategies; the other half comprises three metacognitive strategies in addition to one social-affective and one compensation strategy. This pattern reflects what has been found in previous studies. In their study of Russian and Spanish ESL learners, O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Russo, and Küpper (1985) also

found that the participants from all levels used more cognitive strategies than metacognitive strategies.

It is possible to conclude that the number one strategy in the list ("I pay attention to grammar rules when I speak or write"), together with the other frequently used strategies, indicates that accuracy is important for Turkish EFL learners, and that they employ a variety of strategies when they learn and use grammar structures. The strategy that comes at the end of the list with the lowest mean ("I write e-mails, letters or compositions in order to practice newly learnt grammar structures") may seem confusing as the respondents do probably write compositions as part of their English courses. However, they may not purposefully write these in order to practice newly learnt grammar structures.

Which strategies are considered to be the most useful?

The second scale of the questionnaire provided information about the perceived usefulness of the given grammar learning strategies. The respondents of the questionnaire, on average, "totally" agreed that 17 strategies out of 35 are useful. They "partly" agreed on the usefulness of the remaining strategies.

Seven of the strategies that are considered to be the most useful are also seen as the most frequently used. However, the strategy that appears to be the most useful in this study (i.e. "I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a grammar mistake") is not one of the most frequently used strategies. It can thus be concluded that Turkish EFL students at higher education feel that they should encourage themselves more to take risks in speaking English. Similarly, the fourth strategy from the top of the list ("I try to practice a new grammar structure in speaking or writing") was reported to be only "sometimes" used, but its position in

the top ten most useful strategies may indicate that the respondents wish they used it more often.

On the other hand, two of the strategies that were reported to be "usually" employed by the respondents were not rated as the most useful strategies ("While writing or speaking if I am not sure of a grammar structure, I try to use another one"; and "When I learn a new grammar structure, I compare it with my own language by thinking of its equivalent in my native language.") In other words, the learners in this study use them usually, but they do not think that they are very useful. The former strategy (using another structure when one is not sure) may not be considered to be a useful strategy as the respondents may think that it is important to learn and use all the grammar structures of English. As for the latter (comparing a structure in the target language with its equivalent in the native language), the learners may be aware of the fact that it is not always possible to find an equivalent of a given English grammar structure in Turkish.

A study by Schmitt (1997), in which certain vocabulary learning strategies are rated in terms of their use and helpfulness, revealed similar results. Six strategies in that study were reported by the respondents to be the most frequently used and the most helpful ones. In addition, several vocabulary strategies in Schmitt's study were considered to be helpful, although their usage figures were low. He concluded that "learners can see value in strategies which they do not currently use" (p. 221).

Is there a difference among proficiency levels in terms of strategy use?

With regard to the average frequency of strategy use, no significant difference was found among the three different proficiency levels. However, there is a significant difference between pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate students in

terms of total number of strategies used, with pre-intermediate students using more strategies.

In the literature there have been several studies on the relationship between strategy use and proficiency levels in foreign language learning. These studies have yielded different results. The study by O'Malley et al. (1985), in which the strategy use of beginning and intermediate level ESL students was investigated, found that beginning level students reported using more strategies than intermediate students. However, another study of EFL students by Chamot, O'Malley, Küpper, and Impink-Hernandez (1987, cited in O'Malley & Chamot, 1990) found that higher level students reported using more strategies than lower level students. Wenden (1987) points out that strategies may at times be used consciously, especially when something new is being learnt. She adds that they may also be employed unconsciously as they become automatized. This may account for the fewer number of strategies reported by higher level participants of this study.

Another result obtained from the study is that among the usually employed strategies, there are more cognitive strategies than metacognitive and social-affective strategies for all three proficiency levels. The pre-intermediate level students, however, employ nearly as many metacognitive strategies as cognitive. Moreover, this group uses more metacognitive strategies than the other two groups. One reason for this may be that lower level students pay more attention to correct grammar use and they are more eager to seek practice opportunities, as they rated questionnaire item 13 ("I think about the situations in which I can use the newly learnt grammar structures") higher. Once again the pattern of strategy use by Turkish EFL students is similar to that seen in the literature. O'Malley et al. (1985) also found that beginning

level students used more cognitive and metacognitive strategies than the intermediate level students.

Is there a difference between genders in terms of strategy use?

In the study, 95 men and 79 women were compared in terms of the frequency and number of strategies they used. In terms of the average frequency of strategy use, the difference between genders is approaching significance. With regard to the total number of strategies used, however, there is a significant difference found, with females using more strategies than males. Thirteen strategies from the questionnaire were reported to be usually employed by the females. However, the males reported to use seven strategies with that frequency. This supports what has been found in previous studies. For example, Ehrman and Oxford's (1988) study of 78 adult foreign language learners revealed that females use more learning strategies than males. Similarly, a study by Green and Oxford (1995) indicated higher overall strategy use by women than by men.

With regard to strategy types, the females reported using more metacognitive and social-affective strategies than the males. In addition, eleven of the strategies usually employed by the females are language *learning* strategies, and two are language *use* strategies. The males, on the other hand, reported employing more language *use* strategies; five out of the top seven strategies that the males employ are language *use* strategies, as opposed to two language *learning* strategies. Furthermore, several language *learning* strategies reported by the females, but not by the males, are associated with general study strategies (e.g. taking notes, highlighting important parts of the notes, and examining the mistakes marked by the teacher). These results support the findings of a study by Oxford and Nyikos (1989) in which females

reported significantly more frequent use of general study strategies, formal rule-related practice strategies, and conversational input elicitation strategies. Oxford and Nyikos speculated that this could be explained by "women's desire for good grades and need for social approval" (p. 296).

Green and Oxford's (1995) study also indicated that the strategy types that distinguished females and males were sensory memory strategies (e.g. reviewing English lessons often, and connecting words and location), and social and affective strategies (e.g. asking to be corrected when talking, and encouraging self to speak when afraid). In addition, Green and Oxford state that many of these strategies reflect global learning strategies. According to these researchers, the fact that women are usually classified as more global learners than men may account for their high tendency to use these strategies.

Ehrman and Oxford (1988) also sought to explain the differences in strategy use between genders by analyzing psychological types. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), one of the two data collection instruments used in their study, indicated that women generally preferred intuition to sensing, and feeling to thinking. When this finding was combined with the data from the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), it was revealed that feelers show a statistically clear superiority in use of general strategies. Therefore, their study suggests that psychological type variation may be one of the reasons for the greater strategy use by women.

Is there a relationship between strategy use and perceived importance of grammar?

The data obtained from one of the background questions ("Do you think grammar is important?") indicated that the respondents who answered "Yes" reported using more strategies than those who answered "No". It was also shown that there was a trend towards greater frequency of use of grammar learning strategies on the part of the former group. This finding suggests that Turkish EFL learners give importance to the learning of English grammar, and thus think of different ways to learn it better. This result shows that the accurate use of English is considered to be very important in Turkey.

Is there a relationship between strategy use and grammar achievement?

In order to find an answer to this research question, the correlation between strategy use and average grammar scores was explored within each proficiency group. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, which were calculated for each group, indicated that there are significant positive correlations within the pre-intermediate and intermediate groups in terms of frequency of strategy use. Similarly, concerning the total number of strategies used, significant positive correlations were seen for the pre-intermediate and intermediate levels. These findings indicate that the participants who have higher grammar scores use more grammar strategies than those who have lower scores, and that they use them more frequently. However, among the upper-intermediate students no significant correlation was found. As can be remembered from the previous sections, the upper-intermediate students were shown to use fewer grammar learning strategies than the pre-intermediate students. This may be one reason why there was no correlation

found among the upper-intermediate students in terms of strategy use and achievement.

As can be remembered from the previous chapter, the correlation coefficients seen within the pre-intermediate and intermediate groups were not very high. It may be that there are other factors influential in grammar scores in addition to strategy use, such as motivation or aptitude.

To further explore the differences in strategy use between high grammar achievers and low grammar achievers, the students in each proficiency group were identified as either high or low grammar achievers. Then, the average frequency and total number of strategies they used were compared. The difference found in the means of their strategy frequency of use is approaching significance, indicating a trend towards more frequent use of strategies by high grammar achievers. Similarly, in terms of the total number of strategies they used, a significant difference was found between high and low grammar achievers; that is, high grammar achievers use more strategies. This finding is in contrast to the earlier finding of greater strategy use by lower proficiency learners, and may suggest that greater strategy use, at least for grammar strategies, is related more to course performance than overall language proficiency. This finding suggests that employing grammar learning strategies when learning and using grammar structures is influential in success on grammar tests. However, being a more proficient learner in terms of overall language ability does not necessarily mean employing more grammar learning strategies.

Pedagogical Implications

Oxford (2001) states that learning strategies "make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations" (Oxford, 1990, p. 8) when certain conditions about strategies were met. First, they should fit the learners' learning style, and second, they should relate well to the L2 task at hand (Oxford, 2001). Therefore, certain strategies that help learners deal specifically with grammar tasks are essential for learning a foreign language.

As this study indicated, all EFL learners appear to use learning strategies, whether they are poor or successful learners, and whether they are beginning level students or higher level students. However, they may not always be aware of the strategies they use, and thus may not know whether these strategies work well for them. Therefore, it is the teachers' job to make learners aware of these strategies and encourage them to use strategies with more variety and relevance (Cohen, 1998; Oxford, 2001).

It has been shown by several studies in the literature that strategy instruction, whether given explicitly or implicitly, improves L2 learning (Cohen, 1998; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 2001). The list of strategies devised for this study in order to enable learning and using of grammar structures may help teachers who would like to help their students improve awareness of these strategies. The questionnaire may thus be used to assess their strategy use. This assessment may also help teachers attune their instruction to the students' learning styles and strategies. As Oxford (2001) points out, teachers should draw upon a wide range of instructional approaches to address the different learning styles and strategies of their students.

The strategy instruction can be provided explicitly; for instance, by raising students' awareness about the strategies that distinguish high grammar achievers from low grammar achievers (e.g., asking teacher's help when a grammar structure is not understood, or thinking about the situations that new structures can be used). In addition, the strategies that the participants of this study considered to be useful (e.g., encouraging oneself to speak English when being afraid of making grammar mistakes, taking notes of new grammar structures, and trying to practice new structures in speaking or writing) can be emphasized.

Alternatively, in order to provide an implicit strategy instruction, the teacher may ask his/her students to perform a task in which fluency is emphasized over accuracy. This could be in a form of game that requires the students to take turns to produce orally several sentences in past tense. If the teachers avoid correcting their students constantly in their producing past forms of the verbs, they, then, may encourage the students to use new grammar structures without having any fear to make mistakes.

In Turkey, learning grammar and accurate language production are considered to be important. The students in secondary and higher education need to take several language tests that include large sections on language structure. People employed in governmental offices also take language examinations like KPDS and ÜDS in order to work abroad or get a pay rise. Especially language *learning* strategies that help the acquisition of grammar structures could be stressed in such classes of English for specific purposes. The strategies that Turkish EFL learners find useful, such as taking notes of new grammar structures, reviewing them regularly, and determining the problematic grammar structures could be made explicit for the

students of these classes. Therefore, instruction in grammar learning strategies would also help Turkish EFL learners improve their correct language use.

<div align="center">Limitations</div>

A questionnaire was used in this study, in order to collect data about grammar learning strategies employed by EFL learners. As Dörnyei (2002) states, questionnaires are easy to construct and conduct as they provide a great amount of data in relatively short time. Thus, it allowed the researcher to gather information about grammar learning strategies from 176 participants. However, some researchers (e.g., Cohen, personal communication; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990) emphasize the necessity for additional data collection instruments, such as think-aloud protocols, in order to determine what types of strategies are in fact used when dealing with specific tasks. They further point out that verbal reports gathered through such instruments are especially important to determine the differences between cognitive and metacognitive strategies, as the distinction between these categories may be confusing at times.

The second limitation may be that the study was conducted in only one university, at the School of Foreign Languages of METU. The results concerning grammar strategies may thus apply to only one institution, and may not be generalizable to other settings.

Another limitation concerns the grammar test scores, as the upper-intermediate students took only three grammar quizzes in the second term, which may not have yielded sufficient information about the participants' success in grammar. If more data had been gathered related to their grammar scores, the relationship between strategy use and grammar achievement might have been

explored more thoroughly. Further, had all the participants of this study taken the same grammar tests, the results might have been different.

Suggestions for Further Research

As it is pointed out in the previous section, several limitations of this study necessitate further research into grammar learning strategies. For instance, a study may be conducted by using verbal reports to clarify the mental processes carried out when learning and using grammar structures. In addition, a large-scale study conducted in more than one institution may yield more reliable results about the use of grammar learning strategies. In order to better explore the relationship between grammar achievement and strategy use, a study in which all participants' grammar ability is directly measured using the same test may be conducted.

Further research into grammar learning strategy instruction would also contribute valuable information to the literature. A quasi-experimental study, in which an experimental group that received grammar strategy instruction was compared with a control group, might help the researchers explore the impact of strategy instruction on grammar learning.

Conclusion

This study has revealed that Turkish university preparatory school EFL students use a variety of strategies specifically for learning and using grammar structures. These grammar learning strategies may vary from comparing the rules of the target language with those of the native language to seeking practice opportunities in order to use newly learnt grammar structures. The strategies described in this study have not so far been described in the literature, prior to this study. The study has also revealed that the use of these strategies varies by

proficiency level, gender, or motivation, just like the strategies reported to help other language skills. This lends legitimacy to their inclusion in the inventory of language learning strategies. It has further shown that there is a positive correlation between strategy use and achievement in grammar learning, and that students who are successful on grammar achievement tests use more strategies than those who are less successful. These findings have once again shown the importance of learning strategies to successful learning. In light of these findings, more attention should be given to grammar learning strategies in class rooms, and learners should be given help in developing an awareness of these strategies.

REFERENCES

Abraham, R. G. (1985). Field independence-dependence and the teaching of grammar. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*(4), 689-702.

Brown, A. L., & Palinscar, A. S. (1982). *Inducing strategic learning from texts by means of informed, self-control training*. Champaign: University of Illinois.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). White Plains, N.Y.: Longman.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles : An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. White Plains, N.Y.: Longman.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1-47.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London: Longman.

Cohen, A. D., & Aphek, E. (1980). Retention of second-language vocabulary over time: Investigating the role of mnemonic associations. *System, 8*, 221-235.

DeKeyser, R. (1994). Implicit and explicit learning of L2 grammar: A pilot study. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(1), 188-194.

DeKeyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 42-63). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 206-257). Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2002). *Questionnaires in second language research : Construction, administration, and processing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. L. (1988). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *The Modern Language Journal, 72*(3), 253-265.

Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 83-107.

Eş, Ş. (2003). *Applying focus on form in EFL classes: Focus on form through input flood, output, and corrective feedback.* Unpublished Master's Thesis, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

Fotos, S. (2001). Cognitive approaches to grammar instruction. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 267-284). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(2), 261-297.

Greenfell, M., & Macaro, E. (2007). Claims and critiques. In A. D. Cohen & E. Macaro (Eds.), *Language learner strategies : Thirty years of research and practice* (pp. 9-28). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hinkel, E., & Fotos, S. (2002). *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Hosenfeld, C. (1977). A preliminary investigation of the reading strategies of successful and non-successful language learners. *System, 5*, 110-123.

Johnson, K., & Johnson, H. (1998). *Encyclopedic dictionary of applied linguistics : a handbook for language teaching*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1979). Issues in the teaching of grammar. In M. Celce-Murcia & L. McIntosh (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 217-228). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). Teaching grammar. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 251-266). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. De Bot, C. J. Kramsch & R. B. Ginsberg (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective : Conference papers*. Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.

Mor Mutlu, E. S. (2001). *Task-based teaching effectiveness on students' achievement in learning grammar.* Unpublished Master's Thesis, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

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

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., & Küpper, L. (1989). Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics, 10*, 418-437.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Russo, R. P., & Küpper, L. (1985). Learning Strategy Applications with Students of English as a Second Language. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(3), 557-584.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Oxford, R. L. (2001). Language learning styles and strategies. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 359-366). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Oxford, R. L., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The Modern Language Journal, 73*(3), 291-300.

Parlakyıldız, N. (1997). *Grammar instruction in the discrete skills and the integrated skills programs at Osmangazi University*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara.

Peterson, S. S. (1997). *Pronunciation learning strategies and learning strategies related to pronunciation ability in American university students studying Spanish*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University.

Rathert, S. (2007). Trapped in grammar [Electronic Version]. *HLT Magazine* from http://www.hltmag.co.uk/jan07/sart01.htm.

Reid, J. M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(1), 87-111.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly, 9*(1), 41-51.

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

Sarıçoban, A. (2005). Learner preferences in the use of strategies in learning grammar. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 5*(1), 319-330.

Scarcella, R. C., & Oxford, R. L. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning : The individual in the communicative classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Schmitt, N. (1997). Vocabulary learning strategies. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 199-227). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Spada, N. (2005). Form-focused instruction and second language acquisition: A review of classroom and laboratory research. In K. De Bot, W. Lowie & M. Verspoor (Eds.), *Second language acquisition: An advanced resource book* (pp. 209-220). New York: Routledge.

Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tarone, E. (1981). Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy. *TESOL Quarterly, 15*(3), 285-295.

Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to teach grammar*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education.

Vines Gimeno, V. (2002). *Grammar learning through strategy training: A classroom study on learning conditionals through metacognitive and cognitive strategy training.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain.

Wenden, A., & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning.* Englewood Cliffs, N.Y.: Prentice/Hall International.

White, L. (1995). Universal grammar: Is it just a new name for old problems? In H. D. Brown & S. T. Gonzo (Eds.), *Readings on second language acquisition* (pp. 451-469). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Yalçın, E. (2003). *An analysis of the relationship between the use grammar learning strategies and student achievement at English preparatory school at the University of Gaziantep.* Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Gaziantep, Gaziantep.

APPENDIX A: STRATEGY TYPES OF GRAMMAR LEARNING STRATEGIES

Strategy	Type	
1. When I learn a new grammar structure, I try to associate it with other structures that I already know.	Learning	Cognitive
2. When I learn a new grammar structure, I try to classify it under a group of similar things (e.g. verbs, tenses, etc).	Learning	Cognitive
3. When I learn a new grammar structure, I compare it with my own language by thinking of its equivalent in my native language.	Learning	Cognitive
4. When I see a new grammar structure, I use the context/situation, the dialogue, or the picture in order to understand its meaning.	Learning	Cognitive
5. When I see a new grammar structure, I examine the parts of that structure.	Learning	Cognitive
6. When I see a new grammar structure, I try to infer the rules about that structure.	Learning	Cognitive
7. If I do not understand my teacher's explanation of a new structure, I ask him/her to repeat.	Learning	Social-Affective
8. If I do not understand my teacher's explanation, I ask my friends for help.	Learning	Social-Affective
9. I take notes when my teacher explains a new grammar structure (e.g. I write down the meaning and the usage of the structure).	Learning	Cognitive
10. I use my own language to write the rules of a new grammar structure.	Learning	Cognitive
11. I underline, use different colors or capital letters to emphasize the important parts of grammar rules and explanations.	Learning	Cognitive
12. I draw charts for the grammar rules I learn.	Learning	Cognitive
13. I think about the situations in which I can use the newly learnt grammar structures.	Using	Metacognitive
14. I say a new grammar structure to myself several times in order to memorize it.	Learning	Cognitive
15. I try to notice the new grammar structures that appear in a listening or a reading text.	Learning	Metacognitive
16. I review the grammar structures I learn regularly.	Learning	Cognitive
17. I do grammar exercises at home.	Learning	Cognitive

18. I use grammar books in order to review or better understand new grammar structures.	Learning	Cognitive
19. I preview the grammar subjects that will be covered before coming to class.	Learning	Metacognitive
20. I determine the grammar structures that I have trouble with and make an effort to improve them.	Learning	Metacognitive
21. I examine the mistakes which my instructor has marked in a written assignment, and try to correct them.	Learning	Metacognitive
22. I ask my teacher questions about his/her corrections of my grammatical mistakes.	Learning	Social-Affective
23. I study grammar with a friend or a relative.	Learning	Social-Affective
24. I write one or two sentences using the new grammar structure so that I can remember that structure.	Learning	Cognitive
25. I remember a new grammar structure by thinking of its location in the book (e.g. in the picture or in the dialogue), in my notebook, or on the board.	Using	Cognitive
26. I remember a new grammar structure by thinking of the context/situation it was used in.	Using	Cognitive
27. I try to practice a new grammar structure in speaking or writing.	Learning/Using	Cognitive
28. I write e-mails, letters or compositions in order to practice newly learnt grammar structures.	Learning/Using	Cognitive
29. I try to combine the new structure with my previous knowledge to express new ideas or to make longer sentences.	Using	Cognitive
30. I pay attention to grammar rules when I speak or write.	Using	Metacognitive
31. I try to notice my grammar mistakes and find out the reasons for them.	Learning	Metacognitive
32. I ask good speakers of English to correct my grammar when I talk.	Learning/Using	Social-Affective
33. When my teacher corrects my grammar mistake, I repeat the correct form.	Learning	Cognitive
34. While writing or speaking if I am not sure of a grammar structure, I try to use another one.	Using	Compensation
35. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a grammar mistake.	Using	Social-Affective

APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH VERSION)

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

This study is conducted by Ali Gürata who is studying for MA in teaching English as a foreign language at Bilkent University. The aim of the study is to collect data about the strategies used by learners of foreign language when learning grammar, and to investigate the impact of strategy use on grammar exams. The researcher expects the participants to answer a 35-item-questionnaire that will provide the researcher with the information about grammar learning strategies. Approximate time needed to answer the questionnaire is 15 minutes. In order to discover the impact of strategy use on grammar exams, the researcher also needs to be informed about the participants' grammar exam results. The answers to the questionnaire and exam results will be kept strictly confidential, and used only in this study for scientific purposes. Participation in the study must be on a voluntary basis.

The questionnaire does not contain questions that may cause discomfort in the participants. However, during participation, for any reason, if you feel uncomfortable, you are free to quit at any time. In such a case, it will be sufficient to tell the person conducting the survey (i.e., data collector) that you have not completed the questionnaire.

After all the questionnaires are collected back by the data collector, your questions related to the study will be answered. We would like to thank you in advance for your participation in this study. For further information about the study, you can contact Ali Gürata (e-mail: agurata@bilkent.edu.tr) from Bilkent University Graduate School of Education MA TEFL Program.

I am participating in this study totally on my own will and am aware that I can quit participating at any time I want/ I give my consent for the use of the information I provide for scientific purposes. (Please return this form to the data collector after you have filled it in and signed it).

Name Surname   Date   Signature   Course Taken

                      ----/----/-----

Questionnaire

The class and course level you are enrolled in:

Age:

Gender (please circle):　M　　F

Do you think grammar is important? (please circle):　Y　　N

Below, you will find statements about the strategies you might use when learning or using grammar structures. Please read each statement carefully, and answer the questions given on the right by circling your choice.

	How often do you use this strategy?						I think this is a useful strategy. (Even though I may not use it.)		
---	never	seldom	sometimes	usually	always		totally disagree	partly agree	totally agree
1. When I learn a new grammar structure, I try to associate it with other structures that I already know.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
2. When I learn a new grammar structure, I try to classify it under a group of similar things (e.g. verbs, tenses, etc).	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
3. When I learn a new grammar structure, I compare it with my own language by thinking of its equivalent in my native language.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
4. When I see a new grammar structure, I use the context/situation, the dialogue, or the picture in order to understand its meaning.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
5. When I see a new grammar structure, I examine the parts of that structure.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
6. When I see a new grammar structure, I try to infer the rules about that structure.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
7. If I do not understand my teacher's explanation of a new structure, I ask him/her to repeat.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
8. If I do not understand my teacher's explanation, I ask my friends for help.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
9. I take notes when my teacher explains a new grammar structure (e.g. I write down the meaning and the usage of the structure).	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
10. I use my own language to write the rules of a new grammar structure.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
11. I underline, use different colors or capital letters to emphasize the important parts of grammar rules and explanations.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3

	How often do you use this strategy?						I think this is a useful strategy. (Even though I may not use it.)		
	never	seldom	sometimes	usually	always		totally disagree	partly agree	totally agree
12. I draw charts for the grammar rules I learn.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
13. I think about the situations in which I can use the newly learnt grammar structures.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
14. I say a new grammar structure to myself several times in order to memorize it.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
15. I try to notice the new grammar structures that appear in a listening or a reading text.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
16. I review the grammar structures I learn regularly.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
17. I do grammar exercises at home.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
18. I use grammar books in order to review or better understand new grammar structures.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
19. I preview the grammar subjects that will be covered before coming to class.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
20. I determine the grammar structures that I have trouble with and make an effort to improve them.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
21. I examine the mistakes which my instructor has marked in a written assignment, and try to correct them.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
22. I ask my teacher questions about his/her corrections of my grammatical mistakes.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
23. I study grammar with a friend or a relative.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
24. I write one or two sentences using the new grammar structure so that I can remember that structure.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
25. I remember a new grammar structure by thinking of its location in the book (e.g. in the picture or in the dialogue), in my notebook, or on the board.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
26. I remember a new grammar structure by thinking of the context/situation it was used in.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
27. I try to practice a new grammar structure in speaking or writing.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3

	How often do you use this strategy?						I think this is a useful strategy. (Even though I may not use it.)		
	never	seldom	sometimes	usually	always		totally disagree	partly agree	totally agree
28. I write e-mails, letters or compositions in order to practice newly learnt grammar structures.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
29. I try to combine the new structure with my previous knowledge to express new ideas or to make longer sentences.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
30. I pay attention to grammar rules when I speak or write.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
31. I try to notice my grammar mistakes and find out the reasons for them.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
32. I ask good speakers of English to correct my grammar when I talk.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
33. When my teacher corrects my grammar mistake, I repeat the correct form.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
34. While writing or speaking if I am not sure of a grammar structure, I try to use another one.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
35. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a grammar mistake.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
Please write other strategies you use which are not mentioned above.									

APPENDIX C: QUESTIONNAIRE (TURKISH VERSION)

GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM

Bu çalışma, Ankara Üniversitesi'nde İngilizce okutmanı olarak çalışan ve Bilkent Üniversitesi'nde yüksek lisans yapmakta olan Ali Gürata tarafından yürütülmektedir. Çalışmanın amacı, dil eğitimi alan öğrencilerin, dilbilgisi (gramer) yapılarını öğrenirken kullandıkları stratejileri araştırmak ve strateji kullanımının dilbilgisi sınavlarındaki başarıya etkisini ölçmektir. Bu amaçla, katılımcının 35 soruluk bir dilbilgisi stratejileri anketini cevaplaması beklenmektedir. Anketi cevaplamak için tahmin edilen süre 15 dakikadır. Ayrıca, strateji kullanımının dilbilgisi sınavlarındaki başarıya etkisini ölçmek için katılımcının dilbilgisi sınavları sonuçlarını incelemek gerekmektedir. Ankete verdiğiniz cevaplar ve sınav sonuçlarınız tamamiyle gizli tutulacak ve sadece araştırmacı tarafından değerlendirilecektir; elde edilecek bilgiler bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır. Çalışmaya katılım tamamiyle gönüllülük temelinde olmalıdır.

Anket, genel olarak kişisel rahatsızlık verecek soruları içermemektedir. Ancak, katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden ötürü kendinizi rahatsız hissederseniz cevaplama işini yarıda bırakıp çıkmakta serbestsiniz. Böyle bir durumda anketi uygulayan kişiye, anketi tamamlamadığınızı söylemek yeterli olacaktır.

Anket sonunda, bu çalışmayla ilgili sorularınız cevaplanacaktır. Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz. Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için Bilkent Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi programında yüksek lisans yapmakta olan Ali Gürata (E-posta: agurata@bilkent.edu.tr) ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum ve istediğim zaman yarıda kesip çıkabileceğimi biliyorum. Verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlı yayımlarda kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum. (Formu doldurup imzaladıktan sonra uygulayıcıya geri veriniz).

İsim Soyad   Tarih   İmza   Alınan Ders

                    ----/----/-----

ANKET

Devam ettiğiniz sınıf ve kur (seviye):

Yaşınız:

Cinsiyetiniz (daire içine alınız):   E   K

Dilbilgisinin önemli olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz? (daire içine alınız)   E   H

Aşağıda, dilbilgisi yapılarını öğrenirken ya da uygularken kullanabileceğiniz bazı stratejiler verilmiştir. Tümceleri dikkatle okuyup, sağ tarafta verilen sorulara uygun gördüğünüz seçeneği daire içine alarak yanıt veriniz.

	Bu stratejiyi kullanma sıklığınız nedir?					Bu stratejinin yararlı olduğunu düşünüyorum. (Kullanmasam da)		
	hiç	nadiren	bazen	çoğu zaman	her zaman	Hiç katılmıyorum	Kısmen katılıyorum	Tamamen katılıyorum
1. Yeni bir dilbilgisi yapısı öğrendiğimde, bu yapıyı daha önceden öğrendiğim yapılarla ilişkilendirmeye çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
2. Yeni bir dilbilgisi yapısı öğrendiğimde, bu yapıyı benzer yapıların olduğu grup içinde sınıflandırırım (örn. fiiller, zamanlar, vb.).	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
3. Yeni bir dilbilgisi yapısı öğrendiğimde, bu yapının kendi dilimdeki karşılığını düşünerek, iki dildeki yapıyı karşılaştırırım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
4. Yeni bir dilbilgisi yapısıyla karşılaştığımda, bu yapının ne anlama geldiğini anlamak için, geçtiği durumu, konuşmayı, ya da resmi kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
5. Yeni bir dilbilgisi yapısıyla karşılaştığımda, yapıyı oluşturan parçaları incelerim.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
6. Yeni bir dilbilgisi yapısıyla karşılaştığımda, bu yapıyla ilgili kuralları çıkarmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
7. Eğer öğretmenin yeni bir dilbilgisi yapısıyla ilgili yaptığı açıklamaları anlamazsam, konuyu tekrar etmesini rica ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
8. Eğer öğretmenin yeni bir dilbilgisi yapısıyla ilgili açıklamasını anlamazsam, arkadaşlarıma sorarım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
9. Öğretmen yeni bir dilbilgisi yapısını anlattığında, not alırım (örn. Yapının ne anlama geldiği ve kullanımı gibi bilgileri defterime yazarım).	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
10. Yeni öğrendiğim bir dilbilgisi yapısıyla ilgili kuralları kendi dilimde not ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3

	Bu stratejiyi kullanma sıklığınız nedir?					Bu stratejinin yararlı olduğunu düşünüyorum. (Kullanmasam da)		
	hiç	nadiren	bazen	çoğu zaman	her zaman	Hiç katılmıyorum	Kısmen katılıyorum	Tamamen katılıyorum
11. Dilbilgisi yapılarıyla ilgili kurallar ve açıklamaların önemli yerlerini vurgulamak için altını çizer, farklı renklerde ya da büyük harflerle yazarım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
12. Öğrendiğim dilbilgisi kurallarını daha iyi görebilmek için tablolar çizerim.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
13. Yeni öğrendiğim bir dilbilgisi yapısını hangi durumlarda kullanabileceğimi düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
14. Yeni öğrendiğim bir dilbilgisi yapısını ezberlemek için, bu yapıyı kendi kendime sesli olarak bir kaç kez tekrar ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
15. Okuduğum ya da dinlediğim parçalarda geçen yeni öğrendiğim dilbilgisi yapılarına dikkat ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
16. Yeni öğrendiğim dilbilgisi yapılarını düzenli olarak tekrar ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
17. Evde dilbilgisi alıştırmaları yaparım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
18. Yeni öğrendiğim dilbilgisi yapılarını tekrar etmek ya da daha iyi anlamak için, yardımcı dilbilgisi kitapları kullanırım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
19. Sınıfa gelmeden önce işlenecek dilbilgisi konularına göz atarım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
20. Güçlük çektiğim dilbilgisi yapılarını belirler ve bunların üstesinden gelmek için çaba sarf ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
21. Kompozisyon ödevlerimde işaret edilen hataları inceler ve düzeltmeye çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
22. Dilbilgisi hatalarımla ilgili yaptığı düzeltmeler konusunda öğretmene sorular sorarım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
23. Bir arkadaşımla ya da ailemden birisiyle dilbilgisi yapılarına çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
24. Yeni öğrendiğim bir dilbilgisi yapısını daha sonra hatırlamak için, bu yapıyı kullanarak bir kaç tümce yazarım.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3

	Bu stratejiyi kullanma sıklığınız nedir?						Bu stratejinin yararlı olduğunu düşünüyorum. (Kullanmasam da)		
	hiç	nadiren	bazen	çoğu zaman	her zaman		Hiç katılmıyorum	Kısmen katılıyorum	Tamamen katılıyorum
25. Yeni öğrendiğim bir dilbilgisi yapısını hatırlamak için, bu yapının kitapta geçtiği yeri (örn. bir resim ya da diyalog içinde) ya da defterimdeki ya da tahtadaki yerini hatırlamaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
26. Yeni bir dilbilgisi yapısını hatırlamak için, bu yapının daha önce kullanıldığı durumu hatırlamaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
27. Yeni bir dilbilgisi yapısını konuşurken ya da yazarken kullanmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
28. Yeni öğrendiğim dilbilgisi yapılarını kullanmak için e-posta, mektup ya da kompozisyon yazarım.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
29. Yeni öğrendiğim yapıyı daha önce öğrendiklerimle birleştirerek, yeni düşünceler ifade etmeye ya da daha uzun cümleler kurmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
30. Konuşurken ya da yazarken dilbilgisi kurallarını doğru kullanmaya dikkat ederim.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
31. Konuşurken ya da yazarken yaptığım dilbilgisi hatalarını fark etmeye çalışır, nedenlerini araştırırım.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
32. İngilizceyi iyi bilen birisiyle konuşurken, yaptığım dilbilgisi hatalarını düzeltmesini isterim.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
33. Öğretmen bir yapıyla ilgili hatamı düzelttiğinde, doğru yapıyı sesli tekrar ederim.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
34. Yazarken ya da konuşurken kullanmaya çalıştığım yapının doğru olduğundan emin değilsem, başka bir yapı kullanmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
35. Dilbilgisi hatası yapmaktan korksam bile, kendimi İngilizce konuşmaya zorlarım.	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3

Yukarıda verilenlerden farklı olarak kullandığınız bir strateji varsa lütfen belirtiniz.